

# **Independent Police Review Authority**

## **Quarterly Report**

**April 1, 2012 – June 30, 2012**

**July 16, 2012**

This report is filed pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-57-110, which requires the filing of quarterly reports. This quarterly report provides information for the period April 1, 2012 through June 30, 2012. The information contained in this report is accurate as of June 30, 2012. All of IPRA's public reports are available at [www.iprachicago.org](http://www.iprachicago.org).

### Quarterly Overview

In the past quarter IPRA opened 693 investigations. This includes 188 investigations after a notification of a Taser discharge. IPRA responded to 5 officer involved shootings where an individual was struck, the lowest number of such cases since IPRA was created in the fall of 2007.

During this quarter, IPRA closed 747 investigations. The number of closed investigations has increased from the previous two quarters. This reflects IPRA's ongoing efforts to maximize its resources. In addition, it reflects the contributions of investigators who were hired near the end of 2011 and have now completed sufficient training to contribute significantly to IPRA's efforts. IPRA continues to have investigative vacancies; however, three positions were filled in early July and IPRA has identified candidates for the remaining investigator positions. Three new investigators have begun their training and IPRA expects the next quarterly report will reflect their contributions.

This past quarter IPRA completed 23 sustained investigations. This was a slight decrease from the prior quarter because a significant number of cases IPRA has successfully mediated since March 2012 await CPD approval before being closed. IPRA is working with CPD to further implement and improve this process. IPRA anticipates increased numbers of successful mediations in the third quarter of 2012 and beyond. 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.

During this quarter, at the request of Alderman Jason Ervin, IPRA attended three community meetings in the 28<sup>th</sup> Ward including the Malcolm X Learning Center at 4624 W. Madison on June 19, 2012. Additionally, IPRA continued its outreach to elected officials, community residents, community based organizations, and faith based institutions in order to explain IPRA's role and its process. Chief Administrator Rosenzweig appeared on the Munir Muhammad/CROE television show to discuss IPRA's process and general information about the department. IPRA also attended the three monthly Police Board Meetings.

At the beginning of July, IPRA was able to fill its vacant Director of Public Affairs position. In this next quarter, IPRA will resume hosting community meetings.

## IPRA Cumulative Figures

	INTAKE (all allegations/ notifications) <sup>1</sup>	IPRA Investigations Opened <sup>2</sup>	IPRA Investigations Closed <sup>3</sup>	IPRA Caseload <sup>4</sup>
Sept. 2007	746	216	162	1290
4Q 2007	2273	613	368	1535
1Q 2008	2366	590	554	1571
2Q 2008	2436	640	670	1541
3Q 2008	2634	681	667	1555
4Q 2008	2337	699	692	1562
1Q 2009	2384	657	687	1532
2Q 2009	2648	755	651	1635
3Q 2009	2807	812	586	1981
4Q 2009	2235	617	654	1949
1Q 2010	2191	640	561	2028
2Q 2010	2626	868	832	2048
3Q 2010	2591	942	835	2168
4Q 2010	2127	746	681 <sup>5</sup>	2233
1Q 2011	2023	610	711	2132
2Q 2011	2171	778	747	2159
3Q 2011	2335	788	749	2173
4Q 2011	2038	688	594	2237
1Q 2012	1995	620	649	2210
2Q 2012	2155	693	747	2155

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the IPRA Ordinance, certain events trigger an IPRA investigation even in the absence of an allegation of misconduct. The term “notification” refers to those events that IPRA investigates where there is no alleged misconduct.

<sup>2</sup> This number includes investigations opened and assigned to IPRA as of the end of the identified quarter. It does not include investigations “Re-opened” because of the settlement of litigation, new evidence, or the results of the Command Channel Review process.

<sup>3</sup> This number may include some investigations “Re-closed” after being Re-opened.

<sup>4</sup> The caseload number for periods prior to 3Q 2009 are the numbers that IPRA previously reported in quarterly reports. As discussed previously, due to a calculation error, over time these numbers became inaccurate. The caseload number for 3Q 2009 reflects the results of IPRA’s complete audit of pending investigations.

<sup>5</sup> The number of investigations closed and IPRA Caseload reflect a correction of numbers reported in a previous report.

## IPRA Investigations Opened by Incident Type<sup>6</sup>

	IPRA (COMPLAINTS)	IPRA (NOTIFICATIONS)					
	INFO & CR	Extraordinary Occurrence (EO)	Hit Shooting (U#)	Non-Hit Shooting	Shooting/Animal	Taser	OC Discharge
Sept. 2007	195	4	4	3		3	2
4Q 2007	572	18	7	1		12	5
1Q 2008	475	16	8	12	18	31	16
2Q 2008	526	16	15	8	21	45	9
3Q 2008	563	8	14	10	20	52	13
4Q 2008	579	16	14	7	24	35	24
1Q 2009	553	11	9	9	25	39	14
2Q 2009	624	15	14	13	28	56	7
3Q 2009	657	21	18	16	18	63	22
4Q 2009	495	19	16	19	20	39	9
1Q 2010	482	13	12	14	29	74	15
2Q 2010	505	16	10	10	19	285	27
3Q 2010	576	15	11	10	30	285	16
4Q 2010	470	7	10	10	28	227	10
1Q 2011	377	17	15	12	27	155	10
2Q 2011	471	9	20	10	20	240	10
3Q 2011	460	15	16	17	22	248	9
4Q 2011	420	10	7	14	20	210	6
1Q 2012	384	14	12	10	13	186	3
2Q 2012	440	9	5	12	23	188	3

2-57-110(1): The number of investigations initiated since the last report

Between April 1, 2012 and June 30, 2012, IPRA issued 2155 Log Numbers. Of these Log Numbers, IPRA retained 693 for resolution. IPRA forwarded the remaining 1462 Log Numbers to the Internal Affairs Division of the Chicago Police Department for appropriate resolution.

Of the 693 Log Numbers retained by IPRA, IPRA classified 201 as Complaint Register Numbers. In addition, IPRA began Pre-affidavit Investigations for 239 of the Log Numbers retained by IPRA. The remainder of the retained Log Numbers consisted of 5

<sup>6</sup> Note: A single investigation may fall into more than one Incident Type. For instance, an investigation may be both an Extraordinary Occurrence (EO) and a Complaint Register (CR). For this chart, the investigation is counted in all applicable Incident Types. They are counted only once, in the total Log Numbers retained by IPRA. As defined by ordinance, an 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.

Log Numbers for shootings where an individual was hit by a bullet and a “U Number” was issued, 12 for shootings where no one was hit by a bullet, 23 for shots fired at animals, 188 for reported uses of tasers, 3 for reported uses of pepper spray,<sup>7</sup> 9 for Extraordinary Occurrences,<sup>8</sup> and 1 miscellaneous Log Number as a tracking number.

2-57-110(2): The number of investigations concluded since the last report

Between April 1, 2012 and June 30, 2012, IPRA closed 747 Log Numbers. A Log Number is considered closed when IPRA completes its work on the matter, regardless of whether the Police Department is still processing the results.

2-57-110(3): The number of investigations pending as of the report date

As of June 30, 2012, there were 2155 investigations pending completion by IPRA. These include both allegations that have received Complaint Register Numbers, and those being followed under a Log Number, as well as officer-involved shootings, and Extraordinary Occurrences.

2-57-110(4): The number of complaints not sustained since the last report<sup>9</sup>

Between April 1, 2012 and June 30, 2012, IPRA recommended that 198 investigations be closed as “not sustained.”

In addition, 264 cases were closed after a Pre-affidavit Investigation because the complainants refused to sign an affidavit. IPRA recommended that 64 investigations be closed as “unfounded,” and 4 be closed as “exonerated.”

2-57-110(5): The number of complaints sustained since the last report

Between April 1, 2012 and June 30, 2012, IPRA recommended that 23 cases be closed as sustained. Attached are abstracts for each case where IPRA recommended a sustained finding, and the discipline IPRA recommended.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> As of December 31, 2007, IPRA issued a Log Number for notifications of uses of taser, pepper spray, or for shootings where no one is injured only if it received a telephonic notification of the incident or there was an allegation of misconduct. As of January 1, 2008, IPRA implemented procedures to issue Log Numbers for all uses of taser and shootings, regardless of the method of notification. In addition CPD issued a reminder to CPD personnel to provide notification to IPRA. IPRA continues to issue Log Numbers for discharges of pepper spray at the request of CPD personnel.

<sup>8</sup> These numbers include one Log Numbers classified as both a U Number and a Complaint Register; and one Log Number classified as both an Extraordinary Occurrence and a Complaint Register. These Log Numbers are counted only once in the total number of Log Numbers retained by IPRA, but included in the breakouts of all applicable incident types.

<sup>9</sup> The term “not sustained” is a term of art in police misconduct investigations. It is defined in CPD G.O. 93-3 as “when there is insufficient evidence either to prove or disprove allegation.” In addition, cases may be “unfounded,” which means “the allegation is false or not factual.”

<sup>10</sup> Abstracts for all investigations where IPRA has recommended a sustained finding can be found at [www.iprachicago.org](http://www.iprachicago.org) under the Resources heading.

2-57-110(6): The number of complaints filed in each district since the last report<sup>11</sup>

Between April 1, 2012 and June 20, 2012, IPRA received complaints of alleged misconduct based on incidents in the following districts, as follows:

District 01 = 70	District 07 = 109	District 13 = 24	District 19 = 71
District 02 = 102	District 08 = 121	District 14 = 57	District 20 = 33
District 03 = 112	District 09 = 90	District 15 = 74	District 22 = 76
District 04 = 101	District 10 = 103	District 16 = 50	District 24 = 62
District 05 = 110	District 11 = 128	District 17 = 28	District 25 = 79
District 06 = 134	District 12 = 43	District 18 = 73	
	Outside City Limits = 26	Unknown location = 32	

2-57-110(7): The number of complaints filed against each officer in each district since the last report<sup>12</sup>

(See Attachment)

2-57-110(8): The number of complaints referred to other agencies and the identity of such other agencies

Between April 1, 2012 and June 30, 2012, IPRA referred 1477 cases to other agencies as follows:

Chicago Police Department – Internal Affairs Division = 1462

Cook County State’s Attorney = 15

---

<sup>11</sup> “Complaints” is defined as all reports of alleged misconduct, whether from the community or from a source internal to the Police Department, whether a Complaint Register number has been issued or not. This does not include, absent an allegation of misconduct, reports of uses of Tasers, pepper spray, discharges of weapons whether hitting an individual or not, or Extraordinary Occurrences. Districts are identified based on the district where the alleged misconduct occurred. Some complaints occurred in more than one District, they are counted in each district where they occurred. This list does include confidential complaints.

<sup>12</sup> This uses the same definition of “complaints” as the preceding section. Except as otherwise noted, if a member was assigned to one unit but detailed to another at the time of the complaint, the member is listed under the detailed unit.

**ATTACHMENT: COMPLAINTS AGAINST CPD MEMBERS BY UNIT**

**District 001**

Members 1-24: 1 complaint each  
Member 25-27: 2 complaints each

**District 002**

Members 1-16: 1 complaint each

**District 003**

Members 1-25: 1 complaint each  
Members 26-27: 2 complaints each

**District 004**

Members 1-38: 1 complaint each  
Members 39-41: 2 complaints each  
Members 42: 3 complaints

**District 005**

Members 1-27: 1 complaint each  
Members 28-33: 2 complaints each  
Member 34: 3 complaints

**District 006**

Members 1-34: 1 complaint each  
Members 35: 2 complaints

**District 007**

Members 1-28: 1 complaint each  
Member 29: 2 complaints

**District 008**

Members 1-26: 1 complaint each  
Member 27-28: 2 complaints each

**District 009**

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each  
Members 21: 2 complaints

**District 010**

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each  
Member 21-22: 2 complaints each

**District 011**

Members 1-35: 1 complaint each  
Member 36-37: 2 complaints each

**District 012**

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

**District 013**

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each  
Member 6: 2 complaints

**District 014**

Members 1-14: 1 complaint each  
Members 15-16: 2 complaints each

**District 015**

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each  
Members 21: 2 complaints

**District 016**

Members 1-13: 1 complaint each

**District 017**

Members 1-13: 1 complaint each

**District 018**

Members 1-22: 1 complaint each  
Member 23-25: 2 complaints each

**District 019**

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each  
Member 13: 2 complaints

**District 020**

Members 1-11: 1 complaint each

**District 022**

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each  
Member 13: 3 complaints

**District 024**

Members 1-13: 1 complaint each  
Member 14: 2 complaints

**District 025**

Members 1-28: 1 complaint each  
Member 29-30: 3 complaints each

**Airport Law Enforcement Unit – North (050)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each  
Member 3: 2 complaints

**Airport Law Enforcement Unit – South (051)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Marine Unit (059)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Legal Affairs Section (114)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Deployment Operations Center (116)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Bureau of Administration (120)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Bureau of Internal Affairs (121)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Finance Division (122)**

Member 1: 2 complaints

**Human Resources Division (123)**

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

**Education and Training Division (124)**

Member 1-3: 1 complaint each

**Inspections Division (126)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**CAPS Division (135)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

**Special Functions Division (141)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Traffic Section (145)**

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

**Unit 147**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Records Inquiry Section (163)**

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

**Field Services Section (166)**

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

**Central Detention (171)**

Member 1-2: 1 complaint each

**Bureau of Detectives (180)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Youth Investigation Section (184)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Narcotics Section (189)**

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each

**Gang Investigation Section (193)**

Members 1-11: 1 complaint each

**Bureau of Patrol – Area Central (211)**

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Member 5: 2 complaints

**Bureau of Patrol – Area South (212)**

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

Members 7-8: 2 complaints each

**Bureau of Patrol – Area North (213)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

**OEMC-Detail Section (276)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Gang Enforcement – Area Central (311)**

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

**Gang Enforcement – Area North (313)**

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each



**Gang Team – Area 4 (Former 314)**

Member 1-3: 1 complaint each

**Gang Team – Area 5 (Former 315)**

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

**Canine Unit (341)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) Unit (353)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Alternate Response Section (376)**

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

**Juvenile Intervention Support Center (384)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Gang Enforcement Division (393)**

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

**Crime Scene Processing Unit – ET South (477)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**FOP Detail (541)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Detached Services-Miscellaneous Detail (543)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Central Investigations Unit (606)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Major Accident Investigation Unit (610)**

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

Member 8: 3 complaints

**Bureau of Detectives – Area South (620)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Bureau of Detectives – Area North (630)**

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Members 11-12: 2 complaints each

**Public Transportation Section (701)**

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

**Transit Security Unit (704)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

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 18<sup>th</sup> 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

April 2012

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 13<sup>th</sup> 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 9<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant. It was alleged that the accused Sergeant

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

April 2012

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 14<sup>th</sup> 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 18<sup>th</sup> 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

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

April 2012

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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

April 2012

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 10<sup>th</sup> 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

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

April 2012

the 25<sup>th</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> 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

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

April 2012

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.**



## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

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.**

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> District, involving three on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A, B, and C) and one on-

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

June 2012

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 7<sup>th</sup> 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

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

June 2012

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 6<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

June 2012

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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

June 2012

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 21<sup>st</sup> 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.**