



# Independent Police Review Authority

---

## ANNUAL REPORT 2010 - 2012

Rahm Emanuel  
Mayor  
City of Chicago



Ilana B.R. Rosenzweig  
Chief Administrator  
Independent Police Review Authority



**INDEPENDENT POLICE REVIEW AUTHORITY**

Annual Report 2010 – 2012

Ilana B.R. Rosenzweig  
Chief Administrator



|  |    |
|--|----|
| MESSAGE FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR.....                      | 6  |
| INTEGRITY OF INVESTIGATIONS .....                              | 11 |
| <b>Investigative Resources</b> .....                           | 11 |
| <b>Investigative Training</b> .....                            | 14 |
| <b>Improvements to Investigative Procedures</b> .....          | 19 |
| <b>Investigations of Officer Involved Shootings</b> .....      | 23 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS .....  | 25 |
| <b>CPD Lock-Up Procedures</b> .....                            | 25 |
| <b>Lock-Up Surveillance Cameras</b> .....                      | 26 |
| <b>Updated Police Officer Identification Photographs</b> ..... | 26 |
| TRANSPARENCY .....   | 27 |
| <b>Public Reporting</b> .....                                  | 27 |
| <b>Aldermanic Notification</b> .....                           | 27 |
| <b>Outreach to the Public and Law Enforcement</b> .....        | 28 |
| 2010-2011 BY THE NUMBERS.....                                  | 30 |
| 2011-2012 BY THE NUMBERS.....                                  | 31 |
| APPENDIX A   |    |
| IPRA Investigative Steps.....                                  | 34 |
| APPENDIX B   |    |
| Abstract of Sustained Cases.....                               | 39 |

## MESSAGE FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR

The Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) was created in September of 2007, and in that time there have been successful changes to how police oversight has been managed in the City of Chicago. Fair, thorough, and timely investigations are the foundational pillars upon which IPRA stands.

Much like all City departments and Sister Agencies, IPRA has attempted to provide additional and more efficient work with constrained resources. IPRA has not operated at full level of personnel in more than two years due to illness and attrition. The department has experienced vacancies at every level of operations ranging from Intake Aides to the First Deputy Chief Administrator and every position in between. The vacancies accounted for 12-66% of the personnel assigned to each impacted job function and were compounded by the equivalent of an additional 4-7 vacancies due to illness. For much of the past two years, IPRA had 6 vacant investigator positions and several investigators absent for extended periods due to medical leaves. For most of 2012, IPRA operated with three of eight Intake Aides absent due to illness, a retirement, and a resignation. Of the 12 Supervising Investigator positions, only 4 were not affected in the last two years by either a vacancy or an extended illness.

These resource issues have had a concrete impact on IPRA operations. IPRA investigators carry caseloads that are twice as large as the investigators at CPD's Bureau of Internal Affairs. IPRA had to halt hosting quarterly community meetings. And this Annual Report covers two years because IPRA simply did not have the resources to publish a report last year without a significant negative impact on its investigations.

Despite operating with a less than optimal level of personnel, IPRA accomplished a great deal, a testament to the hard work of its employees. IPRA has been able to reduce the average number of cases currently held by our investigators; has increased the percent of investigations completed in less than six months to 70%; completed 95% and 96% of cases closed in 2011 and 2012 respectively, in less than three years; and continues to work to close older investigations.

IPRA remains confident that the Mayor's Office and Office of Budget and Management recognize the seriousness of the issue and are fully committed to working with us to address and face these challenges moving forward. IPRA has made substantial improvements in five years but we also acknowledge that there is always room for improvement. We are closing cases sooner and while the timeliness has improved, so too has the quality of our investigations. IPRA sees the improved quality not just

in side-by-side comparisons of pre-IPRA investigations with current ones, but also in unsolicited feedback received from CPD command staff who review the investigations and note the differences.

## **IPRA Investigative Personnel**

*Hiring.* As discussed above, vacancies have played a major factor in how proficient IPRA can be in delivering those services that are required and expected. Since July 2011, IPRA has engaged in several rounds of hiring in an attempt to fill these vacancies.

*Training.* During the past two years, IPRA staff has received a variety of training, including specialized training on officer-involved shooting investigations, interview techniques, Fourth Amendment Search and Seizure, and Federal criminal prosecutions. In addition, personnel have attended recurrent training with the CPD Academy on relevant CPD policies and procedures that arise frequently in IPRA investigations and with the Illinois State Police Forensic Science Center. IPRA remains committed to constantly improving through on-going training.

## **Improvement to Investigative Procedures**

*The Rapid Pilot Program* changed how IPRA approaches the investigation of matters where IPRA does not yet have cooperation and a sworn statement regarding the alleged misconduct. Instead of first interviews being delayed until the allegation is assigned to its permanent field investigator, and that investigator potentially spending hours or days determining whether cooperation will be forthcoming or the matter needs to be closed for lack of a statement, the task of obtaining a first sworn statement is now assigned to the Rapid Team investigators. This eliminates delay, allows the field investigators to focus their limited resources on investigations where there is an initial sworn statement, and gives the task of pursuing cooperation, which can involve personal visits and multiple phone calls, to Rapid Team investigator who can more efficiently perform these tasks while fulfilling their existing responsibilities.

*Phased Goals for Completing Older Investigations* began at the start of 2011 in conjunction with the Rapid Pilot Project, and focused investigators and their supervisors on completing their older, and often more complex, investigations. The first goal targeted investigations that were more than 24 months old, and the second targeted investigations that were more than 15 months old. In 2011, 660 targeted investigations were closed. A tremendous amount of progress was achieved because of the hard work and dedication of our investigators and supervisors, and more progress is needed.

*The Federal Bureau of Investigation and U.S. Attorney's Office* have worked more directly with IPRA over the past two. IPRA has requested federal review of several matters for potential federal criminal prosecution. As a result of these efforts, currently two matters that IPRA referred are being pursued by federal authorities for potential criminal charges.

## **Efficiencies**

*Mediation* allows an officer to take responsibility for his or her mistakes and reach an agreement with IPRA on an appropriate level of discipline. It provides the officer a faster resolution, letting the officer instead focus on improving future behavior, and frees IPRA resources for other investigations where they may be better utilized. In the past year, IPRA has actively sought to increase its use of mediation. As a result, the number of successful mediations has more than tripled, from 15 in all of 2011, to 45 in just the first three quarters of 2012. These numbers continue to rise.

*Technology.* IPRA has undertaken a number of efforts to increase efficiency through standardization and technology. DocuShare gives IPRA direct electronic access to CPD documents, eliminating time-consuming paper requests and searches. IPRA also began electronic delivery of materials for transcriptions and returns of transcriptions, shortening the transcription process and eliminating hand deliveries. IPRA also created letter template forms for common correspondence to allow support staff to better support investigators.

## **Investigations of Officer Involved Shootings**

*Interviews of Involved Officers* have undergone a number of changes in the past two years after officers began to refuse to provide voluntary statements to the Roundtable Panel that used to gather preliminary information regarding all shootings. As a result of an arbitration award, IPRA may now compel any witness officers to provide a complete statement regarding the incident within 2 hours, but is required to wait 24-36 hours before taking a complete statement from a shooting officer. This delays a crucial component of the IPRA investigation.

*The Force Analysis Panel* was created by IPRA and CPD in 2009 to ensure a thorough review of officer-involved shootings for any systemic issues relating to policy, training, supervision or equipment. It initially met regularly, but has only met twice in the past two years.

---

## Recommendations

IPRA continued its practice of making recommendations to CPD based on matters identified through IPRA investigations.

*CPD Lock-Up Procedures* were amended this past year and IPRA provided recommendations based on its experience investigating extraordinary occurrences in custody such as attempted and successful suicides, or other deaths or serious injuries. CPD adopted IPRA's recommendations to increase notification requirements and clarify supervisor responsibilities.

*Lock-Up Surveillance Cameras* promote the safety of CPD lock-up personnel and detainees, and are a valuable tool for IPRA investigations, yet many were not functioning properly. As a result of IPRA's recommendation that CPD ensure that lock-up facilities have functioning camera systems, CPD evaluated all the cameras, repaired some, and sought estimates to repair others. It is expected that all camera systems will be required or replaced

*Updated Police Officer Identification Photographs* can assist in identifying officers accused of misconduct. IPRA has therefore recommended that CPD update the photographs maintained in its database on a regular schedule, at least every three years. CPD has not yet indicated whether it will undertake this endeavor.

## Transparency

IPRA remains committed to continually improving transparency through increasing information available to all stakeholders, including residents, community organizations, elected officials, and every Chicago Police Department member.

IPRA continues to use its website to provide appropriate information. This year, IPRA added a report that provides statistical data regarding officer-involved Taser discharges reported to IPRA. IPRA also updated and has kept current the summaries of sustained investigations posted on the website, and is close to completing a project to update the shooting investigation reports contained on IPRA's website.

IPRA also continued face-to-face outreach through addressing community organizations, ward meetings, and CPD Training classes, and participation in media interviews.

## **2012-2013 – The Year Ahead**

In 2013, IPRA will build on its successes and continue to explore how it can further improve the quality of its work, while always seeking to be as efficient as possible with the resources entrusted to it by the people of Chicago.

IPRA will be pursuing further investigator training through on-line courses offered free-of-charge through the National Institute of Justice, as well as other advanced training topics. IPRA also has plans for additional operational changes to enhance efficiency.

IPRA's newly-hired Director of Public Affairs will be reinvigorating IPRA's efforts to make further connections with officials, community organizations, and residents across Chicago. During the past year, IPRA has attended Aldermanic community meetings and is looking forward to increasing that activity in 2013, as well as resuming hosting its own community meetings throughout the City.

As IPRA continues its transformation in the next year, it will remain focused on how best to provide fair, thorough, and timely investigations. IPRA is committed to continually improving, through training of personnel, improvements to investigative processes, and increased efficiencies. In addition, IPRA recognizes it is vital to its mission that it continue to focus on communicating with all stakeholders in its process to provide information to them, and receive their constructive feedback.

IPRA is thankful for the many people who have contributed to our ability to undertake this transformation and have supported our efforts, including Mayor Rahm Emanuel, the Mayor's Office, the City Council, IPRA's sister agencies and departments, community-based organizations, faith-based institutions, the Chicago Police Department, and the residents of the City of Chicago. Most importantly, we all should be grateful for the hardworking employees of IPRA who have dealt with a number of difficulties and been asked to take on additional responsibilities because of vacancies, and yet have remained committed to serving the City of Chicago and advancing the important mission of IPRA.

Ilana B.R. Rosenzweig

## INTEGRITY OF INVESTIGATIONS

### Investigative Resources

IPRA is continually working to improve its efficiency in performing investigations without having any negative effect to the quality of the investigations. Both the complainant and the officer involved expect and deserve a fair, thorough, and timely conclusion to the investigative process. The overall quality has been addressed through continued training and initiatives implemented since IPRA separated from CPD in 2007. During the past five years, IPRA has examined how intake and support staff function and how the investigative process could be improved to improve investigators' efficiency. IPRA remains committed to evaluating the investigative process and making changes where deemed necessary. The entire staff will work to ensure that quality and quantity will not be mutually exclusive as it relates to investigations.

### Hiring and Vacancies

During the past few years, the City has been forced to make some difficult decisions regarding department closings and consolidations. While each department and agency has been tasked with doing more with less, IPRA has worked to maximize the efficiency of existing personnel. IPRA has previously shifted resources, adding investigative staff while eliminating administrative positions where it was possible.

Despite these efforts, IPRA has been affected by attrition. Over the past two years IPRA experienced vacancies at all levels of its operations: Intake Aides, Investigators, Supervising Investigators, Coordinator of Investigations, Chief Investigator, First Deputy Chief Administrator, and Director of Public Affairs. The latter vacancy meant IPRA simply did not have sufficient resources to publish an annual report in 2011. Some individuals reached retirement, some leveraged their experience at IPRA to pursue higher-level positions, some were let go for poor performance, and some have been absent due to personal or family illness.

The vacancies accounted for 12-66% of the personnel assigned those job functions, and the leaves due to illness added the equivalent of an additional 4-7 vacancies (or another 4-7% of IPRA's entire workforce). This severely hampered IPRA's ability to investigate, and supervise those investigations. For much of the past two years, IPRA had 6 vacant investigator positions. For most of 2011, IPRA operated with three of eight Intake Aides absent due to illness and a resignation. Of the 12 Supervising Investigator positions, only 4 were not affected in the last two years by either a vacancy or an extended illness.

IPRA met with the Office of Budget and Management in July 2011 and agreed on the need for IPRA to fill its vacancies. That process, however, has been difficult. IPRA currently has two investigator vacancies, 3 Intake Aide vacancies, and 3 Supervising Investigator vacancies.

### **Efficiencies**

Given scarce resources, it has been more important than ever for IPRA to find efficiencies, without undermining its mission.

### ***Mediation***

The contract between the City of Chicago and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) allows for mediations of allegations of misconduct in which the officer steps forward and admits mistakes, and the officer and IPRA reach an agreement on an appropriate level of discipline. Normally, because the officer accepts responsibility for his or her conduct, the mediation will result in a lower disciplinary recommendation than would be made after a full investigation. While IPRA, and its predecessor OPS, used mediation in the past, it was used rarely.

In the past year, IPRA has increased its use of mediation. In early 2011, IPRA focused on identifying appropriate matters for mediation, emphasizing to the investigators that it can be an appropriate way to resolve any investigation that will not result in a recommendation to terminate employment. IPRA then began to work with FOP to notify officers of this option and schedule mediation meetings. As a result of these efforts, the number of successful mediations has more than tripled, from 15 in all of 2011, to 45 in just the first three quarters of 2012. And these numbers continue to rise.

This process has many advantages. For any discipline less than firing, a primary purpose is to correct the behavior of the member going forward. That purpose is achieved with greater frequency when the accused member recognizes the violations of policy and accepts responsibility for her or his conduct. Mediation allows the accused member to do that, in a system where there can then be agreement on an appropriate amount of discipline. In addition, mediation benefits accused members by resolving the allegations of misconduct more quickly. It also allows IPRA to conserve its resources for those investigations that are truly contested or where termination of employment will be recommended. Finally, mediation allows the parties to agree to non-disciplinary interventions in addition to any discipline. For years, IPRA used mediation in certain matters involving domestic violence or alcohol abuse as a way of compelling an accused member to seek alcohol or anger management treatment. Mediation is the only way to compel such treatment. Under the current program, IPRA has also used it to compel officers to receive training on firearms handling after accidental discharges, in addition to alcohol or anger management counseling.

---

---

IPRA anticipates increased numbers of successful mediations moving forward. IPRA has expanded mediation to sergeants, who are members of the Policeman's Benevolent & Protective Association (PBPA). Mediation benefits both IPRA and the officer involved in that it allows the officer to assume responsibility for his or her actions and potentially avoid future similar behavior, while freeing IPRA resources to be utilized on other cases.

#### *Docushare*

IPRA implemented direct access to CPD documents that are maintained by the Bureau of Administrative Services. In the past, when IPRA needed a document from CPD's Bureau of Administrative Services, the investigator completed a paper form to request a particular document. Someone at CPD would then have to search for and forward the document to the requesting investigator. With direct access to CPD's Docushare database, IPRA investigators are now able to sign on to the database and search for and obtain the needed documents directly, increasing efficiency for both IPRA and CPD.

#### *Electronic Transmission of Recordings for Transcription*

Interviews are the foundation of most investigations whether it be the complainant or the accused officer. IPRA began audio-recording interviews in 2008 and this tool has resulted in more efficient investigations because of the time savings, and better quality because of the ability to capture exactly what the interviewer and interviewee say.

With the audio-recording of interviews, IPRA also needs to transcribe a sub-set of those interviews. IPRA has worked with the same vendor for several years. Two years ago IPRA negotiated a 25 percent decrease in the contract rate. Over the past year, IPRA has discussed with the vendor the implementation of electronic transmittal of recordings and transcripts. The vendor agreed to implement this useful change at its expense. The previous process entailed either mailing or IPRA staff delivering a copy of the interview to the transcription vendor who proceeded with the transcription. The new process saves IPRA the resources needed to transport recordings and completed transcripts between IPRA and the vendor. It will also speed the transcription process, which will improve the timeliness of investigations.

#### *Roll-out of Letter Templates*

IPRA has worked diligently over the past few years to build the trust necessary for investigators to change past practices and rely more heavily on support staff for administrative tasks related to investigations. IPRA created letter templates for the most common letters sent by investigators so that the investigators can more easily request assistance from support staff in creating and processing (copying, completing certified mail forms, and mailing) those letters. The goal is to continue to increase reliance on support personnel and increase efficiency.

## **Investigative Training**

IPRA continues to identify in-house training in addition to supplemental training opportunities with outside entities for appropriate staff. It is important to stay current and up to date on new and emerging technology and techniques.

### **Northwestern Center for Public Safety - Shooting Reconstruction and Officer Involved Shooting Investigations**

All officer-involved shooting cases - especially those where there is a loss of life - can elicit a strong response from the community and affected families as well as involved CPD members. Performing a thorough investigation of these incidents requires a high level of skill and training. IPRA is aware of the responsibility involved in investigating an officer-involved shooting and has taken steps to ensure that key personnel have received advanced training in how to investigate these types of cases.

In November 2011, IPRA personnel, including Shooting Specialists and Supervising Investigators, attended three days of training at Northwestern University Center for Public Safety presented by University of North Texas Senior Lecturer Edward Hueske on the investigation of officer-involved shootings. The training focused on forensic reconstruction of the incident. Professor Hueske has more than 23 years experience serving as a forensic scientist for law enforcement agencies and is considered a national expert in shooting incident analysis and reconstruction.

This training improved the ability of IPRA personnel to use physical evidence to help determine what occurred during a shooting. It refreshed knowledge on the use of gunshot residue evidence and forensic analysis of entry and exit wounds. It provided new information about analyzing bullet impact indicators including holes, ricochet marks, and creases. And it improved investigators' understanding of the use of bullet trajectories to reconstruct a shooting.

### **Interview and Interrogation**

Interviews are the primary source of evidence in most investigations. Thus, the interviews investigators conduct are essential to a fair and thorough investigation. That goal can best be achieved when investigators have the necessary skills to organize and conduct an interview.

Newly-hired investigators at IPRA attended a training course conducted by the Northeast Counterdrug Training Center. The training focused on teaching investigators how to best prepare for and conduct interviews and interrogations. To prepare for an interview, investigators were taught techniques for creating a list of open and close-ended questions. Investigators were trained to be mindful of verbal and non-verbal behavior by interviewees during interviews. Finally, investigators learned how to properly pursue information when confronted with verbally evasive answers.

### CPD Training Academy

IPRA investigations enforce CPD standards as set forth in CPD policy. Therefore, IPRA investigators must stay abreast of these policies and any modifications to the policies. For this reason, IPRA investigators and supervising investigators attend annual training at the CPD Training Academy.

The training in August 2011, covered core topics applicable to the majority of IPRA investigations and topics responsive to recent developments at CPD. IPRA investigators were trained on the CPD Use of Force Model because this is implicated in the vast majority of their investigations. In addition, they received training on the reorganization of the CPD Department Directives; Tactical Communications and Methods; Police Observational Devices (POD) and POD retrieval; Emergency Vehicle Operation; and Close-Quarter Engagement. In response to the recent deployment of and need to investigate incidents involving M4 rifles, IPRA investigators also received training on how rifles, and specifically M4 rifles, function and the policies governing the use of those weapons.

During IPRA's annual CPD training in September 2012, investigators received training on CPD detention lock-up procedures for each phase of processing arrestees, and on the requirements for accurate completion of all related reports. They also received training on CPD's policies for responding to calls for service involving people afflicted with mental illness. The investigators received a review of in-car camera functions and policies. Finally, they were trained on changes to CPD's Use of Force Model. This included participating in a role-playing scenario requiring investigators to respond to an encounter with an appropriate amount of force and provide verbal justifications for their decisions.

### 4th Amendment Search and Seizure

The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides the Constitutional standard for evaluating all police use of force, stops and arrests, and searches of persons, vehicles, and property. While issues of stops, arrests, and searches are implicated in many IPRA investigations, the investigators that came from the former Office of Professional Standards had limited experience applying these legal standards in investigations. IPRA therefore has repeatedly focused on training in this area, and plans additional further training in the near future.

In early 2011, the Chicago Police Education and Training Academy offered revised training sessions on the Fourth Amendment entitled “Search and Seizure” and “Probable Cause and Questioning.” These classes focused on the basic Fourth Amendment standards for stopping, searching, and questioning individuals, including when and how Miranda warnings should be given. IPRA management attended these two trainings to audit them and was highly impressed with the quality of instruction.

Therefore, in August 2011, investigative personnel also received this training. This was the second time that IPRA personnel received Fourth Amendment training from CPD. In 2008, during their annual day at the CPD Training Academy, they attended a legal review of Fourth Amendment issues. In April 2009, IPRA supplemented training by the CPD Academy, with in-house training focused on recent developments in court decisions interpreting the Fourth Amendment, including *Arizona v. Gant*, which significantly changed the rules relating to vehicle searches.

IPRA is currently designing another in-house training on the issues implicated by the Fourth Amendment limitations on stopping and searching individuals and vehicles in order to improve investigators’ ability to identify these issues in their investigations and ask appropriate questions to determine compliance with the Fourth Amendment.

#### **Illinois State Police Forensic Science Center**

Many IPRA investigations require forensic testing and Illinois State Police Forensic Science Center (ISPFSC) has analyzed evidence such as gun-shot residue, fingerprints, and DNA for IPRA. IPRA personnel attend periodic training at ISPFSC to ensure they are familiar with the testing process. This past year’s training offered a review of the science behind each ISPFSC forensic discipline, including testing of trace evidence such as fibers and hairs. The training also covered issues, such as what kind of analysis the forensic section can/can not perform; how lab reports are interpreted; and an understanding of applicable databases.

#### **FBI Color of Law Training**

IPRA investigates cases that will at times be referred to an outside agency for criminal prosecution. The FBI is one such partnering agency. Special Agent Eugene Jackson presented training on Color of Law/Excessive Force for IPRA staff to provide a clear understanding of the types of cases that may be referred to the FBI. IPRA supervisors and investigators attended this presentation.

The presentation included an overall description of the federal government’s involvement in prosecuting excessive force matters. The various statutes that the government uses for criminal charges were outlined. The training also analyzed what constitutes a “Color of Law” crime and what does not. Specific cases that the FBI has charged in the past across the nation, as well as cases handled in the Northern District of Illinois were highlighted along with the challenges and successes that the Chicago FBI office has faced.

---

IPRA has previously referred matters to the FBI and U.S. Attorney's Office for potential federal criminal prosecution. IPRA is hopeful that this training will strengthen that partnership and help IPRA investigators identify other incidents that may rise to the level of a federal crime.

### The National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE)

NACOLE is a non-profit organization consisting of individuals and agencies (including IPRA) that work to establish or improve oversight of police officers throughout the United States. In May 2011, Chicago hosted a regional NACOLE meeting, which included a series of seminars covering various issues related to investigation of police misconduct and presented by a range of professionals and attended by a group of IPRA investigative personnel as well as personnel from agencies across the Midwest.

CPD forensic investigator Officer Herbert Keeler provided training on use of the Leica 3D Laser scanning system to record and analyze the scene of an officer-involved shooting. Then Cook County Medical Examiner Dr. Nancy Jones discussed the post-mortem examinations and specifically the forensic analysis of wounds. A panel on domestic violence issues for law enforcement members was presented by IPRA then Supervising Investigator Andrea Stoutenborough, and then Investigator Sherry Daun. Chicago Police Sergeant Larry Snelling covered Perspectives on the Use of Force. The training concluded with a discussion by Dawn Northwehr, PhD. Professor of Catholic Theological Ethics regarding ethical issues in policing.

This day of training gave attendees a wide-ranging insight into potential concerns and the tools needed to investigate police misconduct. It was attended by oversight practitioners from across the Midwest, including individuals from Detroit, Milwaukee and Champaign-Urbana. In addition to the formal training, attendees had opportunities to interact informally and share experiences and advice.

### NATO Training

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) held meetings in Chicago on May 20-21, 2012. This was the first time an American city other than Washington, D.C. had hosted a NATO summit. The City of Chicago, its residents, businesses, and police department had to all prepare for this unprecedented event and the thousands of journalists and protestors that were a result of such an event.

Based on the experiences of other cities that have previously hosted G8, G20 and NATO summits, IPRA understood that there was the potential for a significant number of complaints against the police. During and after the back-to-back G20 and G8 summits in Toronto, Canada in 2010, for example, the Ontario Office of the Independent Police Review Director, an agency similar to IPRA, received 368 complaints. With the chance for a high volume of complaints, IPRA put a plan in place to ensure that staff was trained and prepared.

IPRA investigations enforce CPD standards as set forth in CPD policy. It was important for IPRA investigators to understand what potential issues could arise from the large crowds of NATO protestors and how CPD members were being trained to respond to them. Therefore, a team of IPRA investigators, pre-identified to handle all NATO-related complaints, and all office supervisors, attended several days of extensive training, which included:

- The First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and how it relates to civil actions.
- The impact of the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution during a civil action/disorder.
- The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and how it relates to civil actions.
- Use of Force Model as it pertains to crowd situations.
- Classification of mass arrest incidents.
- Differences between pre-planned and spontaneous events.
- Case reporting responsibilities at a mass arrest incident.
- Processing arrestees at a mass arrest incident.
- Practice drills for the proper use of riot shields and batons during crowd control.
- Extracting and handcuffing an individual subject who is in a crowd.
- Officer formations and hand communications used during crowd control.

In addition, to prepare for intake duties during the NATO conference, all investigative and intake personnel received a more condensed training highlighting the primary use of force issues, how to distinguish CPD personnel from other law enforcement personnel, and CPD's contingencies for mass arrests and detentions. The training focused on providing the knowledge necessary to do a thorough intake and initial investigation of any complaints received.

In the end, IPRA prepared well, and received nine complaints. In addition to providing IPRA with a strong foundation for investigating this and future crowd control situations, IPRA's attendance at the training also offered the opportunity for formal and informal interactions with the officers being trained. Uniformly, they expressed appreciation that IPRA was taking the time to learn what they were being trained to do, before being in a position to judge their behavior.

---

## Improvements to Investigative Procedures

### Bringing IPRA's Caseload Current

Starting at the end of 2010, having made significant progress in addressing the quality of IPRA investigations, IPRA turned to maintaining that improved quality while focusing on the timeliness of those investigations. It was apparent that investigators were closing large numbers of their least complex investigations, while older, more complex matters were not addressed. IPRA therefore undertook a two-pronged approach to address the timeliness of investigations and to improve its performance. As a result, a symptom of the curative process, IPRA closed an increasing number of its oldest investigations in 2011 and 2012. While these older investigations have attracted attention and concern about whether IPRA has an on-going problem, they are, in fact, evidence of IPRA's success at closing older investigations and should be diminishing in number.

### *Rapid Pilot Program*

The first part of this plan involved examining the first part of the investigation process. IPRA investigators can expend significant resources attempting to track down and obtain cooperation and a full statement from a first witness or alleged victim, and an affidavit to support the statement. Traditionally after initial receipt of the complaint, often through a phone call, investigations were assigned to general field team investigators and they would engage in these efforts. However, this could take an inordinate amount of their time, taking that time away from investigations where witnesses and victims had cooperated. In late 2010, therefore, IPRA undertook the Rapid Pilot Project.

The Rapid Team at IPRA consists of Intake Aides and Investigators who are responsible for gathering information about new allegations of misconduct in the first few hours after the allegation is made. The investigators spend more time in the field tracking down evidence, such as video recordings, that could be lost if not gathered immediately. The team also conducts interviews of walk-in complainants. These investigators however, are not assigned investigations to complete after being assigned to this team.

Because these investigators do not receive their own investigations to investigate and because they spend a significant portion of their time in the field, it was anticipated that they could more efficiently complete the first steps of the investigation and determine whether cooperation, a statement, and an affidavit could be obtained, or the matter needed to be closed.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, in addition to normal Rapid duties, in all but exceptional cases, as part of the Rapid Pilot Project these investigators were assigned to obtain first statements and cooperation.

Under the Rapid Pilot Project, when a complainant calls in a complaint instead of being asked whether they would like to schedule an interview immediately or wait for the

assigned investigator, they are now being asked to schedule the interview immediately. This sets up an immediate determination of their level of cooperation, and eliminates the inevitable round of telephone calls and messages to schedule an appointment later. If they appear for that first interview, the matter is immediately assigned to a general field investigator. If they do not appear, then Rapid Team Investigators immediately begin efforts to re-contact them and reschedule the interview, including contacting them by telephone, letter and personal visit on one of their many trips to the field.

The Pilot Project ran for a few months, and an analysis of the results revealed two important developments. First, the Rapid Team Investigators were able to more efficiently obtain initial statements, or determine that such statements were not forthcoming. General field investigators, who now receive a matter only after the initial statement is obtained, are able to focus their attention and resources on those investigations that could be taken through to completion. They are thus able to become more productive.

In addition, the number of investigations closed because of lack of cooperation by a witness or complainant decreased. In 2009 and 2010, 49% and 48%, respectively, of the investigations commenced were closed because of lack of cooperation. In 2011, the first year of the Rapid Pilot Project, that dropped to fewer than 42% of investigations being closed for lack of cooperation. Meaning, not only could the Rapid Team Investigators more efficiently determine whether cooperation could be obtained, they were also more likely to be successful and get cooperation. IPRA will continue to monitor these statistics to determine if the improved results continue.

#### *Phased Goals for Completing Older Investigations*

In conjunction with the Rapid Pilot Project, at the beginning of 2011 IPRA began phased goals for investigators to bring their caseloads more current. This focused investigators and their supervisors on completing their older, and often more complex investigations.

The first phase began in early 2011 and set a goal that by August 15, 2011, no pending investigation be more than 24 months old. A significant number of investigators reached this goal or came very close. Teams of investigators worked together to address caseloads. The second goal was much more ambitious: that by December 31, 2011 no case should be pending investigation that was more than 15 months old. While more ambitious, several investigators did reach this goal or came close. Overall, in 2011, IPRA was able to close more than 660 of the targeted investigations. In 2010, there were 126 cases closed that were over 2 years old. The number of cases over 2 years old closed in 2011 climbed to 374.

---

<sup>1</sup> Under Illinois Law and the FOP and PBPA contracts, with limited exceptions, no officer can be served with an allegation of misconduct absent a complaining statement supported by an affidavit.

In addition, as expected, many of these older, more complex investigations were investigations where the conduct was “Sustained,” or proven. Therefore, this approach also led to an increase in the number of investigations that IPRA sustained in 2011 and 2012.

To make this progress towards reducing caseloads while maintaining or increasing quality, as well as quantity took a concerted effort from both IPRA investigators and supervisors. Investigators worked with their supervisors on regular case management. Overtime, weekend overtime, and support personnel were all made available to help meet the requirements. In conjunction with these phased goals, IPRA initiated aging reports to allow supervisors to more easily track the age of the investigations pending investigation.

Unfortunately, there were also a number of investigators who did not meet their goals. To the extent investigators did not meet the goals, plans were developed to assist them in managing their caseloads better. In addition, some investigators were counseled, received poor performance evaluations, or were disciplined, depending on their progress and the efforts they put into meeting the goals.

As an on-going goal, IPRA is striving to have all investigators maintain caseloads that are no more than 15 months old on a rolling basis. Given IPRA’s caseloads and investigator vacancies, at this time, this goal may not be achievable for all investigators. However, the focus that these phased goals brought to older investigations has been very effective. This progress would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of our investigators and supervisors.

### Photo Array Procedures

When complaints are filed with IPRA, there are many tools that investigators use to identify the accused officer, including asking the complainant or a witness to identify the officer in a photo array. IPRA investigators conduct photo lineups much like a police detective would in a criminal investigation.

IPRA decided to re-examine its procedures for performing photo arrays, and as part of that process investigative staff attended a series of training sessions to familiarize themselves with how other entities conduct and evaluate photo arrays. All investigative staff attended training conducted by the FBI regarding how it creates and presents a photo array. The training focused on the selection of appropriate pictures to include in the array, as well as procedures to protect against improper influences on the process. Several members of IPRA’s investigative staff also went to a demonstration by CPD’s Internal Affairs Division regarding its process for creating and administering a photo array.

Finally, IPRA personnel also attended training presented by attorneys from The Innocence Project at the annual conference of the International Association for Chiefs of Police, which discussed research they have conducted regarding photo arrays. The research

is examining whether it is more reliable to present the photos in an array individually one at a time in a “sequential” order, or together, “simultaneously,” in a six-photo array, commonly known as “six-packs.” A further distinction is made between “blind” presentations, where the individual presenting the photographs does not know who the potential target is, and ones where the presenter does know which picture is the target.

Research in this area has had mixed results. Advocates of sequential line ups have completed studies that they say support sequential line ups reducing the number of false identifications of a “filler” photograph, without a reduction of positive identifications for the target individual. However, other studies have reached other conclusions. Because false positive identifications do not undermine IPRA’s investigations in the same way they would a criminal prosecution – IPRA has decided for now to maintain simultaneous photo arrays, but to adopt a “blind” procedure.

### **Federal Bureau of Investigation and U.S. Attorney’s Office**

Over the past two years, IPRA has engaged more directly with the Civil Rights Squad of the Chicago office of the FBI and with the U.S. Attorney’s Office. IPRA has requested federal review of several matters for potential federal criminal prosecution. The FBI has helped IPRA identify appropriate matters to refer for federal prosecution, as well as to develop investigations properly for that purpose. As a result of these efforts, currently two matter that IPRA referred are being pursued by federal authorities for potential criminal charges.

In addition, IPRA has recently completed a protocol agreement with the FBI and U.S. Attorney’s Office to facilitate future referrals and their joint investigation by IPRA investigators and FBI agents working side-by-side. There is a joint commitment to building a strong cooperative relationship to ensure that criminal misconduct by officers is properly addressed.

IPRA has recently had a number of investigations it referred successfully prosecuted in state court by the State’s Attorney’s Office, this strengthened relationship with federal authorities increases the resources available to IPRA when criminal misconduct occurs.

## **Investigations of Officer-Involved Shootings**

### **Limitations on Interviewing Involved Officers**

Since IPRA’s inception in 2007, there have been several changes to how officer-involved shootings are investigated. In the previous Annual Report, IPRA explained that CPD officers ceased their voluntary participation in the Roundtable, forcing IPRA to compel statements from officers involved in shootings. When the last report was published, FOP was challenging IPRA’s ability to compel those statements.

---

As a result of an arbitration, it was determined that IPRA could compel statements from non-shooting, witness officers within two hours of an officer-involved shooting incident. However, IPRA is now required to wait 24 to 36 hours before compelling a statement from a shooting officer.<sup>2</sup>

This has limited the information available to IPRA to commence its investigation.<sup>3</sup> In addition to changing procedures for the investigation of the shooting, because of this decision IPRA and the Cook County State's Attorney's Office (SAO) have had to modify their protocols. The only statements that IPRA obtains now are compelled ones. Compelled statements implicate officers' rights under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, as interpreted in *Garrity vs New Jersey*, 385 U.S. 493 (1967). The Fifth Amendment protects individuals from being forced to incriminate themselves. Under *Garrity*, a compelled statement taken from an officer may not be used against that officer in a criminal proceeding.

As a matter of policy, IPRA refers all officer-involved shooting incidents to the SAO to determine whether the officer's conduct complied with Illinois law, or should be criminally prosecuted. However, the SAO may not use these compelled statements. IPRA and the SAO engaged in lengthy discussions regarding how to ensure the SAO can review the shootings for compliance with Illinois law while guarding the officers' Constitutional rights. After trying different procedures, the SAO agreed to be responsible for ensuring that no protected, compelled information is improperly used against an officer.

### Force Analysis Panel

Shortly after IPRA was created, it was determined that under OPS once an investigation of an officer-involved shooting was concluded, if no misconduct was found that investigation was never reviewed by sworn CPD personnel. Yet nationwide, it is the standard to ensure that major uses of force, such as officer-involved shootings, are examined not only to determine whether the conduct of the individual involved complied with policy, but also to look systemically at how the incident evolved and whether the incident revealed any systemic deficiencies in training, policy, supervision, and equipment.

To meet this need, IPRA worked with CPD to create the Force Analysis Panel. CPD and IPRA designed its structure and the areas it would inquire into and agreed on additional evidence the IPRA investigation would gather in order to allow CPD to perform this systemic review.

---

<sup>2</sup> IPRA must wait at least 24 hours before taking the statement. If the 24th hour is between 6 pm and 6 am, IPRA must further wait until 6 am. The involved officer can agree to a shorter timeframe. IPRA can agree to a longer timeframe.

<sup>3</sup> The involved officers continue to provide immediate, non-compelled statements to the investigating Detectives and to Assistant State's Attorneys from the Felony Review Unit who must approve any felony charges relating to any criminal conduct by the subject who has been shot or anyone else.

Unfortunately, after several successful years where Force Analysis Panel review resulted in CPD identifying areas where systemic improvements were needed, CPD has convened only two meetings of the Force Analysis Panel in 2011 and 2012, one in March 2011 and one in April 2012. IPRA has offered to discuss any concerns about the Force Analysis panels and offered to adopt procedures to ensure a meaningful review. However, CPD has not engaged in any discussions of this.

This is significant because an officer-involved shooting may be consistent with CPD policy and Illinois law, yet reveal areas where changes to policy, training, supervision, or equipment could improve the safety of the public and the involved officers.

A shooting presented to the Force Analysis Panel in 2010 illustrates this. Officers pulled into a gas station and were going to enter the associated market when they heard and saw an individual, with his back towards the officers, actively firing shots from the far corner of the gas station. As the officers ran towards the individual, he stopped shooting and placed the gun in his pocket near his waistband, then turned around and began walking with his head down in the direction of the officers. The officers continued towards him, not using any of the available vehicles or any other structure for cover. They approached within 8 to 15 feet of the subject and told him to stop and get on the ground. The subject began to lower his hands. The officers believed he was lowering his hands while reaching for the gun in his pocket, he said that he was just lowering his hands in order to get on the ground. Believing he was reaching for his gun, one officer fired his weapon, striking the subject.

We can never know whether the subject was reaching for his gun, and therefore, given the vulnerable position of the officers, they were just lucky he was not faster at firing it. Or, on the other hand, whether the subject was merely trying to follow the instructions to get on the ground.

Because the officers were a mere 8-15 feet from the subject, with no cover, they were required to make a split second decision to protect their safety. Had the officers instead taken advantage of available cover, they would have been in a better position to assess the situation and been less vulnerable if the subject intended to shoot them. These matters were discussed at the Force Analysis Panel, which then provided an opportunity for CPD to address tactical matters through training.

We can never state, for any single shooting, that if the officers had different training or tactics the shooting would not have happened, because we cannot predict how the subject would have acted in those altered circumstances. In the end, the officers will be responding to the subject's actions. However, we can state that when training, policy, supervision and equipment are examined and improved as a result of review of officer involved shootings, over time officers will be safer, and some shootings will be avoided. Therefore, the Force Analysis Panel, with its review of all the evidence regarding an officer-involved shooting, is invaluable.

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

IPRA was created as an entity that operates outside and separate of the Chicago Police Department. The ordinance that created IPRA empowered it to make recommendations to the Superintendent, the Police Board, and the Chairman of the City Council on Public Safety Committee concerning revisions in policy and operating procedures to increase the efficiency of CPD. Since IPRA began operating in September of 2007, there have been instances where through an investigation IPRA has identified areas where training, policy, or procedures could be revised, and has made recommendations regarding those.

### CPD Lock-Up Procedures

Based on investigations IPRA has performed and issues identified in them, IPRA provided comments to CPD regarding proposed revisions to the procedures for individuals in custody, and in particular those who may be in need of medical care.

For instance, IPRA investigations have uncovered inconsistencies between lock up paperwork and arrest reports regarding whether the arrestee was injured or under the influence of alcohol when he entered lock up. IPRA therefore suggested, and CPD agreed, that arresting officers should be required to notify the station supervisor if the arrestee has visible injuries, has made suicidal comments/remarks, or is under the influence of alcohol or drugs. This will help avoid situations where there is a dispute about whether the station supervisor and lock up personnel knew the arrestee required special handling in detention.

Based on experience with investigations where officers found ambiguity in the language of an order, IPRA also made recommendations to ensure certain obligations were clear. IPRA assisted CPD in clarifying language regarding the obligation to transport arrestees for treatment if they are refused transfer to an outside holding facility. IPRA also requested clarifying language about the station supervisor's responsibility to ensure the lock up personnel have performed their duties.

## **Lock-Up Surveillance Cameras**

Based on a number of instances where IPRA has investigated extraordinary occurrences in lock-up, such as a suicide or an injury to an arrestee, and been informed that lock-up cameras were not functioning, IPRA recommended that CPD examine and repair the cameras. These cameras can be a valuable tool for lock-up personnel to monitor arrestee behavior, and perhaps prevent an arrestee from harming himself. In addition, after an allegation of misconduct is made, the cameras may provide invaluable evidence necessary to determine whether CPD personnel performed their duties properly. Finally, they can enhance the safety of lock up personnel and arrestees. As a result of IPRA's recommendation that CPD ensure that lock-up facilities have functioning camera systems, CPD evaluated all the cameras, repaired some, and sought estimates to repair others.

## **Updated Police Officer Identification Photographs**

Many complainants do not know the names of officers they are accusing of misconduct. Therefore, IPRA investigations often start with efforts to identify the involved officers. As discussed above, sometimes IPRA uses photo arrays to identify involved officers.

However, there are times where identifying the officer can prove difficult because of outdated CPD photos. For most officers, the photographs maintained by CPD are many years old. If an officer's photo was taken ten years ago, it can be difficult to identify or exclude her as the officer who committed alleged misconduct last week. Appearances change, weight may increase or decrease, hair styles and color and facial hair may vary over the years.

IPRA has recommended that CPD update the photographs maintained in its database on a regular schedule, at least every three years. Updated photographs could be scheduled based on anniversary of hire, or requirements to go to the Academy to qualify with weapons, so they could be spread out throughout the year, but occur on a regularly scheduled basis for each officer. IPRA has discussed the logistics of such updates with CPD, but CPD has not yet indicated whether it will undertake this endeavor. Without it, however, IPRA will increasingly be confronted with older and older photographs that no longer resemble the involved officers.

## TRANSPARENCY

Transparency is important in establishing and maintaining trust between IPRA and the community at large. This community includes the residents, community organizations, elected officials, and every Chicago Police Department member. During the previous two years, IPRA has continued working to fulfill the mission of the department while being open to its stakeholders. Due to vacant positions, IPRA has had difficulties keeping current in its efforts to maintain transparency, but there have been some significant accomplishments nonetheless.

### Public Reporting – IPRA Website

IPRA continues to use its website to provide appropriate information to the public, while respecting the rights of CPD members, complainants, and witnesses.

This year, IPRA added a report that provides statistical data regarding officer Taser discharges reported to IPRA. The statistics identify the total number of notifications received by IPRA, the number of discharges per CPD District, and demographic information for the individuals on whom the Taser is used. This is similar to the information IPRA has provided for several years regarding officer-involved shootings.

IPRA fell behind in posting summaries of sustained investigations, as well as the complete, redacted investigative reports for officer-involved shootings. In the past year, IPRA has returned to having current summaries of sustained investigations posted on the website, and has almost completed the process to bring current the shooting investigative reports posted on line.

### Aldermanic Notification

In an attempt to keep the City's Aldermen informed of the police-involved shootings that occur in their districts, IPRA began a pilot program in 2012 in which a brief email was distributed to the Aldermen in whose ward the incident occurred, as well as to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Public Safety Committee. After a pilot period, this process was changed to telephonic outreach to the Alderman in whose ward the incident occurred.

This notification program has further opened the lines of communications between IPRA and the Aldermen. The Aldermen interact with the residents of their wards on a daily basis and this information keeps them informed regarding what is occurring in their ward regarding office-involved shootings.

## **Outreach to the Public and Law Enforcement**

### **CPD Training**

IPRA continues to address classes of new recruits, and promoting detectives, sergeants, and lieutenants to explain IPRA's mission and process. These sessions offer a valuable opportunity to explain what IPRA does, and how it does it, as well as answer questions about IPRA. In addition, for each class, IPRA will describe ways that the CPD members will encounter IPRA in their new positions. IPRA uses this time to emphasize the importance of providing accurate information to IPRA, and explain parts of the discipline process that CPD members are often unfamiliar with, such as the ability to enter mediation.

At times IPRA is confronted with strong concerns about discipline, and the ability to have a frank exchange, and correct misinformation directly is invaluable.

### **Community Organizations and Ward Meetings**

IPRA continued its regular meetings with community organizations who were involved in the creation of IPRA and who have requested regular follow-up meetings to discuss IPRA's progress and operations. In October 2011, IPRA's Chief Administrator addressed a forum sponsored by the Chicago Council of Lawyers and American Constitutional Society. This was the fourth annual forum on these issues sponsored by these organizations.

IPRA has also continued to have regular meetings with the Chicago Coalition for Police Accountability. Originally, meetings were held quarterly. However, it was determined that meeting twice a year would be sufficient. These meetings are a valuable opportunity for the Coalition members to ask questions about IPRA, how the reforms are progressing, and concerns they may have about operations. While providing IPRA with valuable feedback, they also allow IPRA the opportunity to ask about issues that are a concern to IPRA and that the membership may have more insights into.

IPRA was also asked to address a youth program at the Lawndale Christian Legal Center. This was a unique opportunity for IPRA's Chief Administrator and Deputy Chief Administrator to speak directly with and answer questions from young people who have contact with police officers on a daily basis.

IPRA continues to attend aldermanic ward meetings as requested to explain how IPRA functions and answer questions from members of the public.

---

---

### Communication with Media Outlets

IPRA continued to communicate with the public and explain its process and procedures through diverse media outlets. IPRA's Chief Administrator was interviewed by Munir Muhammad on his television program. In addition, the Chief Administrator participated in a live interview broadcast by Vocalo radio discussing a Chicago Reporter article about the CPD disciplinary system.

### Chicago Police Board

IPRA continued to attend the Chicago Police Board monthly meetings. The meetings are open to the public, and this past year were held both at CPD Headquarters and at various locations throughout the city of Chicago. At these meetings, IPRA is able to directly address questions from members of the public.

## INDEPENDENT POLICE REVIEW AUTHORITY: 2010-2011 BY THE NUMBERS<sup>1</sup>

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| Total allegations and notifications:        | 8,656 |
| Total retained by IPRA:                     | 2,922 |
| Total referred to States' Attorney's Office | 82    |
| Total investigations closed by IPRA:        | 2,888 |
| Caseload as of September 30, 2011:          | 2,173 |

Table 1: Overview of IPRA Caseload by Quarter <sup>2</sup>

|               | Intake       | Referred to IAD | Investigations Opened | Investigations Closed | Caseload |
|---------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| 4Q 2010       | 2,127        | 1,547           | 746                   | 681                   | 2,233    |
| 1Q 2011       | 2,023        | 1,393           | 610                   | 711                   | 2,132    |
| 2Q 2011       | 2,171        | 1,413           | 778                   | 747                   | 2,159    |
| 3Q 2011       | 2,335        | 1,381           | 788                   | 749                   | 2,173    |
| <b>TOTALS</b> | <b>8,656</b> | <b>5,734</b>    | <b>2,922</b>          | <b>2,888</b>          |          |

Table 2: Primary Categories of Investigations Commenced by IPRA 2010 - 2011

|                        |       |  |     |
|------------------------|-------|--|-----|
| Excessive Force        | 1,281 | Shooting with No Hits                                  | 49  |
| Domestic Violence      | 105   | Extraordinary Occurrence (EO <sup>3</sup> ) in Custody | 48  |
| Verbal Abuse with Bias | 120   | Destruction of Animal                                  | 97  |
| Coercion               | 1     | Taser  | 870 |
| Shooting with Hits     | 61    | O/C Spray  | 39  |

Table 3: Closed Investigations

|               | Sustained | Not Sustained | Unfounded  | Exonerated | No Affidavit <sup>4</sup> | Shooting with Hits | EO        |
|---------------|-----------|---------------|------------|------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| 4Q 2010       | 9         | 85            | 36         | 2          | 238                       | 5                  | 8         |
| 1Q 2011       | 18        | 208           | 51         | 3          | 232                       | 2                  | 13        |
| 2Q 2011       | 24        | 206           | 49         | 5          | 182                       | 7                  | 10        |
| 3Q 2011       | 14        | 175           | 57         | 1          | 194                       | 4                  | 14        |
| <b>TOTALS</b> | <b>65</b> | <b>674</b>    | <b>193</b> | <b>11</b>  | <b>846</b>                | <b>18</b>          | <b>43</b> |

<sup>1</sup> October 1, 2010 – September 30, 2011

<sup>2</sup> As reported in IPRA Quarterly Reports

<sup>3</sup> Extraordinary Occurrence (EO) is a death or injury to a person while in police custody or other extraordinary or unusual occurrence in a lockup facility.

<sup>4</sup> The No Affidavit finding is used when no one who observed the alleged misconduct is provides an interview and affidavit to IPRA, and there is no other evidence sufficient to substitute for such a statement and no other exception applies.

## INDEPENDENT POLICE REVIEW AUTHORITY: 2011-2012 BY THE NUMBERS<sup>1</sup>

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| Total allegations and notifications:        | 8,452 |
| Total retained by IPRA:                     | 2,691 |
| Total referred to States' Attorney's Office | 56    |
| Total investigations closed by IPRA:        | 2,688 |
| Caseload as of September 30, 2011:          | 2,147 |

|               | Intake       | Referred to IAD | Investigations Opened | Investigations Closed | Caseload |
|---------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| 4Q 2011       | 2,038        | 1,350           | 688                   | 594                   | 2,237    |
| 1Q 2012       | 1,995        | 1,375           | 620                   | 649                   | 2,210    |
| 2Q 2012       | 2,155        | 1,462           | 693                   | 747                   | 2,155    |
| 3Q 2012       | 2,264        | 1,574           | 690                   | 698                   | 2,147    |
| <b>TOTALS</b> | <b>8,452</b> | <b>5,761</b>    | <b>2,691</b>          | <b>2,688</b>          |          |

| Excessive Force        | 1,297 | Shooting with No Hits                                  | 50  |
|------------------------|-------|--|-----|
| Domestic Violence      | 118   | Extraordinary Occurrence (EO <sup>3</sup> ) in Custody | 45  |
| Verbal Abuse with Bias | 158   | Destruction of Animal                                  | 84  |
| Coercion               | 3     | Taser  | 788 |
| Shooting with Hits     | 43    | O/C Spray  | 17  |

|               | Sustained       | Not Sustained | Unfounded  | Exonerated | No Affidavit <sup>4</sup> | Shooting with Hits | EO        |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| 4Q 2011       | 14 <sup>5</sup> | 134           | 25         | 3          | 186                       | 1                  | 4         |
| 1Q 2012       | 33              | 136           | 27         | 2          | 176                       | 0                  | 17        |
| 2Q 2012       | 23              | 198           | 64         | 4          | 264                       | 7                  | 5         |
| 3Q 2012       | 35              | 173           | 49         | 4          | 202                       | 1                  | 13        |
| <b>TOTALS</b> | <b>105</b>      | <b>671</b>    | <b>165</b> | <b>13</b>  | <b>828</b>                | <b>9</b>           | <b>39</b> |

<sup>1</sup> October 1, 2011 – September 30, 2012 As of Friday October 19, 2012

<sup>2</sup> As reported in IPRA Quarterly Reports

<sup>3</sup> Extraordinary Occurrence (EO) is a death or injury to a person while in police custody or other extraordinary or unusual occurrence in a lockup facility.

<sup>4</sup> The No Affidavit finding is used when no one who observed the alleged misconduct is provides an interview and affidavit to IPRA, and there is no other evidence sufficient to substitute for such a statement and no other exception applies.

<sup>5</sup> The 4Q 2011 report erroneously reported 16 sustained investigations. Actual number is 14.



**APPENDIX A**

IPRA Investigative Steps

## Appendix A

### **IPRA INVESTIGATIVE STEPS**

#### **Step One – Intake**

A complaint is received and it is assigned a Log Number. IPRA retains those complaints within its jurisdiction and all others are referred to the Chicago Police Department's Bureau of Internal Affairs (BIA) for resolution.

IPRA will send the complainant a letter acknowledging the complaint within five to seven working days. That letter will indicate whether IPRA or BIA is investigating the matter.

#### **Step Two – Complainant/Victim**

IPRA needs a detailed interview from the complainant, victim or someone who witnessed the incident. State and local laws also dictate that an officer cannot be interviewed about alleged misconduct unless a person making the allegation of misconduct has signed a sworn affidavit that certifies that the allegation is true and correct.

IPRA will contact you as well as identified witnesses to obtain a detailed statement and a signed affidavit.

#### **Step Three – Other Interviews and Physical Evidence**

IPRA will work to obtain statements from all witnesses and gather all physical evidence that is relevant to the alleged misconduct. As appropriate, IPRA will request forensic testing such as fingerprint or DNA analysis. IPRA may also seek medical records or other reports.

If the investigation takes longer than six months, IPRA will send the complainant a letter stating the reasons the investigation is not yet complete.

#### **Step Four – Conclusion of Investigations**

IPRA completes a final report summarizing the available evidence and reaching a finding for the complaint. The entire investigation, including the recommended finding, is forwarded to the Chicago Police Department (CPD) for review and implementation.

IPRA will send the complainant a letter informing him or her that IPRA's investigation is complete.

- SUSTAINED: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to justify disciplinary action.
- NOT SUSTAINED: There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.
- UNFOUNDED: The allegation is false or not factual.
- EXONERATED: The incident occurred, but the actions of the accused were lawful and proper.
- NO AFFIDAVIT: No one who witnessed the alleged misconduct provided a sworn statement and no exception to the affidavit requirement was applicable.

#### Step Five – Post-Investigation Review

After IPRA completes its investigation, CPD reviews the investigation and any recommended discipline. If the Superintendent disagrees with the recommended discipline, he must do so in writing and ultimately the Police Board decides the outcome. If discipline is recommended, CPD employees then have grievance and appeal rights to challenge the outcome.

After those rights are exhausted and a final determination has been reached, IPRA will send the complainant another letter regarding the final outcome.



**APPENDIX B**

Abstract of Sustained Cases



## Appendix B

### ABSTRACTS OF SUSTAINED CASES<sup>1</sup>

OCTOBER 2010

#### **No Sustained Cases**

NOVEMBER 2010

#### **Log/C.R. No. 1016110**

On April 28, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 25th District, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer. It was alleged that the accused on or about April 24 through 26 of 2008, harassed complainant in that he sent her several electronic communications after she informed him that she did not want him to contact her unless it was regarding their divorce proceedings. In addition, it was alleged that the accused on or about the months of May through September of 2008, disobeyed a Direct Order by contacting the complainant via e-mail and correspondence sent via USPS. It was alleged that the accused failed to properly secure his firearm during his marriage with the complainant. Based on statements from the accused officer, complainant, and electronic communications, IPRA recommend a finding of "SUSTAIN" for the allegation that the accused harassed complainant in that he sent her several electronic communications after she informed him that she did not want him to contact her unless it was regarding their divorce proceedings. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAIN" for the allegation that the accused disobeyed a Direct Order by contacting the complainant via e-mail and correspondence sent via USPS. IPRA recommend a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation that the accused failed to properly secure his firearm during his marriage with the complainant. IPRA recommended a seven (7) day suspension for the accused officer.

#### **Log/C.R. No. 1004532**

On March 30, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding a physical altercation that occurred in the 18th District, on March 2, 2007, allegedly involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer (Officer A), four on-duty Chicago Police Department officers (Officers B, C, D and E), an on-duty Chicago Police Department

<sup>1</sup> The following reflect IPRA's recommendations to the Chicago Police Department. Results may be modified through the review and grievance process.

sergeant (Sergeant F), and an on-duty Chicago Police Department captain (Captain G). It was alleged that off-duty Officer A battered the complainants, and Officers B, C, D, E and Sergeant F were inattentive to duty in that they received information that the offenders who battered the complainants were possibly Department members and subsequently failed to include that information in the General Offense Case Report; failed to notify Captain G of allegations of misconduct against a Department member; and failed to submit a To/From Subject Report notifying the Department of the misconduct of which they had been made aware of. In addition, it was alleged that Captain G was inattentive to duty in that he received information that the offenders who battered the complainants were possibly Department members and subsequently failed to include that information in the General Offense Case Report; failed to submit a To/From Subject Report notifying the Department of the misconduct of which he had been made aware of; failed to ensure a Complaint Register Number was initiated after being informed that a Department member was possibly the offender in a battery; failed to ensure the related General Offense Case Report was properly submitted to the appropriate District Review Office in a timely matter; and brought discredit upon the Department when he was made aware of possible misconduct by a Department member, failed to report the incident, and failed to properly direct his subordinates. Based on statements from accused members and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A battered the complainants. Based on statements from the accused members and witnesses, IPRA recommend a finding of “SUSTAIN” for the allegations that the accused Officers B, C and Sergeant F were inattentive to duty in that they received information that the offenders who battered the complainants were possibly Department members and subsequently failed to include that information in the General Offense Case Report. Based on statements from the accused members and witnesses, IPRA recommend a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that the accused Officers D and E were inattentive to duty in that they received information that the offenders who battered the complainants were possibly Department members and subsequently failed to include that information in the General Offense Case Report. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the accused Officers B, C, D, E and Sergeant F failed to notify Captain G of allegations of misconduct against a Department member. Based on statements from the accused members, IPRA recommend a finding of “SUSTAIN” for the allegation that the accused Officers B, C and Sergeant F failed to submit a To/From Subject Report notifying the Department of the misconduct of which they had been made aware of. Based on statements from the accused members, IPRA recommend a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the accused Officers D and E failed to submit a To/From Subject Report notifying the Department of the misconduct of which they had been made aware of. Based on statements from the accused, report, and witnesses, IPRA recommend a finding of “SUSTAIN” for the allegation that Captain G was inattentive to duty in that he received information that the offenders who battered the complainants were possibly Department members and subsequently failed to include that information in the General Offense Case Report. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “SUSTAIN”

for the allegations that Captain G failed to submit a To/From Subject Report notifying the Department of the misconduct of which he had been made aware of and failed to ensure the related General Offense Case Report was properly submitted to the appropriate District Review Office in a timely matter. Based on statements from the accused, report, and witnesses, IPRA recommend a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that Captain G failed to ensure the related General Offense Case Report was properly submitted to the appropriate District Review Office in a timely matter. Based on statements from the accused, report, and witnesses, IPRA recommend a finding of “SUSTAIN” for the allegation that Captain G brought discredit upon the Department when he was made aware of possible misconduct by a Department member, failed to report the incident, and failed to properly direct his subordinates. IPRA recommended a ten (10) day suspension for the accused captain, recommended a ten (10) day suspension for the accused sergeant, and recommended a violation be noted for the accused Officers A and B.

#### **Log/C.R. No. 1007014**

On June 27, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding incidents occurring in the 4th District, on May 2, 2007 and June 27, 2007, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer. It was alleged that in the former marital home of the accused and estranged wife (complainant), the officer, on May 2, 2007, pushed his estranged wife’s father and pushed his estranged wife. In addition, it was alleged that in a public place and during a domestic altercation on June 27, 2007, the officer yelled various profanities towards his estranged wife’s father; grabbed and pushed him; yanked complainant’s vehicle key and remote out of his (complainant) hand; threw complainant’s vehicle key and remote onto the grass when he (complainant) wanted them returned; and violated a court order by verbally forcing his minor son to go with him (accused). It is also alleged that on that date the officer yelled profanities at his estranged wife via telephone. Finally, it was alleged that at on or about July 20, 2007, the accused officer was served with an Emergency Order of Protection and the accused failed to notify the Chicago Police Department by immediately preparing the required To-From-Subject Report. Based on statements from the accused officer, and witnesses, IPRA recommend a finding of “SUSTAIN” for the June 27, 2007 allegations that the accused yelled various profanities towards his estranged wife’s father; grabbed and pushed complainant; yanked complainant’s vehicle key and remote out of his (complainant) hand; threw complainant’s vehicle key and remote onto the grass when he (complainant) wanted them returned; and violated a court order by verbally forcing his minor son to go with him (accused). Due to insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegations, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that the accused pushed his estranged wife’s father and pushed his estranged wife on May 2, 2007, and yelled profanities to his estranged wife via telephone on June 27, 2007. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “SUSTAIN” for the allegation that the accused was served with an Emergency

---

---

Order of Protection and the accused failed to notify the Department by immediately preparing the require To-From-Subject Report. IPRA recommended a twenty (20) day suspension for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1014471**

On February 26, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 4th District, on February 18, 2008, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer. It was alleged that the accused forcefully pulled the screen/storm door open causing damage to it; pushed his minor daughter inside the house; struck a table with overnight bags and broke decorative items that were on the table; verbally abused his estranged wife; and violated a Court Order during a domestic altercation at the former marital residence. In addition, on October 29, 2008, it was alleged that the accused made a false report to IPRA. Based on statements from the accused officer, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommend a finding of “SUSTAINED” for the allegations that the accused forcefully pulled the screen/storm door open causing damage to it; pushed his minor daughter inside the house; verbally abused his estranged wife; violated a Court Order; and made a false report to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the accused struck a table with overnight bags and broke decorative items that were on the table. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for the accused member.

## DECEMBER 2010

**Log/C.R. No. 1012821**

On December 21, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 12th District, on December 21, 2007. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty in that his weapon discharged as he holstered it. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommend to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused was inattentive to duty in that his weapon discharged as he holstered it. IPRA recommended a reprimand for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1030203**

On September 17, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 22nd District, on September 13, 2009. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer engaged in an unjustified altercation with a relative of the complainant’s. In addition, it was alleged that the accused physical maltreated the complainant’s relative in that he slapped him. Based on statements from the complainant, accused

---

officer, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommend to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused engaged in an unjustified altercation with the complainant’s relative; and physically maltreated the complainant’s relative in that he slapped him. IPRA recommended a ten (10) day suspension for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1001300**

On November 14, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 5th District, November 14, 2006, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A and B). It is alleged that Officer A discharged his weapon in violation of CPD General Orders; struck the subject on the face/head with his weapon; and made false reports regarding the details of the incident. It was also alleged that Officer B struck the subject about the head with a baton. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommend to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A discharged his weapon in violation of CPD General Orders; and made a false report regarding the details of the incident. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that Officer A struck the subject on the face/head with his weapon. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommend a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that Officer B struck the subject about the head with a baton. IPRA recommended that Officer A be suspended for thirty (30) days.

**Log/C.R. No. 1009960**

On October 9, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 3rd District, on October 9, 2007. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer violated a court Order of Protection; grabbed the complainant by her hair; struck the complainant; struck the complainant on the nose with a closed fist; referred to the complainant as a “bitch”; disobeyed a Direct Order; and failed to provide the Department with a current address. In addition, it was alleged that the accused made false statements to IPRA regarding the incident and where he resided. Based on statements from the complainant, accused officer, and witnesses, reports, audio recordings and photographs, IPRA recommend to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused violated a court Order of Protection; grabbed the complainant by her hair; struck the complainant; struck the complainant on the nose with a closed fist; referred to the complainant as a “bitch”; disobeyed a Direct Order; failed to provide the Department with a current address; and made false statements to IPRA. IPRA recommended separation for the accused member from the Department.

**Log/C.R. No. 1000214**

On October 4, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 8th District, on October 3, 2006, involving five on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A, B, C, D, and E) and one on-duty CPD commander (Commander F). It was alleged that Officer A, who was off-duty, directed profanity at the complainant and his son; pointed a weapon at the complainant and his son without justification; and twisted the complainant's finger. It was also alleged that on August 13, 2009, Officer A provided an inaccurate statement to IPRA. In addition, it was alleged that Officers B, C, D, and E detained the complainant and his son without justification; failed to perform a duty in that they left the complainant's son, a minor, unattended when they took the complainant into custody; and improperly impounded the complainant's vehicle. It was also alleged that Commander F detained the complainant without justification and improperly impounded the complainant's vehicle. The complainant also filed a civil lawsuit in which he alleged that Officer A punched, slapped, kicked and kneed him and his son; detained him and his son without justification; and was intoxicated while off-duty. In the same lawsuit, the complainant also alleged that Officers B, C, D, and E detained him and his son without justification; failed to perform a duty in that they left the complainant's son, a minor, unattended when they took the complainant into custody; and properly impounded the complainant's vehicle. In the same lawsuit, the complainant also alleged that Commander F detained him without justification and improperly impounded his vehicle. Based on statements from the accused officers, complainants, reports, audio-recordings and witnesses, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer A directed profanity at the complainant and his son, and that he provided an inaccurate statement to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations that Officer A pointed a weapon at the complainant and his son; punched, slapped, kicked and kneed the complainant and his son; detained the complainant and his son without justification; properly impounded the complainant's car; and twisted the complainant's finger. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer A was intoxicated while off-duty. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations that Officers B, C, D, and E detained the complainant and his son without justification and improperly impounded the complainant's vehicle. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officers B, C, D and E failed to perform a duty in that they left the complainant's son, a minor, unattended when they took complainant into custody. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Commander F detained the complainant without justification and improperly impounded his car. IPRA recommended that Officer A be suspended for sixty (60) days and that Officers B, C, D, and E each be suspended for three (3) days.

---

**Log/C.R. No. 1024548**

On March 9, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 20th District, on March 9, 2009. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty, in that he accidentally discharged his weapon; and he failed to notify the Office of Emergency Management & Communications (OEMC) of a firearm discharge incident. On April 15, 2009, it was further alleged that the accused provided a false statement to IPRA relative to the incident. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation that the accused failed to perform a duty in that he did not notify OEMC of a firearm discharge incident. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that the accused provided a false statement to IPRA relative to the incident. IPRA recommended a one (1) day suspension for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1024212**

On February 26, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 21st District, on February 25, 2009, involving two Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A and B), both of whom were on duty. It was alleged that Officer A detained the complainants (Victims 1 and 2) without legal justification; engaged in an unnecessary physical altercation with Victim 1 by grabbing her hands/arms, placing them behind her back, and pushing her; and engaged in an unnecessary physical altercation with Victim 2 by unprofessionally/inappropriately touching/attempting to touch Victim 2's head scarf while trying to engage her in inappropriate/flirtatious conversations. It was further alleged that Officer A failed to document his contact with the complainants in a field contact card, and that he provided a false statement to IPRA on May 12, 2009. In addition, it was alleged that Officer B brought discredit upon the CPD in that he witnessed another CPD member acting in an unprofessional manner towards the complainants, but failed to take any action. Based on statements from the accused officers, video recordings, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer A detained the complainants without legal justification; engaged in an unnecessary physical contact with Victim 1 by grabbing her hands/arms, placing them behind her back, and pushing her; engaged in unnecessary physical contact with Victim 2 by unprofessionally/inappropriately touching/attempting to touch Victim 2's head scarf while trying to engage her in inappropriate/flirtatious conversations; failed to document his contact with the complainants in a field contact card; and provided a false statement to IPRA. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B brought discredit upon the CPD in that he witnessed another CPD member acting in an unprofessional manner towards the complainants, but failed to take any action. IPRA recommended that Officer A be separated from the Department and recommended that a one (1) day suspension for Officer B.

---

JANUARY 2011

**Log/C.R. No. 1012971**

On December 29, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents occurring in the 12th District, on December 28, 2007, and December 29, 2007. It was alleged that on December 28, 2007, during a domestic altercation with his wife, an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer verbally abused her; threatened her; was intoxicated; operated a motor vehicle under the influence of alcohol; and failed to properly secure his firearms. In addition, it was alleged that on December 29, 2007, the officer, while off duty and during a domestic altercation with his wife, verbally abused and threatened her. It is further alleged that the officer failed to properly secure his firearms on numerous dates and times during their marriage. Based on statements from the accused officer and his wife, IPRA recommend a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations stemming from the events on December 28, 2007, that the accused verbally abused her; threatened her; was intoxicated; and operated a motor vehicle under the influence of alcohol. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused failed to properly secure his firearms on December 28, 2007. Further, IPRA recommending a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations stemming from events on December 29, 2007, that the accused verbally abused and threatened her. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the accused failed to properly secure his firearms on numerous dates and times during their marriage. IPRA recommended a twenty (20) day suspension for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1006441**

On June 9, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in Dallas, Texas, on June 8, 2007. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer pushed the complainant, a security guard, on the chest area; attempted to provoke the complainant into a physical altercation; directed profanities at the complainant; was intoxicated; directed a derogatory comment toward the complainant; threatened the complainant; and refused to leave the premises. In addition, it was alleged that the accused was belligerent; received a Criminal Trespass Warning; failed to report that he received a citation for Assault as a result of the incident; and failed to report an impending warrant issued against him. It is further alleged that the accused provided a false report to IPRA on January 24, 2008, and was found guilty of Assault. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused pushed the complainant on the chest area; attempted to provoke the complainant into a physical altercation; directed profanities at the complainant; was intoxicated; directed derogatory comments toward the complainant; threatened the complainant; refused to leave the premises; was belligerent; received a Criminal Trespass Warning; and provided a false report to IPRA. Further, IPRA

---

recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that the accused failed to report that he received a citation for Assault as a result of the incident, and failed to report an impending warrant issued against him. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the accused was found guilty of Assault. IPRA recommended a sixty (60) day suspension for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1015935**

On April 21, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 5th District, on April 16, 2008, involving one known Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer and unknown CPD officers. It was alleged that the known officer, while working as a security guard at an elementary school, struck complainant’s son with a baton without justification; and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR). In addition, it is alleged that unknown officers failed to initiate a complaint on behalf of the complainant. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the accused struck the complainant’s son without justification. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused failed to complete a TRR. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that unknown officers failed to initiate a complaint on behalf of the complainant. IPRA recommended a three (3) day suspension for the known officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1025564**

On April 16, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents occurring in the 12th District, on April 14, 2009, and April 15, 2009, involving Chicago Police Department (CPD) members (Sergeant A and Officer B). It was alleged that on-duty Sergeant A sent on-duty Officer B harassing messages via the PDT system of the CPD on April 14, 2009, and April 15, 2009; used Department equipment and time for reasons other than prescribed Department purposes on April 14, 2009, and April 15, 2009; failed to timely report to the Department the alleged improper conduct of a subordinate Department member; and failed to timely report to the Department an alleged violation of the Residency Rule. In addition, it was alleged that Officer B made numerous public statements while both on-duty and off-duty about Sergeant A that were false and reckless to sworn members of the Department and civilians; and was insubordinate and disrespectful to Sergeant A. Based on statements from the accused, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Sergeant A sent Officer B harassing messages via the PDT system of the CPD on April 14, 2009, and April 15, 2009; used Department equipment and time for reasons other than prescribed Department purposes on April 14, 2009, and April 15, 2009; and failed to report to the Department an alleged violation of the Residency Rule. Further, IPRA recommending a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that Sergeant A failed to timely report to the Department the alleged improper conduct of a subordinate Department member. Based on statements from the accused and witnesses,

---

IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that Officer B made numerous public statements about Sergeant A that were false and reckless; and that Officer B was insubordinate or disrespectful toward Sergeant A. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for Sergeant A.

FEBRUARY 2011

**Log/C.R. No. 1002203**

On December 23, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 14th District, on December 23, 2006, involving twenty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A through T). It was alleged that off-duty Officer A, engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with his girlfriend; engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with his girlfriend; struck the complainant on the head and face with his gun; pointed his gun at the complainant; engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the complainant; directed profanities at the complainant; threatened to shoot the complainant; was intoxicated; failed to maintain control of his weapon; failed to report the incident to a supervisor and/or the Department; provided a false report to IPRA; and brought discredit upon the Department. In addition, it was alleged that on-duty Officers B and C both failed to take proper police action; failed to notify a supervisor; had knowledge of police misconduct and failed to report it; failed to return or inventory property received from the complainant; submitted a false report; failed to generate a case report; and made false reports to IPRA. It is also alleged that on-duty Officers D through Q failed to take proper police action; failed to notify a supervisor; had knowledge of police misconduct and failed to report it; and failed to return or inventory property received from the complainant. It is further alleged that Officer P submitted a false report; and failed to generate a case report. It is further alleged that on-duty Officers R and S both failed to take proper police action; failed to notify a supervisor; had knowledge of police misconduct and failed to report it; failed to return or inventory property received from the complainant; and provided false reports to IPRA. In addition, it is alleged that off-duty Officer T had knowledge of police misconduct and failed to report it. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that Officer A engaged in a verbal altercation with his girlfriend; and directed profanities at the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with his girlfriend; struck the complainant on the head and face with his gun; pointed his weapon at complainant; engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the complainant; threatened to shoot the complainant; was intoxicated; failed to maintain control of his weapon; failed to report the incident to a supervisor and/or the Department; provided a false statement to IPRA; and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer B failed to take proper

police action; failed to notify a supervisor; knew of police misconduct and failed to report it; failed to inventory evidence recovered from the complainant; submitted a false report; failed to generate a case report; and provided a false report to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer C failed to take proper police action; failed to notify a supervisor; knew of police misconduct and failed to report it; failed to inventory evidence recovered from the complainant; submitted a false report; failed to generate a case report; and provided a false report to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that Officers D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, P, Q, and S failed to take proper police action; and had knowledge of misconduct and failed to report it. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that Officers D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, P, Q, and R failed to notify a supervisor. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that Officers D, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, N, P, Q, and S failed to return or inventory property received from the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that Officers E and M failed to return or inventory property received from the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that Officer P filed a false report; and failed to generate a case report. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that Officer S provided a false statement to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer R failed to provide proper police service; failed to notify a supervisor; had knowledge of police misconduct and failed to report it; failed to return or inventory property obtained from the complainant; and provided a false statement to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that Officer O failed to take proper police action; failed to notify a supervisor; had knowledge of police conduct and failed to report it; and failed to return or inventory property received from the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that Officer T had knowledge of police misconduct and failed to report it. IPRA recommended separation from the Department for Officer A, a sixty (60) day suspension for Officer B, a sixty (60) day suspension for Officer C, and a twenty (20) day suspension for Officer R.

### **Log/C.R. No. 1021926**

On November 22, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 6th District, on November 21, 2008. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer struck the complainant during a domestic altercation; damaged the complainant’s cell phone by smashing it to prevent her from calling the police; and damaged the bathroom door by punching it with his fist. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, audio recordings, and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused struck the complainant during a domestic altercation; and smashed the complainant’s cell phone to prevent her from calling the police. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the

allegation that the accused damaged the bathroom door by punching it with his fist. IPRA recommended a three (3) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1003786**

On March 2, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding incidents occurring in the 8th District, on February 14, 2007, February 22, 2007, and March 1, 2007. It was alleged that on February 14, 2007, the accused, an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer, used his vehicle to block complainant's estranged husband's driveway to prevent him from leaving; and was intoxicated. It was further alleged that on February 22, 2007, the accused used profanity and referred to complainant by derogatory names; and caused his vehicle door to strike complainant's estranged husband, knocking him to the ground. It was alleged that on March 1, 2007, during a domestic altercation, the accused pulled the complainant's hair and struck and/or kicked her about the face and body; locked her inside her residence and prevented her from leaving; and was intoxicated. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, audio recordings, photographs, and witness statements, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations that on February 14, 2007, the accused blocked the complainant's estranged husband's driveway with his vehicle to prevent him from leaving; and was intoxicated. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations that on February 22, 2007, the accused used profanity and referred to the complainant using derogatory terms; and struck the complainant's estranged husband with his vehicle door, knocking him to the ground. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that on March 1, 2007, the accused struck and kicked the complainant about her face; locked her inside her residence and prevented her from leaving; and was intoxicated. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1009924**

On October 7, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 22nd District, on October 6, 2007. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer struck the complainant on the face with his hand/fist, and/or choked her, and/or struck her in the stomach; displayed his firearm while inside the house; caused a disturbance at/in the vicinity of Address 1 and surrounding area in the neighborhood; caused a disturbance at/in the vicinity of Address 2 by banging on doors; verbally abused the complainant's mother; and failed to properly secure his firearm. In addition, it was alleged that during the marriage of the accused and the complainant, the accused sprayed mace in the complainant's face and on her back and arms; verbally abused the complainant; physically abused the complainant on numerous dates and times; punched holes in the walls of the inside of the marital residence; broke several glass mirrors, and damaged doors and floors in the marital residence with his baton; and

threw furniture out on the front lawn of the marital residence. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that the accused struck the complainant on the face with his hand/fist, and/or choked her, and/or struck her in the stomach; displayed his firearms while inside the house; caused a disturbance at/in the vicinity of Address 1 and surrounding area in the neighborhood; caused a disturbance at/in the vicinity of Address 2 by banging on doors; verbally abused the complainant’s mother; sprayed mace in the complainant’s face and on her back and arms during their marriage; verbally abused the complainant during their marriage; physically abused the complainant on numerous occasions during their marriage; punched holes in the walls of the inside of the marital residence; broke several glass mirrors and damaged doors and floors in the marital residence with his baton; and threw furniture out on the front lawn of the marital residence. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused failed to properly secure his firearm. IPRA recommended a three (3) day suspension for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1022600**

On December 21, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 18th District, on December 21, 2008, involving one Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant (Sergeant A), one CPD Lieutenant (Lieutenant B), and two CPD Officers (Officers C and D), all of whom were off-duty. It was alleged that Sergeant A discharged his pepper spray without justification; failed to make the required notifications after discharging his pepper spray; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR); submitted a false report dated December 23, 2008; submitted a false statement dated March 18, 2009; provided a false statement dated May 1, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. In addition, it was alleged that Lieutenant B became aware of possible misconduct, failed to report the misconduct, and obtain a complaint register number; failed to ensure that the required notifications of a pepper spray discharge were made; failed to ensure that a TRR was completed on the pepper spray discharge; provided a false statement dated March 17, 2009; provided a false statement dated May 1, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. It was also alleged that Officer C became aware of possible misconduct and failed to report the misconduct; provided a false statement dated March 19, 2009; was inattentive to duty on May 1, 2009, when he failed to go to IPRA for a schedule statement; provided a false statement dated May 12, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. It was further alleged that Officer D became aware of possible misconduct and failed to report the misconduct as prescribed in General Order 93-3; provided a false statement dated April 24, 2009; provided a false statement dated May 1, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. Based on statements from the accused members, reports, video recordings, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations

that Sergeant A discharged his pepper spray without justification; failed to make the required notifications after discharging his pepper spray; failed to complete a TRR; submitted a false report dated December 23, 2008; provided a false statement dated March 18, 2009; provided a false statement dated May 1, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Lieutenant B became aware of possible misconduct and failed to report the misconduct and obtain a complaint register number; failed to ensure that the required notifications of a pepper spray discharge were made; failed to ensure that a TRR was completed on the pepper spray discharge; provided a false statement dated March 17, 2009; provided a false statement dated May 1, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer C became aware of possible misconduct and failed to report the misconduct; provided a false statement dated March 19, 2009; was inattentive to duty on May 1, 2009, when he failed to go to IPRA for a schedule statement; provided a false statement on May 12, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer D became aware of possible misconduct and failed to report the misconduct; provided a false statement dated April 24, 2009; provided a false statement dated May 1, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA recommended separation from the Department for Sergeant A, separation from the Department for Lieutenant B, a thirty (30) day suspension for Officer C, and a thirty (30) day suspension for Officer D.

### **Log/C.R. No. 1016176**

On May 1, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 9th District, on May 1, 2008, involving four on-duty Chicago Police Department officers (Officers A, B, C, and D). It was alleged that Officers A and B, in a vacant graveled lot, engaged in conduct unbecoming in that they suggested that the complainant do push-ups; physically maltreated the complainant in that they grabbed the complainant by his belt while he was doing push-ups and pushed him back down, causing him injury; failed to document their encounter in that they failed to complete a Contact Information Card regarding their contact with the complainant and his brother; engaged in improper verbal abuse against the complainant; failed to take appropriate action in that they did not assist the complainant with obtaining medical attention for the injury he sustained; witnessed misconduct and failed to report it; searched the interior of a vehicle without justification; and brought discredit upon the Department. It was also alleged that Officers C and D witnessed misconduct and failed to report it. The complainant also filed a lawsuit alleging that the officers told the complainant he had to do 50 push-ups or they would arrest him; ordered the complainant to shout out the count; dropped the complainant’s body and face into the pavement as the other officers stood by and allowed these acts to occur without intervening. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, video recordings, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that Officer A engaged in conduct

unbecoming in that he suggested that the complainant do push-ups; grabbed the complainant by his belt while he was doing push-ups and pushed him back down, causing him injury; and engaged in improper verbal action against the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that Officer A failed to complete a Contact Information Card regarding his contact with the complainant and his brother. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “EXONERATED” for the allegation that Officer A did not assist the complainant with obtaining medical attention for the injury that he sustained. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A witnessed misconduct and failed to report it; searched the interior of a vehicle without justification; and brought discredit upon the Department. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, video recordings, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer B engaged in conduct unbecoming in that he suggested that the complainant do push-ups in order to avoid arrest; grabbed the complainant by the belt while he was doing push-ups and pushed him back down, causing injury; and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that Officer B failed to properly document the encounter in that he failed to complete a Contact Information Card regarding his contact with the complainant and his brother; and engaged in improper verbal action against the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that Officer B witnessed misconduct and failed to report it; and searched the interior of a vehicle without justification. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, video recording, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officers C and D witnessed misconduct and failed to report it. IPRA recommended that Officer A receive a suspension of fifteen (15) days, Officer B receive a suspension of thirty (30) days, Officer C receive a suspension of seven (7) days, and Officer D receive a suspension of seven (7) days.

**Log/C.R. No. 1025413**

On April 10, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 7th District, on April 4, 2009, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A discharged his weapon without justification; and failed to report the discharge. It was further alleged that Officer A provided a false statement to IPRA; and brought discredit upon the Department. In addition, it was alleged that Officer B witnessed the misconduct of Officer A and failed to report it. It was further alleged that Officer B provided a false statement to IPRA; and brought discredit upon the Department. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A discharged his weapon without justification; failed to report the discharge; provided a false statement to IPRA; and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA

recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer B witnessed the misconduct of Officer A and failed to report it; provided a false statement to IPRA; and brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA recommended the separation of both Officer A and Officer B from the Department.

MARCH 2011

**Log/C.R. No. 1013445**

On January 16, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents occurring in the 25th District on January 8, 2008, and on January 16, 2008. It was alleged that January 8, 2008, an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) detective verbally abused the complainant. In addition, it was alleged that on January 16, 2008, the accused made a racially biased statement to the complainant. It was further alleged that on February 20, 2008, the accused provided a false statement to IPRA. Based on statements from the accused detective, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the accused verbally abused the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused made a racially biased statement to the complainant and provided a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a twenty (20) day suspension for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1000854**

On October 29, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 13th District on October 29, 2006, involving two Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officer A and Probationary Officer B), both of whom were off duty. It was alleged that Officer A directed profanity at the complainant; engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the complainant; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR) for her contact with the complainant; and provided a false statement to IPRA. In addition, it was alleged that Probationary Officer B grabbed the complainant by her hair; and punched the complainant on the head. The complainant also filed a lawsuit against Officer A and Probationary Officer B alleging that they assaulted and battered her; conspired with the CPD to violate her constitutional rights; and falsely detained her without exigent circumstances and/or any other legal justification. Based on statements from Officer A, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that Officer A directed profanity at the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the complainant; failed to complete a TRR; and provided a false statement to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that Probationary Officer B grabbed the complainant by the hair; and punched the complainant on the head. IPRA recommended a twenty (20) day suspension for Officer A. Probationary Officer B was terminated for an unrelated violation from the Chicago Police Department during this investigation.

**Log/C.R. No. 1009478**

On September 21, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 2nd District on September 21, 2007, involving two Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A and B), and two high school students (Victims 1 and 2). It was alleged that Officer A, who was on duty, slapped Victim 1 on the face; grabbed Victim 1 by the neck; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR) for Victim 1; directed profanities during the incident; and grabbed Victim 2 by the neck and choked him. It was further alleged that Officer B, who was off duty and working as a security supervisor at the school, grabbed Victim 2's arm; and threatened to break Victim 2's arm. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer A slapped Victim 1 on the face; grabbed Victim 1 by the neck; failed to complete a TRR for Victim 1; used profanities during the incident; and grabbed Victim 2 by the neck and choked him. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "EXONERATED" for the allegation that Officer B grabbed Victim 2's arm. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer B threatened to break Victim 2's arm. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for Officer A.

**Log/C.R. No. 1021498**

On November 6, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 22nd District, on November 6, 2008. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) detective, while experiencing a negative reaction to multiple medications prescribed for him, used deadly force in violation of Department policy and grabbed the victim. Based on reports, photographs, and statements from witnesses, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused used deadly force in violation of Department policy and grabbed the victim. IPRA recommended that a violation be noted in the accused member's disciplinary file.

**Log/C.R. No. 1000301**

On October 8, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 7th District, on October 7, 2006, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer (Officer A) and an on-duty CPD Sergeant (Sergeant B). It was alleged that Officer A struck the complainant about the head and body with a retractable baton without justification; and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR) regarding his contact with the complainant. In addition, it was alleged that Sergeant B failed to ensure that a TRR was completed by Officer A. Based on statements from the accused members, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer A struck the complainant about the head and body with a retractable baton without justification; and failed

---

to complete a TRR regarding his contact with the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Sergeant B failed to ensure that a TRR was completed by Officer A. IPRA recommended separation from the Department for Officer A and a reprimand for Sergeant B.

APRIL 2011

**Log/C.R. No. 1005496**

On May 7, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in Glenview, Illinois, on May 6, 2007. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer failed to properly secure his weapon; failed to immediately report unlawful actions; violated his bail bond; and was charged with Domestic Battery and Unlawful Restraint, which resulted in his subsequent arrest. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused failed to properly secure his weapon; violated his bail bond; and was charged with Domestic Battery and Unlawful Restraint. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the accused failed to immediately report unlawful actions. IPRA recommended a fifteen (15) day suspension for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1005113**

On April 22, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding incidents occurring in the 5th District on April 20, 2007, and in the 12th District between April 23, 2007, and May 14, 2007. It was alleged that on April 20, 2007, an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer engaged in an unjustified altercation with complainant, his wife, in that he threw water on her; and pushed a cup against her face causing her to fall against an armoire and/or used his body to push her. In addition, it was alleged that between April 23, 2007, and May 14, 2007, the accused failed to notify the Department that there was an active Order of Protection against him. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the complainant in that he threw water on her; and pushed a cup against her face causing her to fall against an armoire, and/or used his body to push her. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the accused failed to notify the Department that there was an active Order of Protection against him. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1003683**

On February 26, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding incidents occurring in the 11th District on February 22, 2007, and in the 14th District on February 23, 2007, involving four Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A, B, C, and D), one CPD Sergeant (Sergeant E) and unknown CPD Officers. It was alleged by the complainant that Officer A stomped on his face without justification; kicked him without justification; and handcuffed him too tightly. It was further alleged by the complainant that Officers B and C directed racial slurs at him; directed profanities at him; and handcuffed him too tightly. It was further alleged by the complainant that Officer D threatened to plant drugs on him. It was further alleged by the complainant that Sergeant E failed to obtain a Complaint Register (CR) number after being made aware of allegations of possible misconduct. It was further alleged by the complainant that unknown officers kicked him about the head and body without justification; punched him on the face without justification; stepped on his hand without justification; discharged a Taser on him without justification; damaged his vehicle; and took his personal belongings. It was further alleged by the complainant that an unknown officer spat on him. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations that Officer A stomped on the complainant's face without justification; kicked him without justification; and handcuffed him too tightly. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations that Officer B handcuffed the complainant too tightly; and punched him on the body without justification. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations that Officer C directed racial slurs at the complainant; directed profanities at him; and handcuffed him too tightly. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer D threatened to plant drugs on the complainant. Further, based on the complainant's and Sergeant's statements, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Sergeant E failed to obtain a CR number after being made aware of allegations of misconduct. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations that unknown officers kicked the complainant about the head and body without justification; punched him on the face without justification; stepped on his hand without justification; discharged a Taser on him without justification; damaged his vehicle; took his personal belongings; and spat on him. IPRA recommended a three (3) day suspension for Sergeant E.

**Log/C.R. No. 1023629**

On February 4, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 9th District, on February 4, 2009, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A and B) and three victims (Victims 1, 2, and the complainant). It was alleged that Officer A verbally abused, unlawfully searched and seized, and improperly threatened Victim 1; engaged in the improper verbal abuse of the complainant; and directed profanities

at Victim 2. It was further alleged that Officer A disobeyed a Department General Order by conducting an improper search; made a false statement concerning the incident to IPRA; and engaged in conduct that brought discredit upon the Department. In addition, it was alleged that Officer B verbally abused, unlawfully searched and seized, and improperly threatened Victim 1; engaged in the improper verbal abuse of the complainant; and directed profanities at Victim 2. It was further alleged that Officer B disobeyed a Department General Order by conducting an improper search; made a false statement concerning the incident to IPRA; and engaged in conduct that brought discredit upon the Department. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A verbally abused, unlawfully searched and seized, and improperly threatened Victim 1; engaged in the improper verbal abuse of the complainant; directed profanities at Victim 2; disobeyed a Department General Order by conducting an improper search; made a false statement during an interview at IPRA; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer B verbally abused, unlawfully searched and seized, and improperly threatened Victim 1; engaged in the improper verbal abuse of the complainant; directed profanities at Victim 2; disobeyed a Department General Order by conducting an improper search; made a false statement during an interview with IPRA; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA recommended thirty (30) day suspensions for both Officers A and B.

### **Log/C.R. No. 1026980**

On June 3, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 8th District, on June 3, 2009, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A directed profanities at the complainant; engaged in the improper verbal abuse of the complainant; used improper force against the complainant; and threatened to arrest the complainant without basis. In addition, it was alleged that Officer B failed to report the misconduct of Officer A, concerning Officer A’s treatment of the complainant. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A directed profanities at the complainant; engaged in the improper verbal abuse of the complainant; used improper force against the complainant; and threatened to arrest the complainant without basis. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer B failed to report the misconduct of Officer A. IPRA recommended a (15) day suspension for Officer A and a reprimand for Officer B.

**Log/C.R. No. 1001233**

On November 12, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding incidents occurring in the 8th District on September 10, 2006, and on November 12, 2006, involving an on-duty and an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant (Sergeants A and B). It was alleged that on September 10, 2006, Sergeant A, while off-duty, grabbed the complainant and tried to pull her inside his vehicle; and kicked the complainant on the leg. In addition, it was alleged that on November 12, 2006, Sergeant A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the complainant in that he pulled her by the hair, slammed her to the floor, placed his arm across her throat and choked her, spat on her face, kicked her in the shin and thigh, grabbed her by the coat and pulled off the buttons, pulled her down the stairs by her hair, and/or threw her cell phone outside; and verbally abused the complainant in that he called her a “whore.” It was further alleged that Sergeant B failed to initiate a Complaint Register (CR) Number against Sergeant A on behalf of the complainant after she made allegations of misconduct against Sergeant A. Based on statements from the accused sergeants, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that on September 10, 2006, Sergeant A grabbed the complainant and tried to pull her inside his vehicle; and kicked the complainant on the leg. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that on November 12, 2006, Sergeant A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the complainant in that he pulled her by the hair, slammed her to the floor, placed his arm across her throat and choked her, spat on her face, kicked her in the shin and thigh, and grabbed her by the coat and pulled off the buttons; and verbally abused the complainant in that he called her a “whore.” Additionally, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Sergeant B failed to initiate a CR Number against Sergeant A on behalf of the complainant after she made allegations of misconduct against Sergeant A. IPRA recommended a ten (10) day suspension for Sergeant A and a reprimand for Sergeant B.

MAY 2011

**Log/C.R. No. 1040012**

On September 21, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 12th District, on September 21, 2009. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer mishandled his weapon, which resulted in an accidental discharge. Based on reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused mishandled his weapon, which resulted in an accidental discharge. Based on a mediation, the accused member received a one (1) day suspension.

**Log/C.R. No. 1030340**

On September 21, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 3rd District, on September 21, 2009. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer mishandled his weapon, which resulted in an accidental discharge in the bathroom. Based on reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused mishandled his weapon, which resulted in an accidental discharge in the bathroom. Based on a mediation, the violation was noted in the accused’s disciplinary file.

**Log/C.R. No. 1022994**

On January 9, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 5th District, on January 9, 2009. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon. IPRA recommended a reprimand for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1019258**

On August 19, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 19th District, on August 19, 2008, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A raised the complainant’s right arm while it was behind his back and attempted to break it; handcuffed the complainant too tightly; verbally abused the complainant; stood on the complainant’s left thigh and head/neck area with his foot; and threatened to gas and taser the complainant. It was also alleged that Officer A failed to file a Tactical Response Report (TRR); was inattentive to duty; falsified a report; and brought discredit upon the Department. In addition, it was alleged that Officer B handcuffed the complainant too tightly. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that Officer A raised the complainant’s right arm while it was behind his back and attempted to break it; verbally abused the complainant; stood on the complainant’s left thigh and head/neck area with his foot; failed to file a TRR; and was inattentive to duty. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that Officer A handcuffed the complainant too tightly. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “EXONERATED” for the allegation that Officer A threatened to gas and taser the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A falsified a report; and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that Officer B handcuffed the complainant too tightly. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for Officer A.

**Log/C.R. No. 1032752**

On December 24, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 7th District, on December 24, 2009. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty in that she unintentionally discharged a Taser. Based on reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused was inattentive to duty in that she unintentionally discharged a Taser. Based on a mediation, the violation was noted in the accused’s disciplinary file.

**Log/C.R. No. 1035207**

On April 6, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 1st District, on April 6, 2010. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty in that he unintentionally discharged a Taser. Based on reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused was inattentive to duty in that he unintentionally discharged a Taser. Based on a mediation, the violation was noted in the accused’s disciplinary file.

**Log/C.R. No. 1035474**

On April 15, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 9th District, on April 15, 2010. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty in that she unintentionally discharged a Taser. Based on reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused was inattentive to duty in that she unintentionally discharged a Taser. Based on a mediation, the violation was noted in the accused’s disciplinary file.

**Log/C.R. No. 1034065**

On February 23, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 3rd District, on February 23, 2010. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty in that she unintentionally discharged a Taser. Based on reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused was inattentive to duty in that she unintentionally discharged a Taser. Based on a mediation, the violation was noted in the accused’s disciplinary file.

**Log/C.R. No. 1037128**

On June 12, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 13th District, on June 11, 2010. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty in that she unintentionally discharged a Taser. Based on reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused was inattentive to duty in that she unintentionally discharged a Taser. Based on a mediation, the violation was noted in the accused’s disciplinary file.

JUNE 2011

**Log/C.R. No. 1016302**

On May 6, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents occurring in the 2nd District, on various dates, involving three on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A, B, and C), one on-duty CPD sergeant (Sergeant D), and one on-duty CPD lieutenant (Lieutenant E), and six high school students (Victims 1 through 6). It was alleged that during the month of September 2007, Officer A struck Victim 1 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle. It was further alleged that on April 7, 2008, Officer A struck Victims 2 and 3 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle. It was further alleged that on April 29, 2008, Officer A struck Victim 4 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle. It was further alleged that on May 5, 2008, Officer A struck Victims 1, 4, 5, and 6 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle; and instructed Victim 5 to make derogatory remarks. It was further alleged that Officer A brought discredit upon the Department. It was further alleged that on September 29, 2009, Officer A provided a false statement to IPRA. In addition, it was alleged that on April 7, 2008, Officer B struck Victim 2 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle. It was further alleged that on May 5, 2008, Officer B struck Victims 1, 4, 5, and 6 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle; and instructed Victim 5 to make derogatory remarks. It was further alleged that Officer B brought discredit upon the Department. It was further alleged that on November 6, 2009, Officer B provided a false statement to IPRA. In addition, it was alleged that on April 29, 2008, Officer C struck Victim 4 on his buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle. It was further alleged that on May 5, 2008, Officer C verbally abused Victim 5; punched Victim 6 on the stomach and face inside a closet; slapped Victim 6 on the face inside a closet; kicked Victim 6 on the buttocks; and held Victim 6’s hands down on a desk while Officers A and B struck him with a paddle. It was further alleged that Officer C brought discredit upon the Department. It was further alleged that on May 6, 2008, Officer C received information of misconduct and failed to follow the provisions of a General Order regarding reporting and investigation of the misconduct. It was further alleged that on November 5, 2009, Officer C provided a false statement to IPRA. In addition, it was alleged that on May 5, 2008, Sergeant D received information of misconduct and

failed to follow the provisions of a General Order regarding reporting and investigation of the misconduct; and failed to ensure that the two wooden paddles were inventoried. In addition, it was alleged that on May 8, 2008, Lieutenant E failed to report the misconduct of Sergeant D. Based on statements from the accused members, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that on May 5, 2008, Officer A struck Victims 1, 4, 5, and 6 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle; on May 5, 2008, instructed Victim 5 to make derogatory remarks and brought discredit upon the Department; and on September 29, 2009, provided a false statement to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that during the month of September 2007, Officer A struck Victim 1 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle; on April 7, 2008, Officer A struck Victims 2 and 3 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle; and on April 29, 2008, Officer A struck Victim 4 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle. In addition, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that on May 5, 2008, Officer B struck Victims 1, 4, 5, and 6 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle; on May 5, 2008, instructed Victim 5 to state words to make derogatory remarks and brought discredit upon the Department; and on November 6, 2009, provided a false statement to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that on April 7, 2008, Officer B struck Victim 2 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle. In addition, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that on May 5, 2008, while inside a closet, Officer C punched Victim 6 on the stomach and face, slapped Victim 6 on the face, and kicked Victim 6 on the buttocks; on May 5, 2008, Officer C verbally abused Victim 5; on May 5, 2008, held Victim 6’s hands down on a desk while Officers A and B struck him with a paddle; brought discredit upon the Department; on November 5, 2009, provided a false statement to IPRA; and on May 6, 2008, received information of misconduct and failed to follow the provisions of a General Order. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that on April 29, 2008, Officer C struck Victim 5 on the buttocks and/or thigh area with a paddle. In addition, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that on May 5, 2008, Sergeant D received information of misconduct and failed to follow the provisions of a General Order. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that on May 5, 2008, Sergeant D failed to assure that the two wooden paddles were inventoried. In addition, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that on May 8, 2008, Lieutenant E failed to report misconduct against Sergeant D. IPRA recommended separation from the Department for Officers A, B, and C, and five (5) day suspensions for both Sergeant D and Lieutenant E.

**Log/C.R. No. 1022236**

On December 4, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 8th District, on November 29, 2008, involving five on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A, B, C, D, and E) and one on-duty CPD sergeant (Sergeant F). It was alleged by the

complainant that Officer A struck her on the left side of her face/jaw with an open hand; kneed her on the back of her head and leg; elbowed her in the chin and neck; dragged her down some stairs; was inattentive to duty by taking her outside while wearing only boxer shorts and a tank top; verbally abused her; directed profanities at her; and verbally abused her while at the hospital. It is further alleged that Officer A prepared a To-From-Subject-Report and a question and answer statement that contained a false account of the incident. In addition, it was alleged that Officer B used profanity; and threatened her. In addition, it was alleged that Officers C and D, at the 8th District Station, failed to register the complainant's complaint against a CPD member. It is further alleged that Sergeant F, at the 8th District Station, failed to register the complainant's complaint against Officer A; verbally abused her; and directed profanities at her. In addition, it is alleged that Officer E, at the 5th District Station, failed to register a complaint against a CPD member. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations against Officers B, C, D, and E, and Sergeant F. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations against Officer A that he struck the complainant on the left side of her face/jaw with an open hand; kneed the complainant on the back of her head and leg; elbowed the complainant on the chin and neck; dragged the complainant down some stairs; was inattentive to duty by taking the complainant outside while wearing only boxer shorts and a tank top; verbally abused her. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer A directed profanities at the complainant; and submitted a false report to IPRA. IPRA recommended a ten (10) day suspension for Officer A.

### **Log/C.R. No. 1005987**

On May 24, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 12th District, on May 23, 2007. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer choked the complainant; pushed the complainant; punched the complainant on the face; and threatened the complainant. In addition, it was alleged that the accused was arrested and charged with Aggravated Battery; was indicted on the two counts of Aggravated Battery, five counts of Official Misconduct, and one count of Unlawful Restraint; was convicted of two counts of Aggravated Battery and five counts of Official Misconduct; and brought discredit upon the Department. Based on reports and statements from witnesses, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused choked the complainant; pushed the complainant; punched the complainant on the face; threatened the complainant; was arrested for Aggravated Battery; was indicted on eight criminal charges; was found guilty of two counts of Aggravated Battery and five counts of Official Misconduct; and brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA recommended separation from the Department for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1015390**

On April 1, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 5th District, on April 1, 2008, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A grabbed the Complainant A, to whom he was married but separated from, by the neck and pushed her; slapped Complainant A on the face, causing her to fall to the ground; verbally abused Complainant A; pointed a gun at Complainant B and chased him down the street; smashed out the windows of the Complainant B's vehicle; and was arrested and charged with Official Misconduct, Domestic Battery, and Criminal Damage to Property. In addition, it was alleged that Officer B witnessed the criminal conduct committed by his partner, Officer A, and failed to take police action and/or failed to report the misconduct. Based on statements from Officer B, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer A grabbed the Complainant A by the neck and pushed her; slapped Complainant A on the face, causing her to fall to the ground; verbally abused Complainant A; pointed a gun at the Complainant B and chased him down the street; smashed out the windows of the Complainant B's vehicle; and was arrested and charged with Official Misconduct, Domestic Battery, and Criminal Damage to Property. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer B witnessed the criminal conduct committed by his partner, Officer A, and failed to take police action and/or failed to report the misconduct. IPRA recommended separation from the Department for Officer A.

**Log/C.R. No. 1036567**

On May 24, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 16th District, on May 24, 2010. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his Taser. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his Taser. IPRA recommended that a violation be noted in the accused's disciplinary file.

**Log/C.R. No. 1017553**

On June 21, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 18th District, on June 21, 2008. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer directed profanities at the complainant; and pointed his handgun at the complainant. Based on reports and witnesses, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused directed profanities at the complainant and pointed his handgun at the complainant. IPRA recommended a fifteen (15) day suspension for the accused member.

---

**Log/C.R. No. 1032584**

On December 16, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in Aurora, Illinois, on December 16, 2009. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer pointed a handgun at the complainant without lawful justification; and failed to immediately notify the CPD that he was under investigation by an outside agency. It was further alleged that the accused made a false statement to IPRA concerning the incident. Based on statements from the accused officer, report, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused pointed a handgun at the complainant without lawful justification; failed to immediately notify the CPD that he was under investigation by an outside agency; and made a false statement to IPRA concerning the incident. IPRA recommended a sixty (60) day suspension for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1032712**

On December 22, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 19th District, on December 15, 2009, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A kicked the complainant in the face; punched the complainant in his face; and dragged the complainant. It was further alleged that Officer A provided a false statement to IPRA. In addition, it was alleged that Officer B grabbed the complainant by his neck; and shook the complainant’s body. It was further alleged that Officer B failed to report misconduct by a fellow officer; and provided a false statement to IPRA. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A kicked the complainant in the face; and provided a false statement to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that Officer A punched the complainant in the face; and dragged the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that Officer B grabbed the complainant by his neck; shook the complainant’s body; failed to report misconduct by a fellow officer; and provided a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) suspension for Officer A.

JULY 2011

**Log/C.R. No. 1030631**

On October 1, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 16th District, on October 1, 2009. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer struck the complainant on the face during a domestic altercation; was intoxicated while off-

duty; and operated a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol. Based on reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations against the accused. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1044018**

On March 16, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 2nd District, on March 16, 2011. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty in that her Taser discharged while she attempted to re-holster it following checking its energy level. Based on reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation against the accused. Based on a mediation, a violation was noted in the accused’s disciplinary file.

**Log/C.R. No. 1023874**

On February 13, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 23rd District, on February 13, 2009. It was alleged that a on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his Taser. Based on statements from the accused, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation against the accused. IPRA recommended that a violation be noted in the accused’s disciplinary file.

**Log/C.R. No. 1043749**

On March 4, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 1st District, on March 4, 2011. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty in that he discharged his Taser without justification. Based on reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation against the accused. Based on a mediation, a violation was noted in the accused’s disciplinary file.

**Log/C.R. No. 1018738**

On August 2, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 23rd District, on August 1, 2008. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer verbally abused the complainant; slapped the complainant; was intoxicated while off duty; physically maltreated the complainant; and brought discredit upon the Department. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations against the accused. IPRA recommended separation for the accused member from the Department.

---

---

AUGUST 2011

**Log/C.R. No. 1029438**

On August 22, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 16th District, on August 22, 2009. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer engaged in a verbal altercation with the complainant; grabbed the complainant and pushed her onto the floor; used his forearm on her neck to pin her down; removed and left with her cellular phone and purse; and was intoxicated. Based on statements from the accused officer, complainant, witnesses, photographs and reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused engaged in a verbal altercation with the complainant; and removed and left with her cellular phone and purse. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that the accused grabbed the complainant and pushed her onto the floor; used his forearm on her neck to pin her down; and was intoxicated. IPRA recommended a two (2) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1007971**

On July 29, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 8th District, on July 29, 2007 involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department Officer (Officer A) and on-duty Sergeant (Sergeant B). It was alleged that Officer A engaged in a verbal altercation with the complainants; directed profanities at the complainants; and pointed his weapon at the complainants without justification. In addition, it was alleged that Sergeant B failed to register the complaint on behalf of the complainants. Based on statements from the accused members, complainant and witness, reports, and audio transmissions, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer engaged in a verbal altercation with the complainants and pointed his weapon at the complainants without justification. Further, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A directed profanities at the complainants. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Sergeant B failed to register the complaint on behalf of the complainants. IPRA recommended a ten (10) day suspension for Officer A and a “violation noted” for Sergeant B.

**Log/C.R. No. 1030944**

On October 13, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 25th District, on March 23, 2007. It was alleged that a Chicago Police Department officer had two different types of ammunition loaded in his magazine. Based on the accused officer’s own statement and reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused had

---

two different types of ammunition loaded in his magazine, thus failing to comply with Chicago Police Department regulations. IPRA recommended a “violation noted” for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1024756**

On March 17, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in Oak Park, IL on March 17, 2009. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer physically maltreated complainant; used improper verbal abuse; failed to file a Tactical Response Report; failed to report the incident to a supervisor; and failed to take appropriate police action. Based on statements from the accused officer, complainant and witnesses, reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused physically maltreated complainant; used improper verbal abuse; failed to file a Tactical Response Report; failed to report the incident to a supervisor; and failed to take appropriate police action. IPRA recommended a ten (10) day suspension for the accused member.

SEPTEMBER 2011

**Log/C.R. No. 1001242**

On November 12, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 16th District, on November 12, 2006. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer directed profanity towards the victim; engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with her; spat at her; grabbed her by the neck and/or hair; failed to identify himself as a police officer; pushed a second complainant without justification; gave IPRA false statements on two occasions; and that the officer’s overall actions regarding this incident and the subsequent investigation were contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. Based on statements from the accused officer, complainants, witnesses, and reports, IPRA recommend to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with the victim; spat at her; grabbed her by the neck and/or hair; failed to identify himself as a police officer; gave IPRA false statement on two occasions; and that the officer’s overall actions regarding this incident and the subsequent investigation were contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. Further, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer pushed a second complainant without justification. IPRA recommended separation for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1008346**

On August 12, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 22nd District, on August 12, 2007 involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officer A and B). It was alleged that Officers A and B received information that the offenders who battered complainants were possibly Department members and failed to generate a General Offense Case Report; failed to notify a supervisor of allegations of misconduct against Department members; failed to submit a To/From Subject Report notifying the Department of the misconduct they had been made aware of; provided false statements to IPRA on two occasions; and that their overall actions regarding this incident and the subsequent investigation had been contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. Based on statements from the accused officers, complainants and witnesses, and on reports and photographs, IPRA recommend to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officers received information that the offenders who battered complainants were possibly Department members and failed to generate a General Offense Case Report; failed to notify a supervisor of allegations of misconduct against Department members; failed to submit a To/From Subject Report notifying the Department of the misconduct they had been made aware of; provided false statements to IPRA on two occasions; and that their overall actions regarding this incident and the subsequent investigation had been contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. IPRA recommended separation for Officers A and B.

**Log/C.R. No. 1016398**

On May 9, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 2nd District, on May 9, 2008 involving a involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer and sergeant (Officer A and Sergeant B). It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department officer pushed complainant against the fence; verbally abused him with profanities; and forcefully entered his property without consent. It was also alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department sergeant failed to initiate a complaint register investigation after being made aware of allegations against a department member. Based on statements from the accused officer, complainant and witnesses, and on reports, IPRA recommend a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that the accused officer pushed complainant against the fence and forcefully entered his property without consent. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A verbally abused him with profanities. Based on statements from the accused members and witnesses, and an audio recording and reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Sergeant B failed to initiate a complaint register investigation after being made aware of allegations against a department member. IPRA recommended a two (2) day suspension for Officer A and a one (1) day suspension for Sergeant B.

OCTOBER 2011

**No Sustained Cases**

NOVEMBER 2011

**Log/C.R. No. 1012910**

On December 26, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred in the 14th District on December 26, 2007. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) sergeant failed to properly secure his weapon and unnecessarily discharged his weapon, striking himself. Based on statements of the accused officer, an eyewitness, reports, and records, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the officer failed to properly secure his weapon and unnecessarily discharged it, striking himself. IPRA recommended separation from the department for the accused member.

**Log/C.R. No. 1003833**

On March 4, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 19th District on March 4, 2007. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer shot at the complainant for no reason and was in possession of a firearm while consuming alcoholic beverages. Based on the refusal of the complainant to provide a signed affidavit as required, IPRA entered a finding of “CLOSED-NO AFFIDAVIT” for the allegation that the officer shot at complainant for no reason. Based on statements of the accused officer, eyewitnesses, reports, photographs, medical reports, audio transmissions and surveillance video, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the officer possessed a firearm while he consumed alcoholic beverages. IPRA recommended that the violation be noted in the accused officer’s disciplinary file.

DECEMBER 2011

**Log/C.R. No. 1002449**

On January 4, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding incidents that occurred between January 2006 and December 2006 in the 13th, 20th and 24th districts involving an off-duty CPD Officer. It was alleged that the accused officer sent complainant numerous threatening and harassing text messages; directed profanity towards the complainant; violated a court order by sending text messages

---

to complainant for reasons other than child related matters, work related messages or personal mail; and brought discredit upon the department by her overall actions. Based upon statements of the accused and complainant, records, reports, text messages and court documents, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the accused sent complainant numerous threatening and harassing text messages. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the accused directed profanity towards the complainant. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused violated a court order by sending text messages to complainant for reasons other than child related matters, work related messages or personal mail and brought discredit upon the department by her overall actions. IPRA recommended a three (3) day suspension for the accused officer.

### **Log/C.R. No. 1008366**

On August 13, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding incidents starting from August 2007 in the 2nd District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused officer made harassing and threatening calls to complainant; violated an Emergency Order of Protection when she sent complainant two emails; violated an Emergency Order of Protection when she made phone calls to complainant; was insubordinate towards a superior; was verbally abusive towards a superior; attempted to physically confront a superior; was arrested on two counts of Violation of an Order of Protection; gave a false statement to IPRA during its investigation; and that the officer’s overall actions were contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. Based upon statements by the accused officer, complainant and witnesses, phone records, court records and reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer made harassing and threatening calls to complainant; was insubordinate towards a superior; was verbally abusive towards a superior; attempted to physically confront a superior; was arrested on two counts of Violation of an Order of Protection; gave a false statement to IPRA during its investigation; and that the officer’s overall actions were contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. Further, based upon statements by the accused officer, complainant and witnesses, electronic correspondences, court records and reports, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the accused officer violated an Emergency Order of Protection when she sent complainant two emails. Based upon statements by the accused officer, complainant and witnesses, phone records, court records and reports, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the accused officer violated an Emergency Order of Protection when she made phone calls to complainant. IPRA recommended separation from the department for Officer A.

---

**Log/C.R. No. 1016622**

On May 17, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred in Niles, IL on May 17, 2008. It was alleged that an Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was intoxicated while off-duty; was in possession of a firearm while consuming alcohol; physically maltreated the complainants; threatened to kill a complainant; pointed a firearm at the same complainant; threatened to beat a Niles Police Officer; directed profanities at a Niles Police Officer; was later found guilty of two counts of Battery; and that the officer's overall actions were contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. Based upon statements by the accused officer, complainants and witnesses, medical and court records, reports and photographs, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused officer was intoxicated while off-duty; was in possession of a firearm while consuming alcohol; physically maltreated the complainants; threatened to beat a Niles Police Officer; directed profanities at a Niles Police Officer; was later found guilty of two counts of Battery; and that the officer's overall actions were contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for allegations that the accused officer threatened to kill a complainant and pointed a firearm at the same complainant. IPRA recommended separation from the department for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1017305**

On June 12, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on June 12, 2008 in the 19th District involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant (Sergeant A) and two on-duty CPD Officers (Officers B and C) and two Complainants (Complainants A and B). It was alleged that Sergeant A engaged in an unjustified physical and verbal altercation with Complainants A and B; punched Complainant A; punched Complainant B; directed profanities at Complainants A and B; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report regarding the incident; gave a false statement to IPRA during its investigation; and that his overall actions were contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. It was further alleged that Officer B failed to protect his arrestees (Complainants A and B); failed to follow general orders regarding an injured arrestee; failed to report an officer's misconduct; and provided a false report to IPRA. It was alleged that Officer C failed to protect her arrestees (Complainants A and B); failed to follow general orders regarding an injured arrestee; and failed to report and officer's misconduct. Based upon statements by the accused members, complainants and eyewitnesses, photographs, records, reports, and a video recording, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Sergeant A engaged in an unjustified physical and verbal altercation with Complainants A and B; punched Complainant A; directed profanities at Complainants A and B; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report regarding the incident; gave a false statement

to IPRA during its investigation; and that his overall actions were contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that Sergeant A punched Complainant B. Based upon statements by the accused members, complainants and eyewitnesses, photographs, records, reports, and a video recording, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officers B and C failed to protect their arrestees (Complainants A and B) and failed to follow general orders regarding an injured arrestee. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that Officer B and C failed to report an officer’s misconduct. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer B provided a false report to IPRA. IPRA recommended separation from the department for Sergeant A, a thirty (30) day suspension for Officer B, and a fifteen (15) day suspension for Officer C.

**Log/C.R. No. 1017379**

On June 14, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred in the 18th District on June 14, 2008. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the complainant; falsely arrested the complainant; was working secondary employment while on a medical leave of absence; provided a false statement to IPRA during its investigation; and that his overall actions were contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. Based upon statements by the accused officer, witnesses, photographs, records, and other reports, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for allegations that the officer engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the complainant and falsely arrested the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” allegations that the officer was working secondary employment while on a medical leave of absence; provided a false statement to IPRA during its investigation; and that his overall actions were contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. IPRA recommended separation from the department for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1019476**

On August 27, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred in the 4th District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) detective displayed her weapon without justification; threatened to shoot the complainants; directed profanities at the complainants; threatened to physically harm the complainants; threatened to burn down the complainants’ property; was intoxicated while off-duty; and was in possession of unregistered weapons. Based upon the statements of the accused detective, eyewitnesses, and reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused detective displayed her weapon without justification; was intoxicated while off-duty; and was in possession of unregistered weapons.

Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for allegations that the accused detective threatened to shoot the complainants; directed profanities at the complainants; threatened to physically harm the complainants; and threatened to burn down the complainants’ property. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for the accused detective.

**Log/C.R. No. 1023617**

On February 4, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred in the 2nd District on February 4, 2009 involving one on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant (Sergeant A) and seven on-duty CPD Officers (Officers B through H). It was alleged that Sergeant A conducted an improper search; used improper force against Victim A; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim C; used improper force against Victim D; used improper force against Victim E; directed profanities at Victim A; directed profanities at Victim D; unnecessarily displayed a weapon; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A; submitted a false report; made a false statement to IPRA; disobeyed two Department Special Orders regarding searching premises; and that his overall actions were contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. It was alleged that Officer B conducted an improper search; used improper force against Victim A; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim C; used improper force against Victim D; used improper force against Victim E; directed profanities at Victim A; directed profanities at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim A; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim B; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim C; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim E; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A; submitted a false report; made a false statement to IPRA; and disobeyed two Department Special Orders regarding searching premises. It was alleged that Officer C and G conducted an improper search; used improper force against Victim A; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim C; used improper force against Victim D; used improper force against Victim E; directed profanities at Victim A; directed profanities at Victim D; unnecessarily displayed a weapon; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A; submitted a false report; and made a false statement to IPRA. It was alleged that Officer D and Officer F conducted an improper search; used improper force against Victim A; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim C; used improper force against Victim D; used improper force against Victim E; directed profanities at Victim A; directed profanities at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim A; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim B; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim C; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim E; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A; and made a false statement to IPRA. It was alleged that

Officer E conducted an improper search; used improper force against Victim A; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim C; used improper force against Victim D; used improper force against Victim E; directed profanities at Victim A; directed profanities at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim A; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim B; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim C; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim E; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A; submitted a false report; and made a false statement to IPRA. It was alleged that Officer H conducted an improper search; used improper force against Victim A; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim C; used improper force against Victim D; used improper force against Victim E; directed profanities at Victim A; directed profanities at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim A; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim B; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim C; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim E; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; and engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A. IPRA's investigation consisted of statements by the accused members, complainants and witnesses, court records, audio transmissions, GPS records, police reports and records. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegations that Sergeant A conducted an improper search; used improper force against Victim A; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim C; used improper force against Victim D; used improper force against Victim E; directed profanities at Victim A; directed profanities at Victim D; unnecessarily displayed a weapon; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; and engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Sergeant A submitted a false report; made a false statement to IPRA; disobeyed two Department Special Orders regarding searching premises; and that his overall actions were contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegations that Officer B used improper force against Victim A and used improper force against Victim C. IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer B used improper force against Victim E. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" allegations that Officer B conducted an improper search; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim D; directed profanities at Victim A; directed profanities at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim A; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim B; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim C; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim E; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A; submitted a false report; made a false statement to IPRA; and disobeyed two Department Special Orders regarding searching premises. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" allegations that Officer C conducted an improper search and made a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegations that Officer C used improper force against Victim A; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim C; used improper force against Victim D;

used improper force against Victim E; directed profanities at Victim A; directed profanities at Victim D; unnecessarily displayed a weapon; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A; and submitted a false report. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” allegations that Officer D conducted an improper search and made a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that Officer D used improper force against Victim A; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim C; used improper force against Victim D; directed profanities at Victim A; directed profanities at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim A; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim B; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim C; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim E; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; and engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that Officer D used improper force against Victim E. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” allegations that Officer E conducted an improper search; submitted a false report; and made a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that Officer E used improper force against Victim A; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim C; used improper force against Victim D; used improper force against Victim E; directed profanities at Victim A; directed profanities at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim A; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim B; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim C; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim E; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; and engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” allegations that Officer F conducted an improper search and made a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that Officer F used improper force against Victim A; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim C; used improper force against Victim D; used improper force against Victim E; directed profanities at Victim A; directed profanities at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim A; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim B; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim C; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim D; unnecessarily pointed a weapon at Victim E; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; and engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” allegations that Officer G conducted an improper search; used improper force against Victim C; unnecessarily displayed a weapon; threatened to arrest Victim A without basis; engaged in improper verbal action against Victim A; submitted a false report; and made a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that Officer G used improper force against Victim A; used improper force against Victim B; used improper force against Victim D; used improper force against Victim E; directed profanities at Victim A; and directed profanities at Victim D. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for all allegations against Officer H. IPRA recommended separation from the department for Sergeant A and Officers B, C, D, E, F, and G.

**Log/C.R. No. 1031273**

On October 25, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred in the 5th District on October 25, 2009. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty and improperly handled a Taser, resulting in its discharge. Based upon a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" with the recommendation of "violation noted".

**Log/C.R. No. 1032243**

On November 25, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred in Bridgeview, IL on November 25, 2009. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer threatened complainant; directed profanities at her; and failed to report to CPD that he was the respondent in an Order of Protection. Based upon statements by the officer, the complainant, and court reports, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for allegations that the officer threatened complainant and directed profanities at her. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that officer failed to notify CPD that he was a respondent to a Protection Order. IPRA recommended a three (3) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 310927**

On January 30, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on January 26, 2006 in the 20th District involving four on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (A, B, C, and D) and one on-duty CPD Sergeant (Sergeant E). It was alleged that Officer A grabbed Complainant's arms and raised them behind his back with excessive force; handcuffed Complainant too tightly; stomped Complainant on the shoulder with his foot while handcuffed on the ground; verbally abused Complainant; took Complainant's wrist watch and failed to return it; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report; and gave false information in his statements to IPRA and at his deposition. It was alleged that Officer B grabbed Complainant's arms and raised them behind his back with excessive force; threatened Complainant with jail after he was released if he continued to complain about what had occurred; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report; gave false information in his statements to IPRA and at his deposition; and conducted an improper pat-down search. It was alleged that Officer C submitted a false case report and provided a false statement to IPRA. It was alleged that Officer D submitted a false case report and provided a false statement to IPRA. It was alleged that Sergeant E failed to register a complaint with OPS/IPRA when he received allegations of misconduct made by Complainant. IPRA's investigation consisted of statements by the accused members, complainant and witnesses, OEMC and PDT transmissions, official records, medical reports and ET photographs. IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for

the allegations that Officer A grabbed Complainant's arms and raised them behind his back with excessive force; handcuffed Complainant too tightly; stomped Complainant on the shoulder with his foot while handcuffed on the ground; and took Complainant's wrist watch and failed to return it. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer A verbally abused Complainant; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report; and gave false information in his statements to IPRA and at his deposition. IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations that Officer B grabbed Complainant's arms and raised them behind his back with excessive force and threatened Complainant with jail after he was released if he continued to complain about what had occurred. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer B failed to complete a Tactical Response Report; gave false information in his statements to IPRA and at his deposition; and conducted an improper pat-down search. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer C submitted a false case report and provided a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer D submitted a false case report and provided a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Sergeant E failed to register a complaint with OPS/IPRA when he received allegations of misconduct made by Complainant. IPRA recommended separation from the department for Officers A, B, D, E, and Sergeant C.

#### **Log/C.R. No. 1025740**

On April 23, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred in the 10th District on April 22, 2009, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officer A and B) and one CPD Sergeant (Sergeant C). It was alleged that Officer A pushed Complainant A; unlawfully seized Complainant B; struck Complainant B with an expandable baton; carried/used an expandable baton without having certification; and was inattentive to duty, in that he failed to properly document the use of an expandable baton and that he carried it without having certification. It was alleged that Officer B failed to report a CPD member's misconduct by not reporting the information and the complaints to a supervisor. It was alleged that Sergeant C threatened Complainant C with arrest without basis; grabbed Complainant C's wrist without justification; failed to report misconduct and initiate an investigation of the alleged misconduct; and was inattentive to duty in that no complaint register Log number was initiated and he (Sergeant C) approved Officer A's Tactical Response Report without making sure that the information and all the boxes in the report were properly completed. Based on statements by the accused members, witnesses, reports, records, photographs, a cell phone video recording, 911 recordings and transcripts, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for allegation that Officer A pushed Complainant A. IPRA recommend a finding of "EXONERATED" for allegation that Officer A unlawfully seized Complainant B. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" allegations that Officer A struck Complainant B with an expandable baton; carried/used an expandable baton without having certification; and was inattentive

to duty, in that he failed to properly document the use of an expandable baton and that he carried it without having certification. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” allegations that Officer B failed to report a CPD member’s misconduct by not reporting the information and the complaints to a supervisor. IPRA recommend a finding of “EXONERATED” for allegation that Sergeant C threatened Complainant C with arrest without basis. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that Sergeant C grabbed Complainant C’s wrist without justification. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” allegations that Sergeant C failed to report misconduct and initiate an investigation of the alleged misconduct and was inattentive to duty in that no complaint register Log number was initiated and he (Sergeant C) approved Officer A’s Tactical Response Report without making sure that the information and all the boxes in the report were properly completed. IPRA recommended a ninety (90) day suspension for Officer A, a one (1) day suspension for Officer B, and a fifteen (15) day suspension for Sergeant C.

**Log/C.R. No. 1033974**

On February 18, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding incidents that occurred between August 18, 2009 and February 18, 2010 involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer (Officer A) and on-duty Sergeant (Sergeant B). It was alleged that Officer A threatened the victim; pointed his weapon at her; struck her about the face; physically abused her; threw her against a couch; and was under the influence of alcohol while on duty. It was also alleged that Sergeant B failed to obtain a CR number and failed to ensure that a case report was created and that an evidence technician was ordered to photograph the victim’s injuries. Based on the refusal of the complainant to provide a signed affidavit, as required, IPRA entered a finding of “CLOSED-NO AFFIDAVIT” for all allegations against Officer A. Based upon a statement by an accused officer, 911 recordings, reports, and witness statements, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Sergeant B failed to obtain a CR number and failed to ensure that a case report was created and that an evidence technician was ordered to photograph the victim’s injuries. IPRA recommended a reprimand for the Sergeant B.

JANUARY 2012

**Log/C.R. No. 1017419**

On June 16, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding multiple incidents that started on June 2008 involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer (Officer A) and one on-duty CPD Sergeant (Sergeant B). It was alleged that Officer A verbally abused complainant; physically maltreated complainant; threatened to shoot complainant; displayed his weapon without justification; engaged in conduct by his overall actions which brought discredit upon the Department; engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon

the Department by his overall actions when he encountered the complainant by chance a month after the initial incident; engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department when he had contact with a witness to a Complaint Register investigation; engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department when he drove past a witness's home; and provided false statements to IPRA. It was alleged that Sergeant B failed to initiate a complete and comprehensive investigation relative to the allegations of misconduct against a Department member; failed to obtain a Complaint Register number after bring made aware of allegations of misconduct against a Department member; and provided a false statements to IPRA. Based upon statements made by the accused members, complainant and witnesses, OEMC transmissions, photographs and reports, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer A verbally abused complainant; physically maltreated complainant; threatened to shoot complainant; displayed his weapon without justification; engaged in conduct by his overall actions which brought discredit upon the Department; engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department by his overall actions when he encountered the complainant by chance a month after the initial incident; engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department when he had contact with a witness to a Complaint Register investigation; and provided false statements to IPRA. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer A engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department when he drove past a witness's home. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Sergeant B failed to initiate a complete and comprehensive investigation relative to the allegations of misconduct against a Department member; failed to obtain a Complaint Register number after bring made aware of allegations of misconduct against a Department member; and provided a false statements to IPRA. IPRA recommended separation from the department for Officer A and a thirty (30) day suspension for Sergeant B.

### **Log/C.R. No. 312270**

On April 12, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on April 12, 2006 in the 24th District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer engaged in an unjustified physical altercation; was in possession of a firearm while impaired; and made a false statement to IPRA. Based upon statements by the accused member, complainant and witnesses, photographs, OEMC transmissions, and reports, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for allegations that the officer possessed a firearm while impaired. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" allegations that the officer engaged in an unjustified physical altercation and made a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for the accused officer.

<sup>1</sup> Under Illinois Law and the FOP and PBPA contracts, with limited exceptions, no officer can be served with an allegation of misconduct absent a complaining statement supported by an affidavit.

**Log/C.R. No. 312979**

On May 16, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on May 16, 2006 in the 22nd District involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer (Officer A), one on-duty CPD Officer (Officer B), and one on-duty CPD Lieutenant (Lieutenant C). It was alleged that Officer A engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with Complainant; engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Complainant; was intoxicated while off duty; failed to properly secure his service weapon; and whose overall conduct impeded the department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the department. It was further alleged that Officer B was inattentive to duty by failing to report misconduct by a fellow officer; failed to complete a tactical response report; and whose overall conduct impeded the department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the department. It was further alleged that Lieutenant C failed to conduct a complete investigation regarding allegations that Officer A was intoxicated off-duty; violated an order or directive in that she failed to obtain a Central Booking number for Complainant after releasing him without charges; gave a false report to IPRA; and whose overall conduct impeded the department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the department. Based upon statements by the accused members, complainant and witnesses, reports, and witness statements, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for allegations that Officer A engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with Complainant and failed to properly secure his service weapon. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" allegations that Officer A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Complainant; was intoxicated while off duty; and whose overall conduct impeded the department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the department. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" allegations that Officer B was inattentive to duty by failing to report misconduct by a fellow officer; failed to complete a tactical response report; and whose overall conduct impeded the department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the department. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" allegations that Lieutenant C failed to conduct a complete investigation regarding allegations that Officer A was intoxicated off-duty; violated an order or directive in that she failed to obtain a Central Booking number for Complainant after releasing him without charges; gave a false report to IPRA; and whose overall conduct impeded the department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the department. IPRA recommended a ten (10) day suspension for Officer A, a seven (7) day suspension for Officer B, and a thirty (30) day suspension for Lieutenant C.

**Log/C.R. No. 1035477**

On April 16, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 16, 2010 in the 3rd District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer

was inattentive to duty and mishandled her Taser causing it to deploy. Based upon a statement by the accused and reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation. IPRA recommended a “violation noted” for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1014256**

On February 18, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on February 16, 2008 in the 4th District and on October 12, 2003 on an unspecified location. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer pushed the victim repeatedly; grabbed/pulled the victim’s hair; pulled hair from the victim’s scalp; placed his gun to the victim’s head; threatened to shoot the victim; grabbed the victim and applied his body weight on her back; struck the victim’s right hand with his gun; and punched the victim on her nose on a previous occasion. Based upon statements by the accused and victim, reports, OEMC transcriptions, medical records, photographs and records, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for allegations that the officer pushed the victim repeatedly; grabbed/pulled the victim’s hair; pulled hair from the victim’s scalp; placed his gun to the victim’s head; threatened to shoot the victim; grabbed the victim and applied his body weight on her back; struck the victim’s right hand with his gun. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer and punched the victim on her nose on a previous occasion. IPRA recommended a twenty-five (25) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1002752**

On January 16, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on January 16, 2007 in the 4th District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A physically abused Victim A; struck Victim B about the body; placed her (Officer A) hand on her (Officer A) gun and verbally threatened Victim B; left a threatening voice message on Victim B’s cellular telephone; pushed Victim C to the floor; kicked Victim C; threw flower plants and vases at Victim B; left her assigned job without authorization; and left her assigned district without authorization. It was alleged that Officer B left his assigned job without authorization and left his assigned district without authorization. Based upon statements by the accused members, one of the victims, one of the witnesses, a voice recording, 911 recordings, and reports, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that Officer A physically abused Victim A. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for allegations that Officer A struck Victim B about the body; placed her (Officer A) hand on her (Officer A) gun and verbally threatened Victim B; pushed Victim C to the floor; kicked Victim C; and threw flower plants and vases at Victim B. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A left a threatening voice message on Victim B’s cellular telephone; left her assigned job without authorization; and left her assigned district

without authorization. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” allegations that Officer B left his assigned job and district without authorization. IPRA recommended a twenty (20) day suspension for Officer A and a five (5) day suspension for Officer B.

FEBRUARY 2012

**Log/C.R. No. 1010320**

On October 22, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on October 21, 2007 in the 3rd District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer (Officer A) and an on-duty CPD officer (Officer B). It was alleged that Officer A was insubordinate towards a superior; physically maltreated Officer B; directed profanities at Officer B; committed a Battery which resulted in her subsequent arrest; and brought discredit upon the Department due to her overall conduct. It was alleged that Officer B physically maltreated Officer A during the course of her arrest and verbally abused Officer A. Based upon statements by the accused members and witnesses, 911 recordings, medical records, reports and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A was insubordinate towards a superior; physically maltreated Officer B; directed profanities at Officer B; committed a Battery which resulted in her subsequent arrest; and brought discredit upon the Department due to her overall conduct. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for allegations that Officer B physically maltreated Officer A during the course of her arrest. IPRA recommended a finding of “EXONERATED” for allegations that Officer B verbally abused Officer A. IPRA recommended separation from the department for Officer A.

**Log/C.R. No. 1020924**

On October 17, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding multiple incidents that occurred between November 2005 and October 2008 in the 1st District and East Chicago, Indiana. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer pointed his firearm at the complainant; threatened her; forced her to perform oral copulation at gunpoint; took their sons from the complainant’s residence without permission; left his District of assignment without proper authorization; used his official position for personal gain; made false reports by submitting time records claiming he worked during a holiday for which he was not present for his entire tour of duty; and verbally abused and battered the complainant about the abdomen when she was pregnant. Based upon statements by the accused officer and complainant, police and court records, and reports, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for allegations that the officer pointed his firearm at complainant; threatened her; forced her to perform oral copulation at gunpoint; and took their sons from the complainant’s residence without permission. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for allegations that the

officer used his official position for personal gain or influence and verbally abused and battered the complainant about the abdomen while she was pregnant. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” allegations that the officer left his District of assignment without proper permission and made false reports by submitting time records claiming he worked during a holiday for which he was not present for his entire tour of duty. IPRA recommended a twenty (20) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1009954**

On October 8, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on October 8, 2007 in the 16th District with subsequent incidents continuing through April 2008. It was alleged that a Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer used departmental resources to access Complainant A’s personal information; used departmental resources to access Complainant B’s personal information; verbally maltreated Complainant B in October 2007 regarding her involvement with Complainant A; verbally maltreated Complainant B while seated in court during a pre-trial hearing on an unknown date; verbally maltreated Complainant B while at a hospital in March 2008; verbally maltreated Complainant B in April 2008 regarding her statement at IPRA; and verbally maltreated Complainant B in April 2008 regarding an alleged accident involving Complainant B. Based upon statements by the accused officer, complainant, witness, department reports, and medical and CPD department records, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer used departmental resources to access Complainant A’s personal information; used departmental resources to access Complainant B’s personal information; verbally maltreated Complainant B in October 2007 regarding her involvement with Complainant A; verbally maltreated Complainant B while seated in court during a pre-trial hearing on an unknown date; verbally maltreated Complainant B while at a hospital in March 2008; verbally maltreated Complainant B in April 2008 regarding her statement at IPRA; and verbally maltreated Complainant B in April 2008 regarding an alleged accident involving Complainant B. IPRA recommended a twenty (20) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1013436**

On January 16, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that took place on January 16, 2008 in the 4th District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer engaged in an unnecessary physical altercation; was intoxicated. Based upon statements by the accused officer and witness, photographs, court records, breathalyzer tests, and official reports, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for allegations that the officer engaged in an unnecessary physical altercation. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the officer was intoxicated. IPRA recommended a seven (7) day suspension for the accused officer.

---

**Log/C.R. No. 311066**

On February 7, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards) regarding multiple incidents that arose first on August 20, 2005 continuing through July 18, 2006 involving a Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer. It was alleged that on February 6, 2006, the accused officer made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim. It was alleged that on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours, the accused officer arrived uninvited to the victim's new unlisted address; shouted victim's name outside her residence causing a disturbance; verbally abused the victim; was intoxicated; made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim; and left numerous harassing telephone messages to the victim. It was alleged that on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours, the accused officer arrived uninvited to her address; verbally abused the victim; grabbed the telephone from the victim's hand to prevent her from calling the police; pushed the victim; struck the victim; choked the victim; and was subsequently arrested. It was alleged that between February 9, 2006 through February 14, 2006, the accused officer made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim and repeatedly told her over the phone not to show up in court against him. It was alleged that on February 26, 2006, the accused officer made numerous harassing telephone calls to victim's cellular phone and violated an Order of Protection. It was alleged that on March 1, 2006, the accused officer was arrested for violation of an Order of Protection. It was alleged that between April 19, 2006 and April 25, 2006, the accused officer made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim and violated an Order of Protection. It was alleged that on May 2, 2006, the accused officer was arrested for violation of an Order of Protection. It was alleged that between April 27 through May 5, 2006, the accused officer sent numerous harassing e-mails to the victim and violated an Order of Protection. It was alleged that on July 11, 2006, the accused officer violated an Order of Protection. It was alleged that on July 18, 2006, the accused officer was arrested for violation of Order of Protection. It was alleged that on August 20, 2005, the accused officer threatened to kill the victim. It was alleged that on August 24, 2005, the accused officer made numerous harassing and threatening telephone calls to the victim and her family members and left numerous harassing and threatening telephone messages. It was alleged that on December 2005, the accused officer showed the victim a handgun that he (the accused officer) said was untraceable and not registered. Based on statements from the victim and witnesses, official reports, medical reports, OEMC reports and transmissions, court records, phone records, voicemail and electronic messages, drug test results and photographs, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused officer arrived uninvited to the victim's new unlisted address on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours; made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours; left numerous harassing telephone messages to the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours; arrived uninvited to her address on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; grabbed the telephone from the victim's hand to prevent

her from calling the police on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; pushed the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; struck the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; choked the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; was subsequently arrested on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; made numerous harassing telephone calls to victim's cellular phone on February 26, 2006; violated an Order of Protection on February 26, 2006; was arrested for violation of an Order of Protection on March 1, 2006; the accused officer made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim between April 19, 2006 and April 25, 2006; violated an Order of Protection between April 19, 2006 and April 25, 2006; was arrested for violation of an Order of Protection on May 2, 2006; sent numerous harassing e-mails to the victim between April 27 through May 5, 2006; violated an Order of Protection between April 27 through May 5, 2006; violated an Order of Protection on July 11, 2006; and was arrested for violation of Order of Protection on July 18, 2006. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused officer made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim on February 6, 2006; shouted victim's name outside her residence causing a disturbance on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours; verbally abused the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours; verbally abused the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim between February 9, 2006 through February 14, 2006; repeatedly told her over the phone not to show up in court against him between February 9, 2006 through February 14, 2006; threatened to kill the victim on August 20, 2005; made numerous harassing and threatening telephone calls to the victim and her family members on August 24, 2005; left numerous harassing and threatening telephone messages on August 24, 2005; and showed the victim a handgun that he (the accused officer) said was untraceable and not registered on December 2005. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that the accused officer was intoxicated on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours. IPRA recommended separation for the accused officer from the department. During the course of this investigation, the accused officer was discharged from the department as a result of a different matter.

MARCH 2012

**Log/C.R. No. 1002011**

On December 15, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on December 15, 2006 in the 12th District involving a Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant (Sergeant A) and six off-duty Officers (Officer B through F). It was alleged that Sergeant A and Officer C physically maltreated Victims A through D; engaged in an improper verbal and/or physical altercation; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; prevented Victims A through D from obtaining

police assistance; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report regarding the incident; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. It was alleged that Officer B physically maltreated Victims A through D; engaged in an improper verbal altercation; was in possession of a firearm while consuming alcohol in violation of a General Order; failed to maintain control of his weapon; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. It was also alleged that Officer D and F physically maltreated Victims A through D; engaged in an improper verbal and/or physical altercation; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit on the Department. It was also alleged that Officer E engaged in an improper verbal and/or physical altercation; was in possession of a firearm that was not registered to him in violation of a General Order; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; unnecessarily displayed a weapon; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report regarding this incident; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit on the Department. It was alleged that Officer G failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA's investigation consisted of statements from the accused members, complainants and witnesses, video recordings, photographs, medical records, 911 calls, and departmental records. IPRA recommended a finding of "EXONERATED" for the allegation that both Sergeant G and Officer C failed to complete a Tactical Response Report regarding the incident. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that both Sergeant G and Officer C engaged in an improper verbal and/or physical altercation; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; prevented Victims A through D from obtaining police assistance; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA also recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Sergeant G physically maltreated Victims A through C. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer C physically maltreated Victim D. IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer B physically maltreated Victims A through D. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer B engaged in an improper verbal altercation; was in possession of a firearm while consuming alcohol in violation of a General Order; failed to maintain control of his weapon; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA recommended a finding of "CLOSED-HOLD" for all allegations against Officer D because he resigned and did not address the allegations against him. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer E unnecessarily displayed a weapon. IPRA recommended a finding of "EXONERATED" for the allegation that Officer E failed to complete a Tactical Response Report regarding this incident. IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the

allegations that Officer E engaged in an improper verbal and/or physical altercation; was in possession of a firearm that was not registered to him in violation of a General Order; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit on the Department. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegations that Officer F physically maltreated Victims A through D; engaged in an improper verbal and/or physical altercation; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit on the Department. IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the allegations that Officer F failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; and failed to report a fellow member's misconduct. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer G engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the department. IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for allegations that Officer G failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions and failed to report a fellow member's misconduct. IPRA recommended a forty-five (45) day suspension for Sergeant A, thirty (30) day suspension for Officer B, twenty-five (25) day suspension for Officer C, thirty (30) day suspension for Officer E, fifteen (15) day suspension for Officer F, and a five (5) days suspension for Officer G.

#### **Log/C.R. No. 311925**

On March 15, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards) regarding two incidents that occurred on February 11, 2006 in the 17th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant. It was alleged that on February 11, 2006, the accused Sergeant behaved in a hostile, intimidating and inflammatory manner to Victim A and made a threatening comment referring to Victim A. It was later alleged that on March 24, 2006, the accused Sergeant verbally abused and threatened complainant Victim A; struck Victim A; kicked Victim A; shoved the Victim B; punched Victim C; charged towards Victim D in a hostile manner; and by his overall actions brought discredit upon the Department. Based upon statements by the accused sergeant, Victims and witnesses, police reports, photographs, medical records, and 911 calls, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations that on February 11, 2006, the accused Sergeant behaved in a hostile, intimidating and inflammatory manner to Victim A and made a threatening comment referring to Victim A. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the allegations that on March 24, 2006, the accused Sergeant verbally abused and threatened complainant Victim A; struck Victim A; kicked Victim A; shoved the Victim B; punched Victim C; charged towards Victim D in a hostile manner; and by his overall actions brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA recommended a twenty-five (25) day suspension for the accused sergeant.

**Log/C.R. No. 312890**

On May 11, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards) regarding an incident that occurred on May 10, 2006 in the 24th District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A squeezed the complainant's testicles; failed to inventory or return the complainant's keys; provided false information on an arrest report; failed to follow proper procedure in that he failed to secure complainant's vehicle after his arrest; and improperly searched the complainant's vehicle. It was alleged that Officer B handcuffed the complainant too tightly; failed to inventory or return the complainant's keys; provided false information on an arrest report; and failed to follow proper procedure in that he failed to secure complainant's vehicle after his arrest. Based upon statements by the accused officers, complainant and witnesses, and OEMC and department records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer A squeezed the complainant's testicles; failed to inventory or return the complainant's keys; and provided false information on an arrest report. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A failed to follow proper procedure in that he failed to secure complainant's vehicle after his arrest. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer A improperly searched the complainant's vehicle. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer B handcuffed the complainant too tightly; failed to inventory or return the complainant's keys; and provided false information on an arrest report. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B failed to follow proper procedure in that he failed to secure complainant's vehicle after his arrest. IPRA recommended "Violation Noted" for both Officers A and B.

**Log/C.R. No. 1005098**

On April 22, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA, f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on April 21, 2007 in the 14th District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) sergeant unnecessarily discharged his weapon; failed to properly secure his weapon; failed to remain on the scene; failed to make proper notifications; and failed to submit a Tactical Response Report. Based upon a statement by the accused sergeant, OEMC transmissions, photographs, department records, and laboratory reports, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused sergeant unnecessarily discharged his weapon; failed to properly secure his weapon; failed to remain on the scene; failed to make proper notifications; and failed to submit a Tactical Response Report. IPRA recommended separation for the accused sergeant from the department.

---

**Log/C.R. No. 1005376**

On May 2, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA, f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on May 2, 2007 in the 6th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer pointed his weapon at Victims A through F; kicked Victim C several times; kicked Victim A; punched Victim A; choked Victim B; threatened Victim A; directed profanities at Victims A through C; and made a false statement to IPRA. Based upon statements by the accused officer, victims and witnesses, department reports, OEMC transcripts, medical records, photographs and depositions, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that the accused officer pointed his weapon at Victims A through F and threatened Victim A. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer kicked Victim A; punched Victim A; and choked Victim B. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer kicked Victim C several times; directed profanities at Victims A through C; and made a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1006073**

On May 28, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA, f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred in the 14th District involving two off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B), an on-duty Officer (Officer C), and an on-duty Sergeant (Sergeant D). It was alleged that Officer A kicked Victim A on the thigh and groin area; grabbed Victim A by his hair; struck Victim A's head/face against a vehicle; searched and moved Victim A's vehicle without justification; removed and used a disposable camera from the glove compartment of Victim A's vehicle; failed to return or inventory the disposable camera belonging to Victim A; directed profanities and racial slurs at Victim A; was intoxicated while off-duty; urinated in public view; and violated state traffic law in that proof of insurance was not provided. It was alleged that Officer B snatched Victim A's cellular phone from his hand, grabbed Victim A's hand roughly and twisted it behind him; handcuffed Victim A too tightly; searched Victim A's vehicle without justification; directed profanities at Victim A; and was intoxicated while off-duty. It was alleged that Officer C failed to conduct a thorough traffic investigation; failed to secure Victim A's vehicle; and directed profanities at Victim B. It was alleged that Sergeant D was inattentive to duty in that he failed to interview all the witnesses and request an evidence technician and failed to ensure that a thorough traffic crash investigation was conducted. Based upon statements by the accused members, victim statements, departmental reports, witness statements, OEMC transmissions, and traffic citations, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A kicked Victim A on the thigh and groin area; grabbed Victim A by his hair; struck Victim A's head/face against a vehicle; searched and moved Victim A's vehicle without justification; and urinated in public view. IPRA

recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A removed and used a disposable camera from the glove compartment of Victim A’s vehicle; failed to return or inventory the disposable camera belonging to Victim A; directed profanities and racial slurs at Victim A; and was intoxicated while off-duty. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that Officer A violated state traffic law in that proof of insurance was not provided. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer B snatched Victim A’s cellular phone from his hand, grabbed Victim A’s hand roughly and twisted it behind him; and handcuffed Victim A too tightly. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer B directed profanities at Victim A and was intoxicated while off-duty. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that Officer B searched Victim A’s vehicle without justification. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer C directed profanities at Victim B. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer C failed to conduct a thorough traffic investigation. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that Officer C failed to secure Victim A’s vehicle. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Sergeant D was inattentive to duty in that he failed to interview all the witnesses and request an evidence technician and failed to ensure that a thorough traffic crash investigation was conducted. IPRA recommended separation for Officer A from the department, a thirty (30) day suspension for Officer B, a five (5) day suspension for Officer C, and a ten (10) day suspension for Sergeant D.

**Log/C.R. No. 1010031**

On October 11, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on September 13, 2007 in the 8th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer struck complainant in the face; directed profanities at complainant; failed to submit a Tactical Response Report; failed to ensure complainant received medical attention; gave false statements to the DEA, IPRA and/or at trial; brought discredit upon the department when he was indicted; and brought discredit upon the department when he was arrested. Based on statements from the accused officer, complainant and witnesses, court reports and transcripts, department records, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer struck complainant in the face; directed profanities at complainant; failed to submit a Tactical Response Report; gave false statements to the DEA, IPRA and/or at trial; brought discredit upon the department when he was indicted; and brought discredit upon the department when he was arrested. IPRA recommended a finding of “EXONERATED” for the allegation that the accused officer failed to ensure complainant received medical attention. IPRA recommended separation for the accused officer from the department.

**Log/C.R. No. 1011021**

On November 19, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on November 19, 2007 in the 11th District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B) and two Detention Aides (Detention Aide C and D). It was alleged Officer A, Officer B, Detention Aide C, and Detention Aide D violated department orders when they failed to follow the guidelines for arrestee screening for Victim. Based on statements from the accused members and witnesses, department, medical and official records, drug test and OEMC reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A violated department orders when he failed to follow the guidelines for arrestee screening for Victim. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the Officer B, Detention Aide C, and Detention Aide D violated department orders when they failed to follow the guidelines for arrestee screening for Victim. IPRA recommended a three (3) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1014252**

On February 18, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on February 17, 2008 in Oak Lawn, Illinois involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused officer harassed complainant by following her to a business establishment and keeping her whereabouts under surveillance; was detained by the Oak Lawn Police Department where it was determined that he was intoxicated; operated a motor vehicle while intoxicated; and was in possession of a firearm while intoxicated. It was alleged that between approximately December 2007 and February 2008, that the accused officer harassed complainant by repeatedly following her. It was alleged that between February 17, 2008 and March 17, 2011, the accused officer gave false statements to IPRA and the Oak Lawn Police Department. Based on statements from the accused officer and witnesses, CPD and Oak Park Police Department reports, and drug tests, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer harassed complainant by following her to a business establishment and keeping her whereabouts under surveillance on February 17, 2008; and harassed complainant by repeatedly following her between approximately December 2007 and February 2008. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer was detained by the Oak Lawn Police Department where it was determined that he was intoxicated; operated a motor vehicle while intoxicated; was in possession of a firearm while intoxicated; and gave false statements to IPRA and the Oak Lawn Police Department between February 17, 2008 and March 17, 2011. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1015651**

On April 10, 2008 a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 10, 2008, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Members, Officer (Officer A) and Detective (Detective B). It was alleged that Officer A punched Detective B in the face; shoved Detective B; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. It was alleged that Detective B punched Officer A about his body; verbally abused Officer A; and made a verbally abusive comment directed at Officer A regarding people with disabilities. Based on statements from the accused members and witnesses, department and medical reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A punched Detective B in the face and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A shoved Detective B. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that Detective B punched Officer A about his body; verbally abused Officer A; and made a verbally abusive comment directed at Officer A regarding people with disabilities. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for Officer A. Officer A retired prior to the completion of IPRA’s investigation.

**Log/C.R. No. 1020690**

On October 10, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 10, 2008 in the 4th District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer physically abused the Victim; was arrested for domestic battery; pushed the Victim; grabbed and/or choked the Victim; struck the Victim about her face and body; and gave a false statement to IPRA. Based on statements from the accused officer and Victim, department reports, OEMC transcriptions and reports, medical records, photographs, court records, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer physically abused the Victim; was arrested for domestic battery; pushed the Victim; grabbed and/or choked the Victim; struck the Victim about her face and body; and gave a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended separation for the accused officer from the department.

**Log/C.R. No. 1021122**

On October 25, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 25, 2008 in the 4th District involving three on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A, B and C). It was alleged that an Officer A was inattentive to duty in that he failed to secure a shotgun; and was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged a shotgun. It was alleged that an Officer B was inattentive to duty in that he failed to secure a shotgun. It was alleged that an Officer C was inattentive to duty in that he failed to secure a shotgun. Based on a mediation, Officers A, B, and C agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” for all allegations and a written reprimand.

**Log/C.R. No. 1023369**

On January 26, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that took place in the 5th District Station involving six on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A through F), an on-duty Captain (Captain G), an on-duty Lieutenant (Lieutenant H), two on-duty Sergeants (Sergeants I and J), and on-duty Detention Aide. It was alleged that Captain G failed to perform his duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that Officer A failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that Lieutenant H failed to perform his duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met and failed as a supervisor, to ensure his subordinate staff complied with policy. It was alleged that Sergeant I failed to perform his duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met and failed as a supervisor, to ensure his subordinate staff complied with department policy. It was alleged that Officer B failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that Officer C failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that the Detention Aide failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that Sergeant J failed to perform his duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met and failed as a supervisor, to ensure his subordinate staff complied with department policy. It was alleged that Officer D failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that Officer E failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that Officer F failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. Based upon statements by the accused members, departmental records, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Captain G failed to perform his duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. IPRA recommended a finding of "EXONERATED" for the allegation that Officer A failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that both Officers B through F, Lieutenant H, Sergeants I and J, and Detention Aide failed to perform their duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that both Lieutenant H and Sergeants I and J failed as a supervisor, to ensure that their subordinate staff complied with department policy. IPRA recommended a three (3) day suspension for Lieutenant H, a one (1) day suspension for Sergeants I and J, a two (2) day suspension for Officers B through F, and a written reprimand for the accused Detention Aide.

**Log/C.R. No. 1024565**

On March 10, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 10, 2009 in the 5th District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant had

---

an expired FOID card; discharged her weapon in violation of the department's policy on Deadly Force; impeded the subsequent investigation by tampering with evidence; and gave false statements to IPRA and CPD. Based on statements from the accused sergeant and witnesses, department reports, photographs, and OEMC recordings, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused officer had an expired FOID card; discharged her weapon in violation of the department's policy on Deadly Force; and gave false statements to IPRA and CPD. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused officer impeded the subsequent investigation by tampering with evidence. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for the accused sergeant.

**Log/C.R. No. 1025475**

On April 13, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on April 11, 2009, in the 18th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant (Sergeant A) and two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer B and Victim Officer C). It was alleged that Sergeant A made derogatory remarks about Victim Officer E in the presence of Officer B; made a racial remark about Victim Officer C and Victim Officer D in the presence of Officer B; and made a racial remark about Victim Officer E in the presence of Officer B. It was alleged that Officer B failed to report a fellow member's misconduct and provided a false statement to IPRA. It was alleged that Victim Officer C failed to report a fellow member's misconduct. Based upon statements by the accused officers, victims and witnesses, and department records, IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" the allegation that Sergeant A made derogatory remarks about Victim Officer E in the presence of Officer B. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegations that Sergeant A made a racial remark about Victim Officer C and Victim Officer D in the presence of Officer B; and made a racial remark about Victim Officer E in the presence of Officer B. IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the allegations that Officer B failed to report a fellow member's misconduct and provided a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the allegations that Victim Officer C failed to report a fellow member's misconduct. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for Sergeant A and Officer B and a written reprimand for Victim Officer C.

**Log/C.R. No. 1026439**

On May 16, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that took place on May 15, 2009 in the 5th District involving two off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A pushed complainant and punched complainant. It was alleged that Officer B failed to report a fellow member's misconduct. Based upon statements by the accused officers, the Victim and witnesses, and photographs, IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the allegations that Officer A pushed

the Victim and punched the Victim. IPRA recommended a finding of “SUSTAINED” for the allegation that Officer B failed to report a fellow member’s misconduct. IPRA recommended a seven (7) day suspension for Officer A and a “Violation Noted” for Officer B.

**Log/C.R. No. 1027271**

On July 13, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on July 13, 2009 in the 8th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the Officer was intoxicated and intentionally discharged his weapon. Based on a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” for all allegations and a thirty (30) day suspension.

**Log/C.R. No. 1042917**

On January 23, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on January 23, 2011 in Hoffman Estates, Illinois. It was alleged that an off-duty officer pushed Victim, which resulted in his arrest for Domestic Battery; damaged property belonging to Victim, which resulted in his arrest for Criminal Damage to Property; and was intoxicated while off-duty. Based on a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” for all allegations and a two (2) day suspension.

**Log/C.R. No. 1043460**

On February 20, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on February 19, 2011 in the 3rd District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officer A and B). It was alleged that Officer A accidentally discharged his weapon while attempting to holster his weapon; failed to immediately notify OEMC that he discharged his weapon; and dragged/pulled Victim A down the stairs. It was alleged that Officer B put a gun to Victim B’s head; stepped on Victim B’s stomach; stepped on Victim B’s neck; and verbally abused Victim B. Based on statements from Officer B, a Victim and witnesses, department and OEMC reports, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer B put a gun to Victim B’s head; stepped on Victim B’s neck; and verbally abused Victim B. IPRA recommended a finding of “EXONERATED” for the allegation that Officer B stepped on Victim B’s stomach. Based on a mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” for all allegations and a one (1) day suspension.

**Log/C.R. No. 1044302**

On March 27, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 27, 2011 in the 11th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon. Based on a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a written reprimand.

**Log/C.R. No. 1045517**

On May 19, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on May 19, 2011, in the 13th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused officer was inattentive to duty in that she accidentally discharged her taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Violation Noted".

**Log/C.R. No. 1045833**

On June 2, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on June 2, 2011, in the 13th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused officer was inattentive to duty in that she accidentally discharged her taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Violation Noted".

APRIL 2012

**Log/C.R. No. 1037959**

On July 11, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on July 11, 2010 in the 18th District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officer A and Officer B). It was alleged that both Officer A and B failed to properly search the subject while in their custody; failed to properly secure the subject while in their custody; failed to properly monitor the safety of the subject, while in their custody; failed to provide medical care for the subject, who was in need of immediate medical attention; failed to properly notify a supervisor of a sick person, the subject, in their custody; failed to treat the subject with respect and dignity; and made a false statement to IPRA. Based on statements from the accused officers and witnesses, department reports, audio recordings, and video recordings, IPRA recommended a finding of "EXONERATED" for the allegations that Officer A and Officer B failed to properly search the subject while in their custody and, based on the absence of a governing CPD policy, that Officer A

and Officer B failed to properly notify a supervisor of a sick person, the subject, in their custody. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that Officer A and Officer B failed to properly monitor the safety of the subject, while in their custody. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A and Officer B failed to properly secure the subject while in their custody; failed to provide medical care for the subject, who was in need of immediate medical attention; failed to treat the subject with respect and dignity; and during its investigation, made a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended separation for the accused officers from the department.

**Log/C.R. No. 1024576**

On March 10, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 10, 2009 in the 7th District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officer A and Officer B). It was alleged that Officer A and Officer B entered the residence of the victim without legal justification; seized victim without justification; threatened victim with injury and/or death; failed to secure their firearms; delayed summoning medical assistance for the victim; and that Officer B fired his firearm without justification. Based on statements from the accused officers and witnesses, reports and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A and Officer B entered the residence of the victim without legal justification and seized victim without justification. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A failed to secure his firearm. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that Officer A and Officer B threatened victim with injury and/or death and delayed summoning medical assistance for the victim. IPRA recommended a finding of “EXONERATED” for the allegation that Officer B fired his firearm without justification. IPRA recommended a seventeen (17) day suspension for Officer A and a fifteen (15) day suspension for Officer B.

**Log/C.R. No. 1050750**

On December 18, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on December 18, 2011 in the 13th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant and victim Lieutenant. It was alleged that the accused Sergeant verbally and physically mistreated victim Lieutenant. Based on a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” for the allegation and subsequently retired from the department.

**Log/C.R. No. 1017716**

On June 27, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on June 26, 2008 in the 9th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused officer physically maltreated the victim during a domestic dispute; was taken into custody and placed under arrest for Domestic Battery; and violated the conditions of his bail bond when he contacted the victim via text message. Based on statements from the accused officer, victim, and witnesses, reports and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer physically maltreated the victim during a domestic dispute; was taken into custody and placed under arrest for Domestic Battery; and violated the conditions of his bail bond when he contacted the victim via text message. IPRA recommended separation for the accused officer from the department.

**Log/C.R. No. 1051707**

On February 6, 2012, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on February 6, 2012 in the 8th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant. It was alleged that the accused Sergeant failed to properly secure his weapon and unnecessarily discharged his weapon. Based on a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” for the allegation and subsequently retired from the department.

**Log/C.R. No. 1017110**

On June 4, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on June 4, 2008 in the 14th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant. It was alleged that the accused Sergeant directed profanities at complainant; pushed complainant; failed to provide complainant with his name and/or badge number; and brought discredit on the department by his overall actions. Based on statements from the accused officer, complainant, and witnesses, department reports, and OEMC transmissions, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer directed profanities at complainant; pushed complainant; and brought discredit on the department by his overall actions. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer failed to provide complainant with his name and/or badge number. IPRA recommended a twenty (20) day suspension for the accused sergeant.

**Log/C.R. No. 1014617**

On March 3, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 3, 2008 in the 18th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused officer engaged in a physical altercation with the complainant and was intoxicated while off-duty. Based on statements from the accused officer, complainant, and witnesses, department and medical reports, video recordings, photographs, and a breathalyzer test, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer was intoxicated while off-duty. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer engaged in a physical altercation with the complainant. IPRA recommended a two (2) day suspension for the accused officer. The accused officer resigned prior to the completion of IPRA’s investigation.

**Log/C.R. No. 1001556**

On November 25, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on November 25, 2006 in Merrionette Park, IL involving two off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officer A and Victim Officer B). It was alleged that Officer A was intoxicated off-duty; engaged in a verbal altercation with Victim Officer B; engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Victim Officer B; punched Victim Officer B about the face; was arrested and charged with Battery; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. It was alleged that Victim Officer B was intoxicated off-duty; engaged in a verbal altercation with Officer A; engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Officer A; and “head-butted” Officer A. Based on statements from the accused members and witnesses, police and medical reports, breathalyzer tests, and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A was intoxicated off-duty; engaged in a verbal altercation with Victim Officer B; was arrested and charged with Battery; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Victim Officer B and punched Victim Officer B about the face. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that Victim Officer B was intoxicated off-duty; engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Officer A; and “head-butted” Officer A. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that Victim Officer B engaged in a verbal altercation with Officer A. IPRA recommended a ten (10) day suspension for Officer A.

**Log/C.R. No. 1003207**

On February 2, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on February 2, 2007 in the 3rd District involving two off-duty Chicago Police

---

Department (CPD) Officers (Officer A and Officer B). It was alleged that Officer A struck victim on the back of the head; punched victim on the mouth; verbally abused victim; and provided a false statement to IPRA. It was alleged that Officer B observed Officer A engage in misconduct and failed to report the misconduct. Based on statements from the accused members, victim and witnesses, reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A punched victim on the mouth and provided a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A struck victim on the back of the head and verbally abused victim. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer B observed Officer A engage in misconduct and failed to report the misconduct. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for Officer A.

### **Log/C.R. No. 1034720**

On March 16, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 16, 2010 in the 10th District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officer A and Officer B). It was alleged that both Officer A and Officer B conducted an unjustified traffic stop of the vehicle Complainant A drove; admitted to past use of racially-biased language; were verbally abusive towards Complainant A and Complainant B; threatened Complainant A and Complainant B; made coercive statements to Complainant A; made a coercive statement to Complainant B; made a false department report; and observed misconduct and failed to take action. Based on statements from the accused members and complainants, department records, and a cell phone audio recording IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A conducted an unjustified traffic stop of the vehicle Complainant A drove; made a false department report; and observed misconduct and failed to take action. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that Officer A admitted to past use of racially-biased language; was verbally abusive towards Complainant A and Complainant B; threatened Complainant A and Complainant B; made coercive statements to Complainant A; and made a coercive statement to Complainant B. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer B admitted to past use of racially-biased language; was verbally abusive towards Complainant A and Complainant B; threatened Complainant A and Complainant B; and made coercive statements to Complainant A. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer B conducted an unjustified traffic stop of the vehicle Complainant A drove; made a coercive statement to Complainant B; and made a false department report. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that Officer B observed misconduct and failed to take action. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for Officer B.

---

**Log/C.R. No. 1006000**

On May 24, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on May 24, 2007 in the 25th District involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer (Officer A) and one on-duty CPD Officer (Officer B). It was alleged that on May 24, 2007, Officer A engaged in a physical altercation with the victim; verbally abused the victim; threatened the victim; and unnecessarily displayed his weapon. It was also alleged that on May 29, 2007, Officer A brought discredit upon the department when he was arrested and charged with Domestic Battery. It was alleged that on November 19, 2005, Officer A verbally abused the victim and unnecessarily displayed his weapon. It was alleged that on May 24, 2007, Officer B verbally abused the victim. Based on statements from the accused officers, victim and witnesses, department and medical reports, court records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that on May 24, 2007, Officer A engaged in a physical altercation with the victim. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that on May 29, 2007, Officer A brought discredit upon the department when he was arrested and charged with Domestic Battery. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegations on May 24, 2007, Officer A verbally abused the victim; threatened the victim; and unnecessarily displayed his weapon. Further, IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegations on that November 19, 2005, Officer A verbally abused the victim and unnecessarily displayed his weapon. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that on May 24, 2007, Officer B verbally abused the victim. IPRA recommended a fifteen (15) day suspension for Officer A.

**Log/C.R. No. 1007584**

On July 16, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on July 16, 2007 in the 5th District involving a Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that on July 16, 2007, Officer A engaged in a physical altercation with the victim; verbally abused the victim; had victim's cell phone service disconnected; and was intoxicated. It was alleged that on July 11, 2007, Officer A engaged in a physical altercation with the victim. It was alleged that on December 17, 2006, Officer A engaged in a physical altercation with the victim. It was alleged that between October 2006 and July 2007, Officer A pointed a gun at the victim and threatened to kill her; threatened to have victim's children taken away from her; and threatened to have victim's family members arrested. It was alleged on an unspecified date, Officer A obtained a copy of victim's criminal history. Based on statements from the accused officer, victim and witnesses, department and medical records, cell phone data, and photographs, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that on July 16, 2007, the accused officer engaged in a physical altercation with the victim. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that on July 16, 2007, the accused

officer verbally abused the victim. IPRA recommended a finding of “EXONERATED” for the allegation that on July 16, 2007, the accused officer had victim’s cell phone service disconnected. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that on July 16, 2007, the accused officer was intoxicated. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that on July 11, 2007, the accused officer engaged in a physical altercation with the victim. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that on December 17, 2007, the accused officer engaged in a physical altercation with the victim. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that between October 2006 and July 2007, the accused officer pointed a gun at the victim and threatened to kill her and threatened to have victim’s children taken away from her. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that between October 2006 and July 2007, the accused officer threatened to have victim’s family members arrested. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that on an unspecified date, the accused officer obtained a copy of victim’s criminal history. IPRA recommended separation for the accused officer from the department.

MAY 2012

#### **Log/C.R. No. 1045912**

On June 5, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurred on June 5, 2011 in the 25th District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer. It was alleged that the accused officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

#### **Log/C.R. No. 1005045**

On April 18, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurred on April 18, 2007 in the 3rd District, involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer (Officer A) and one on-duty CPD officer (Officer B). It was alleged that Officer A verbally abused the victim; grabbed and pushed the victim; punched the victim; got on top of the victim and choked him; and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report. It was also alleged that Officer B failed to provide his name and star number upon request. Based on statements from the accused officers, complainant and witnesses, department reports and photographs, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A verbally abused the victim; grabbed and pushed the victim; punched the victim; and got on top of the victim and choked him. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A failed to complete a Tactical Response Report. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation

that Officer B failed to provide his name and star number upon request. IPRA recommended a written reprimand for Officer A.

JUNE 2012

**Log/C.R. No. 1004549**

On March 31, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on March 31, 2007 in Cicero, Illinois. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer struck the victim on the face and verbally abused the victim. Based on statements from the accused officer, victim and witnesses, photographs, 911 records, department and medical reports, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused officer struck the victim on the face and verbally abused the victim. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1027491**

On June 19 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on June 19, 2009, in the 2nd District, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A directed racial slurs at Victim A; grabbed Victim A by the throat; damaged Victim A's personal property; and failed to complete a Contact Information Card for Victim B. It was further alleged that Officer B failed to complete a Contact Information Card for Victim B. Based on statements from the accused officers, witnesses and victims, and department records, IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A directed racial slurs at Victim A. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A grabbed Victim A by the throat. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A damaged the personal property of Victim A. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A failed to complete a Contact Information Card for Victim B. Additionally, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B failed to complete a Contact Information Card for Victim B. IPRA recommended a fifteen (15) day suspension for Officer A and a one (1) day suspension for Officer B.

**Log/C.R. No. 1024366**

On March 4, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on February 28, 2009, in the 20th District, involving three on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A, B, and C) and one on-duty CPD sergeant (Sergeant). It was alleged that

Officers A and B failed to return or inventory the Victim's property. It was alleged that Officer C handcuffed the victim too tightly. Additionally, it was alleged that the Sergeant was inattentive to duty in failing to take action to ensure a Case Report was generated regarding the Victim's property. Based on statements from the accused officers, victim and witness, and department and medical records, IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer A failed to return or inventory the Victim's property. IPRA further recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer B failed to return or inventory the Victim's property. Additionally, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer C handcuffed the Victim too tightly. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Sergeant was inattentive to duty. IPRA recommended written reprimands for Officer A and Officer B.

### **Log/C.R. No. 1025858**

On April 27, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 26, 2009, in the 7th District, involving three on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A, B, and C) and two on-duty CPD sergeants (Sergeants A and B). It was alleged that Officer A struck the Victim with a police vehicle; threatened to fight with Bystander A; made false reports; and failed to follow Department policy regarding traffic crashes. Further, it was alleged that Officer B pushed the Victim; directed profanities at Bystander B; and threatened Bystander B. Additionally, it was alleged that Officer C made an incomplete Illinois Traffic Crash Report. It was alleged that Sergeant A failed to follow Department policy regarding initiation responsibilities and procedures. It was alleged that Sergeant B failed to follow Department policy regarding initiation responsibilities and procedures; and failed to follow Department policy regarding investigation of traffic crashes involving Department members. Based on statements from the accused officers, victims, and witnesses, departmental and medical records, and admissions by Officers A, C, and Sergeant A, IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the allegations that Officer A struck the Victim with a police vehicle. IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer A threatened to fight with Bystander A. Additionally, IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer A made false reports. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer A failed to follow Department policy regarding traffic crashes. IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer B pushed the victim; directed profanities at Bystander B; and threatened Bystander B. IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Officer C made an incomplete Illinois Traffic Crash Report. IPRA recommended a finding of "SUSTAINED" for the allegation that Sergeant A failed to follow department policy regarding initiation responsibilities and procedures. IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations that Sergeant B failed to follow Department policy regarding initiation responsibilities and procedures

and failed to follow Department policy regarding investigation of traffic crashes involving Department members. IPRA recommended a sixty (60) day suspension for Officer A, a one (1) day suspension for Officer C, and a five (5) day suspension for Sergeant A.

**Log/C.R. No. 1025382**

On April 9, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 9, 2009 in the 6th District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer. It was alleged that the accused officer unintentionally discharged his firearm and was in possession of a firearm with which he had not qualified. Based on the statements from the accused officer and witness, and department records, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer discharged his firearm without justification. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer was in possession of a firearm, with which he had not qualified. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for the accused officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1028765**

On July 31 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on July 31, 2009, in the 4th District, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer. It was alleged that the accused officer approached Victim A in an aggressive manner and banged on the front door of the house; yelled at Victim A and Victim B; violated a court order; and brought discredit to the department. Based on the statements from the accused officer, witness and victims, department records, and Court Order, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer approached Victim A in an aggressive manner and banged on the front door of the house. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer yelled at Victim A and Victim B. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer violated a Cook County Court Order by approaching the residence. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer brought discredit upon the department by engaging in an unjustified verbal altercation with Victim A and Victim B and by violating a Court Order. IPRA recommended separation of the accused officer from the department.

**Log/C.R. No. 1020562**

On October 5, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 5, 2008 in the 4th District, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer. It was alleged that the accused officer repeatedly struck Victim A about his body; struck Victim B on the head with his firearm; fired a gun at the victims; kicked Victim A about his body;

---

and made a false statement to IPRA on 25 February 2011. Further, it was alleged that the accused officer brought discredit upon the department by engaging in the above actions. Based on the statements from the accused officer, victims and witnesses, department reports, medical records, photographs, and video evidence, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer repeatedly struck Victim A about his body; struck Victim B on the head with a gun; fired a gun at Victim A and Victim B; kicked Victim A about his body; provided a false statement to IPRA on February 25, 2011; and brought discredit to the department. IPRA recommended separation of the accused officer from the department.

**Log/C.R. No. 1023183**

On January 17, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on January 16, 2009, in the 3rd District, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officer A and Officer B). It was alleged that Officer A kicked the victim on the nose; choked the victim during an interview; and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report. It was further alleged that Officer B held the victim’s head in the snow for approximately one minute. Based on the statements from the accused officers, victim and witnesses, departmental, police, and medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A kicked the victim in the face and choked the victim during an interview. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A failed to complete a Tactical Response Report. Further IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer B held the victim’s head in the snow. IPRA recommended a two (2) day suspension for Officer A.

**Log/C.R. No. 1015527**

On April 6, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 6, 2008, in the 21st District, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer. It was alleged that the accused officer pointed his firearm at Victim A, Victim B, Victim C, and Victim D; struck Victim B on the head with his firearm; was intoxicated while off-duty; and was in possession of his firearm while impaired due to the consumption of alcoholic beverages. Based on the statements from the accused officer, victims and witnesses, department reports, and breathalyzer test, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that on April 6, 2008, the accused officer unjustifiably pointed his firearm at Victim A, Victim B, Victim C, and Victim D; and that the accused officer struck Victim B on the head with his firearm. IPRA recommended a finding of “SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the accused officer was intoxicated while off duty; and that the accused officer was in possession of his firearm while impaired due to the consumption of alcoholic beverages. IPRA recommended an eight (8) day suspension for the accused member.

JULY 2012

**Log/C.R. No. 1008540**

On August 18, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on August 18, 2007 in the 23rd District involving three on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A, B, and C). It was alleged that Officer A pulled the victim's hood over his head and punched him on his face and neck; verbally abused the victim; and provided a false statement to IPRA. It was alleged that Officers B and C observed misconduct and failed to take action and both individually provided a false statement to IPRA. Based on statements from the accused officers, complainant, and witnesses, department reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A pulled the victim's hood over his head and punched him on his face and neck; verbally abused the victim; and both individually provided a false statement to IPRA. Based on statements from the accused officers, complainant, and witnesses, department reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officers B and C observed misconduct and failed to take action and provided a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a forty-five (45) day suspension for Officer A and a thirty (30) day suspension for Officers B and C.

**Log/C.R. No. 1008640**

On August 22, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on August 22, 2007 in the 14th District involving one on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Lieutenant (Lieutenant A) and two on-duty CPD Officers (Officers B and C). It was alleged that Lieutenant A improperly executed a search warrant and verbally abused the complainant. It was alleged that Officers B and C discharged their weapons and destroyed complainant's dogs without justification. Based on statements from the accused members, complainant and witnesses, photographs and department reports, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Lieutenant A improperly executed a search warrant. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that Lieutenant A verbally abused the complainant. Based on statements from the accused members and witnesses, photographs and department reports, IPRA recommended a finding of "EXONERATED" for the allegation that Officers B and C discharged their weapons and destroyed complainant's dogs without justification. IPRA recommended a three (3) day suspension for the accused Lieutenant.

**Log/C.R. No. 1009860**

On October 4, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 4, 2007 in the 9th District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A verbally abused Complainants A, B, and C; grabbed Complainant A and pushed him against a car; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. It was alleged that Officer B observed misconduct and failed to take action; verbally abused Complainant A; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. Based on statements from the accused officers, complainants, and department reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused Officer A verbally abused Complainants A, B, and C; grabbed Complainant A and pushed him against a car; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused Officer B observed misconduct and failed to take action; verbally abused Complainant A; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended a twenty (20) day suspension for Officer A and a fifteen (15) day suspension for Officer B.

**Log/C.R. No. 1022800**

On January 1, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on January 1, 2009 in the 25th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer bit Victim Sergeant on the leg; kicked Victim Officer A on the leg; kicked Victim Paramedic A on the arm; spat on the back of the head of Victim Paramedic B; verbally abused Victim Sergeant; verbally abused Victim Officer B; and by her overall actions brought discredit on the department. Based on statements from the accused officer, victims and witnesses, department reports, and medical records, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused Officer bit Victim Sergeant on the leg; kicked Victim Officer A on the leg; kicked Victim Paramedic A on the arm; spat on the back of the head of Victim Paramedic B; verbally abused Victim Sergeant; verbally abused Victim Officer B; and by her overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for the accused Officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1031216**

On October 22, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents occurring in the 8th and 22nd Districts, on various dates, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that on October 22, 2009, that the accused Officer threatened complainant via telephone. It was further alleged that from August 5, 2009 through October 2009, that the accused Officer harassed complainant via several phone calls. It was later

alleged that on an undetermined date and time on or about April and/or May 2009, the accused Officer put a pillow over her infant daughter's face and shook her infant daughter on two separate occasions. It was alleged that on December 2, 2009, that the accused Officer made a false report to the Department. It was alleged that on December 15, 2009, that the accused Officer provided false information in a Petition for Order of Protection. It was further alleged that on June 17, 2010, that the accused Officer made a false report to IPRA. Based on statements from the accused officer, complainant, and witnesses, DCFS and police reports, OEMC, telephone, medical and court records, IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that on October 22, 2009, the accused Officer threatened complainant via telephone. Further, IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that on August 5, 2009 through October 2009, the accused Officer harassed complainant via several phone calls. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that on December 15, 2009, the accused Officer provided false information in a Petition for Order of Protection. Further, IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that on June 17, 2010, the accused Officer made a false report to IPRA. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that on an undetermined date and time on or about April and/or May 2009, the accused Officer put a pillow over her infant daughter's face and shook her infant daughter on two separate occasions. IPRA recommended separation for the accused Officer from the department.

**Log/C.R. No. 1031396**

On October 29, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 29, 2009 in the 16th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was intoxicated while off duty, made a false statement to a superior officer, engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the department, failed to follow procedure after the discharge of his firearm in that the officer did not make the appropriate oral and written reports after he discharged his firearm, disobeyed a department directive regarding firearm discharge, unlawfully and unnecessarily used his firearm, and subsequently pled guilty to the charges of Reckless Conduct and Discharge of Firearm in City Limits. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a thirty (30) day suspension.

**Log/C.R. No. 1044943**

On April 24, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 24, 2011 in the 8th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Violation Noted".

---

**Log/C.R. No. 1045412**

On May 14, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on May 14, 2011 in the 5th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Violation Noted".

**Log/C.R. No. 1049571**

On October 25, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 25, 2011 in the 22nd District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant. It was alleged that the accused Sergeant failed to properly secure his weapon and verbally threatened Complainants A and B. Based upon a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Reprimand".

**Log/C.R. No. 1049626**

On October 27, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 27, 2011 in the 3rd District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Violation Noted".

**Log/C.R. No. 1050191**

On November 21, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on November 21, 2011 in the 16th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Violation Noted".

**Log/C.R. No. 1050398**

On December 1, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents that occurred on December 1, 2011 and December 4, 2011 in the 19th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant. On December 1, 2011, it was alleged that the accused Sergeant threatened the complainant (his brother) via text message, threatened the complainant via voicemail, verbally abused the complainant via voicemail, and was intoxicated. On December 4, 2011, it was alleged that the accused Sergeant threatened complainant

via text message. Based upon a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Violation Noted".

**Log/C.R. No. 1052479**

On March 10, 2012, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 10, 2012 in the 5th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Violation Noted".

AUGUST 2012

**Log/C.R. No. 1047471**

On August 5, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on August 5, 2011 in Lake Delton, Wisconsin. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer was intoxicated; was in possession of her weapon while intoxicated; was inattentive to duty, in that she failed to maintain control of her weapon; threatened to shoot her fiancé, the victim; pointed her weapon at the victim; engaged in a physical altercation with the victim; discharged her weapon; was arrested for Felony Endangering Safety, Disorderly Conduct, and Endanger Safety/Use/Dangerous Weapon; failed to report her felony arrest; and by her overall actions brought discredit on the department. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a forty-five (45) day suspension.

**Log/C.R. No. 1045406**

On May 13, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents that occurred in the spring of 2011 continuing through May 2011 in the 16th District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant violated an Order of Protection in that he contacted his five children, Complainants A through E, multiple times via telephone and text messaging on May 13, 2011; telephoned son Complainant A multiple times on May 20, 2011; contacted his wife, Complainant F, on May 20, 2011 via email and accessed her email account on May 23, 2011; harassed his wife, Complainant F, by stealing her car on May 12, 2011; threatened his wife, Complainant F, in Spring 2011; harassed his wife, Complainant F, through electronic means in April and May 2011; and struck his sons, Complainant B and C, on unknown dates. Based upon a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a three (3) day suspension.

---

**Log/C.R. No. 1048130**

On September 1, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on September 1, 2011 in the 3rd District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant. It was alleged that the accused Sergeant was inattentive to duty in that she accidentally discharged her taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Violation Noted".

**Log/C.R. No. 1033096**

On January 12, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on January 12, 2010 in the 22nd District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department Officer (CPD) was intoxicated while off-duty; failed to secure his weapon; shot Victim A; assaulted Victim B, a CPD Sergeant; verbally abused Victim B, a CPD Sergeant; brought discredit to on the department, in that he interfered with the Chicago Fire Department (CFD) personnel who were attempting to treat Victim A and was subsequently arrested for those actions; and provided false statements to investigating police officers and detectives regarding this incident when he indicated that Victim A shot himself. Based on statements from the accused officer, victim and witnesses, medical, expert, breathalyzer, and police reports, OEMC records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused Officer was intoxicated while off-duty; failed to secure his weapon; assaulted Victim B, a CPD Sergeant; verbally abused Victim B, a CPD Sergeant; and brought discredit to on the department, in that he interfered with the Chicago Fire Department personnel who were attempting to treat Victim A and was subsequently arrested for those actions. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused Officer shot Victim A and provided false statements to investigating police officers and detectives regarding this incident when he indicated that Victim A shot himself. IPRA recommended a sixty (60) day suspension for the accused Officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1046872**

On July 12, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on July 12, 2011 in the 2nd District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Reprimand".

**Log/C.R. No. 314738**

On August 6, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on August 6, 2006 in the 18th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department Officer (CPD) punched victim about his face; detained victim without justification; threatened to kill victim; directed a racial slur at the victim; failed to properly restrain the victim; left his duty assignment without proper authorization; failed to adequately secure department property; failed to promptly report damage to department property; made a false report regarding his contact with the victim; make a false report regarding damage to department property; made a false report regarding his activities; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. Based on statements from the accused officer, victim and witnesses, medical and police reports, OEMC records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused Officer punched victim about his face; detained victim without justification; threatened to kill victim; directed a racial slur at the victim; failed to properly restrain the victim; left his duty assignment without proper authorization; failed to adequately secure department property; failed to promptly report damage to department property; made a false report regarding his contact with the victim; make a false report regarding damage to department property; made a false report regarding his activities; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended separation for the accused Officer from the department.

**Log/C.R. No. 1044261**

On March 25, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 25, 2011 in the 10th District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

**Log/C.R. No. 1023942**

On February 17, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on February 13, 2011 in the 18th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer verbally abused complainant; grabbed complainant by the collar and pushed him down onto a Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) bus seat; and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR) documenting his use of force during the arrest of the complainant. Based on statements from the accused officer, victim and witnesses, medical and police reports, CTA and OEMC records, and video, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the accused Officer verbally abused complainant. IPRA recommended a finding of “EXONERATED” for the allegation that

the accused Officer grabbed complainant by the collar and pushed him down onto a CTA bus seat. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused Officer failed to complete a TRR documenting his use of force during the arrest of the complainant. IPRA recommended a “Violation Noted” for the accused Officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1029189**

On August 14, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on May 3, 2009 in the 19th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer verbally abused the victim; choked the victim; and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR) documenting his use of force during the arrest of the complainant. Based on statements from the accused Officer, victim and witnesses, police reports and medical records, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that the accused Officer verbally abused the victim and choked the victim. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused Officer failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR) documenting his use of force during the arrest of the complainant. IPRA recommended a “Violation Noted” for the accused Officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1044788**

On April 17, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 17, 2011 in the 12th District, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

**Log/C.R. No. 1049273**

On October 13, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 13, 2011 in the 14th District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

**Log/C.R. No. 1052698**

On March 17, 2012, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 17, 2012 in the 19th District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer failed to properly document his encounter with an unknown subject. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

**Log/C.R. No. 1029960**

On September 9, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on September 9, 2009 in the 8th District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Written Reprimand".

**Log/C.R. No. 1017706**

On June 26, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on June 26, 2008 in the 14th District, involving five on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A through E). It was alleged that accused Officers B and C failed to place Victim where he could be monitored and supervised. It was also alleged that Officers A, D, and E failed to process Victim in a timely manner and failed to properly monitor Victim. Based on statements from the accused and witnesses, medical records, photographs and video, and police records, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer A failed to process Victim A in a timely manner. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer A violated departmental policy regarding monitoring arrestees held in lockup facilities. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B failed to place Victim A where he could be monitored and supervised. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer C failed to follow guidelines for arrestee screening in that he failed to place Victim where he could be monitored. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer D failed to process Victim A in a timely manner. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer D violated Departmental policy regarding monitoring arrestees held in lockup facilities. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer E failed to process Victim A in a timely manner. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer E violated Departmental policy regarding monitoring arrestees held in lockup facilities. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for Officer B, a one (1) day suspension for Officer D, and a one (1) day suspension for Officer E.

**Log/C.R. No. 1032601**

On December 17, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on December 16, 2009 in the 7th District, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that accused Officer A stomped/kicked the Victim; verbally abused the Victim; struck the Victim on the face; submitted false department

---

reports regarding the arrest of the Victim; and provided a false statement to IPRA on March 8, 2010, and September 13, 2011. It was also alleged that accused Officer B held the Victim to the ground by placing his foot on his back; submitted false department reports regarding the arrest of the Victim; witnessed misconduct and failed to report it; and provided false statements to IPRA on April 27, 2010, June 4, 2010, and September 15, 2011. Based on statements from from the complainant and witnesses, medical records, photographs and video, 911 calls, and police records, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer A stomped/kicked the Victim; verbally abused the Victim; struck the Victim on the face; made false department reports regarding the Victim’s arrest; and provided a false report to IPRA on April 8, 2010. Further, IPRA also recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officer B physically maltreated the Victim by placed his foot on the Victim’s back; made false reports relative to the Victim’s arrest; witnessed and failed to report misconduct; and provided false statements to IPRA on April 27, 2010, June 4, 2010, and September 15, 2011. IPRA recommended separation for both Officers A and B.

### **Log/C.R. No. 1014602**

On March 2, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 2, 2008 in Forest Park, Illinois. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department Officer directed profanities at Victim A; caused a disturbance by jumping around and landing on his back on restaurant tables, causing them to break; was arrested, charged, and subsequently indicted for the criminal offenses of Aggravated Battery and Resisting or Obstructing a Peace Officer; was intoxicated while off-duty; failed to identify himself as a CPD Officer; struck Victim B, a Forest Park Police Officer, on the face; grabbed Victim C, a Forest Park Police Sergeant by his legs and tackled him to the ground; spat on Victim D, a Forest Park Fire Department Paramedic; and directed profanities at Victim E, a Forest Park Fire Department Paramedic. Based on statements from the accused Officer, victims and witnesses, medical and ambulance reports, photographs, radio transmissions, CPD, Forest Park Police, and Cook County Sheriff’s Department records, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the accused Officer failed to identify himself as a CPD Officer. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused Officer directed profanities at Victim A; caused a disturbance by jumping around and landing on his back on restaurant tables, causing them to break; was arrested, charged, and subsequently indicted for the criminal offenses of Aggravated Battery and Resisting or Obstructing a Peace Officer; was intoxicated while off-duty; struck Victim B, a Forest Park Police Officer, on the face; grabbed Victim C, a Forest Park Police Sergeant by his legs and tackled him to the ground; spat on Victim D, a Forest Park Fire Department Paramedic; and directed profanities at Victim E, a Forest Park Fire Department Paramedic. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for the accused Officer.

---

SEPTEMBER 2012

**Log/C.R. No. 1031207**

On October 22, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 21, 2009, involving one on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer, Officer A, slapped Victim CPD Officer B across the face in the women's locker room and head-butted her. It was alleged that Officer A placed her hand on her weapon and verbally threatened to kill Victim Officer B. It was also alleged that on April 19, 2011, Officer A gave a false statement to IPRA regarding the incident that occurred on October 21, 2009. Based on statements from the accused, the victim and witnesses, police reports, and medical records, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A slapped Victim CPD Officer B across the face in the women's locker room. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A head-butted Victim CPD Officer B. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A placed her hand on her weapon and verbally threatened to kill Victim CPD Officer B. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A gave a false statement to IPRA on April 19, 2011, regarding the incident that occurred on October 21, 2009. IPRA recommended separation for Officer A.

**Log/C.R. No. 1029410**

On August 21, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on August 21, 2009, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer punched the Victim in the face and verbally abused him. It was also alleged that on January 22, 2010, the Officer gave a false report to IPRA stating that he did not punch the Victim. Based on statements made by the accused, the victim and a witness, arrest reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation that the Officer punched the Victim in the face. IPRA also recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the Officer verbally abused the Victim. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that the Officer submitted a false report to IPRA. IPRA recommended a written reprimand for the accused Officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1010477**

Between October 26, 2007 and December 17, 2007, three complaints were registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding three separate incidents involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer and his girlfriend, the Victim. It was alleged that, on October 26, 2007, the Officer pushed the Victim against a wall, choked and scratched her, verbally abused her, threatened

her, and physically maltreated her by pouring drinks on her head and taking her purse from her. It was also alleged that, on December 3, 2007, the Officer slapped the Victim on the face, threatened to kill her, and verbally abused her. It was alleged that, on December 17, 2007, the Officer attempted to grab the Victim during a verbal altercation, and verbally abused her. Based on statements made by the accused, the victim and a witness, photographs and case reports, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer pushed the Victim against a wall, and choked and scratched her. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer verbally abused the Victim. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer threatened the Victim. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the Officer physically maltreated the Victim by pouring drinks on her head and taking her purse from her, since the Officer admitted to those acts. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the Officer slapped the Victim. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer threatened to kill the Victim and verbally abused her. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer attempted to grab the Victim during a verbal altercation, and verbally abused her. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer verbally abused the Victim. IPRA recommended a suspension of fifteen (15) days for the accused Officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1025477**

On April 13, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 12, 2009, involving one known on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer and other unknown CPD Officers. It was alleged that the unknown Officers falsely arrested Victim A, falsely arrested Victim B, slammed Victim C against a squad car, and improperly searched Victim C. It was alleged that the known Officer falsely arrested Victim A, falsely arrested Victim B, slammed Victim C against a squad car, and improperly searched Victim C. It was also alleged that the known Officer discharged his taser without justification. Because the complainant did not give a sworn affidavit, IPRA recommended a finding of “NO AFFIDAVIT” for the allegations that the accused Officers falsely arrested Victim A, falsely arrested Victim B, slammed Victim C against a squad car, and improperly searched Victim C. However, based on statements made by the accused and witnesses, arrest reports, tactical response reports, and communication records, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the known Officer discharged his taser accidentally. IPRA recommended a “Violation Noted” for the known Officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1032554**

On October 25, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 25, 2009, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer punched his ex-wife, the Victim, struck her multiple times with a chair, choked her, pushed her to the floor multiple times, pulled her by the hair, and grabbed her arm, threatened to kill the Victim and her son, and failed to notify the Department that he was the respondent to an Order of Protection granted on February 5, 2010. Based upon a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" for all allegations and a suspension of ten (10) days.

**Log/C.R. No. 1035288**

On April 9, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 8, 2010, involving one known on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer and one unknown CPD Officer. It was alleged that the unknown Officer maced students from a high school without justification. It was alleged that the known Officer failed to register a complaint on behalf of the high school students who stated that they were maced without justification by the unknown CPD Officer. It was also alleged that the known Officer failed to complete any department reports after being notified by the students that they incurred injuries that required medical attention. IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations that the unknown officer maced the students without justification. Based upon a mediation, the known Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" for all allegations and a suspension of one (1) day.



Independent Police Review Authority  
10 West 35th Street  
Suite 1200  
Chicago, Illinois 60616

(312) 745-3594 Complaint Line  
(312) 745-3609 General  
(312) 745-3591 FAX  
(312) 745-3593 TTY

[www.iprachicago.org](http://www.iprachicago.org)