Office of the City Clerk

F2013-9

Office of the City Clerk

City Council Document Tracking Sheet

Meeting Date:	1/17/2013
Sponsor(s):	Mendoza, Susana A. (Clerk)
Type:	Report
Title:	Quarterly report for Independent Police Review Authority (4th)
Committee(s) Assignment:	

INDEPENDENT POLICE REVIEW AUTHORITY

CITY OF CHICAGO

TO: Office of the Mayor
Committee on Public Safety
Office of the City Clerk
Legislative Reference Bureau

FROM: Ilana B.R. Rosenzweig
Chief Administrator

RE: Quarterly Report

DATE: January 15, 2013

Enclosed please find the Independent Police Review Authority's Quarterly Report provided pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-57-110, which requires the filing of quarterly reports. The information contained in this report is accurate as of January 10, 2013. This quarterly report provides information for the period from October 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012.

If you have any questions or need any additional information, please contact me at 312-746-3551.

2013 JAN 15 PM 4:53
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

1615 WEST CHICAGO AVENUE, 4TH FLOOR, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60622
312.746.3594 (COMPLAINT LINE) • 312.746.3609 (GENERAL) • 312.745.3598 (TTY) • WWW.IPRACHICAGO.ORG

Independent Police Review Authority

Quarterly Report

October 1, 2012 – December 31, 2012

January 15, 2013

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

Between October 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012, IPRA issued 1824 Log Numbers. Of these Log Numbers, IPRA retained 543 for resolution. IPRA forwarded the remaining 1281 Log Numbers to the Internal Affairs Division of the Chicago Police Department for appropriate resolution.

Of the 543 Log Numbers retained by IPRA, IPRA classified 141 as Complaint Register Numbers. In addition, IPRA began Pre-affidavit Investigations for 187 of the Log Numbers retained by IPRA. The remainder of the retained Log Numbers consisted of 14 Log Numbers for shootings where an individual was hit by a bullet and a "U Number" was issued, 13 for shootings where no one was hit by a bullet, 26 for shots fired at animals, 149 for reported uses of tasers, 4 for reported uses of pepper spray, [7] and 8 for Extraordinary Occurrences.

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

Between October 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012, IPRA closed 759 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 December 31, 2012, there were 1925 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[8]

Between October 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012, IPRA recommended that 229 investigations be closed as "not sustained."

In addition, 170 cases were closed after a Pre-affidavit Investigation because the complainants refused to sign an affidavit. IPRA recommended that 67 investigations be closed as "unfounded," and 1 be closed as "exonerated."

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

---

[7] 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.

[8] 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."

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 July October 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012. The information contained in this report is accurate as of January 10, 2013. All of IPRA's public reports are available at www.iprachicago.org.

Quarterly Overview

During the final quarter of 2012, IPRA initiated 543 investigations. This includes the 149 investigations resulting from notifications of a Taser discharge. IPRA responded to 14 officer-involved shootings from October through December which is down from the previous quarter.

This past quarter, IPRA closed 759 investigations. The number reflects an eight percent increase from the third quarter. IPRA ended the calendar year with 2 investigator and 3 supervising investigator vacancies.

From October through December, IPRA completed 20 sustained investigations. Sustained cases were down during the last quarter of 2012 compared to the previous quarter. There were 16 cases this past quarter identified where mediation was deemed appropriate and 13 officers agreed to accept. IPRA expects that more cases will be handled through the mediation process, thus, leaving more investigative resources to close older cases.

More than 20 completed officer-involved shooting case summaries have been uploaded to IPRA's web site. These cases can be found by clicking on the *Resources* section followed by the *Officer-Involved Shootings* tab on IPRA's web site at www.iprachicago.org.

IPRA Cumulative Figures

	INTAKE (all allegations/ notifications) [1]	IPRA Investigations Opened[2]	IPRA Investigations Closed[3]	IPRA Caseload[4]
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[5]	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
3Q 2012	2264	690	698	2147

[1] 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.

[2] 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.

[3] This number may include some investigations "Re-closed" after being Re-opened.

[4] 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.

[5] The number of investigations closed and IPRA Caseload reflect a correction of numbers reported in a previous report.

IPRA Cumulative Figures (Continued)

	INTAKE (all allegations/ notifications)	IPRA Investigations Opened	IPRA Investigations Closed	IPRA Caseload
4Q 2012	1824	543	759	1925

IPRA Investigations Opened by Incident Type[6]

	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
3Q 2012	411	12	19	14	28	204	5
4Q 2012	328	8	14	13	26	149	4

[6] 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.

Between October 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012, IPRA recommended that 20 cases be closed as sustained. Attached are abstracts for each case where IPRA recommended a sustained finding, and the discipline IPRA recommended.[9]

2-57-110(6): The number of complaints filed in each district since the last report[10]

Between October 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012, IPRA received complaints of alleged misconduct based on incidents in the following districts, as follows:

District 01 = 64	District 07 = 105	District 13 = 30	District 19 = 62
District 02 = 91	District 08 = 108	District 14 = 40	District 20 = 29
District 03 = 87	District 09 = 93	District 15 = 58	District 22 = 48
District 04 = 81	District 10 = 58	District 16 = 46	District 24 = 43
District 05 = 75	District 11 = 113	District 17 = 27	District 25 = 79
District 06 = 104	District 12 = 30	District 18 = 63	

Outside City Limits = 38 Unknown location = 30

2-57-110(7): The number of complaints filed against each officer in each district since the last report[11]

(See Attachment)

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

Between October 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012, IPRA referred 1303 cases to other agencies as follows:

Chicago Police Department – Internal Affairs Division = 1281

Cook County State's Attorney = 22

---

[9] Abstracts for all investigations where IPRA has recommended a sustained finding can be found at www.iprachicago.org under the Resources heading.

[10] "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.

[11] 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 1-14: 1 complaint each

Member 15: 2 complaints

District 002

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each

Members 21: 2 complaints

District 003

Members 1-21: 1 complaint each

District 004

Members 1-32: 1 complaint each

Members 33-39: 2 complaints each

Members 40-41: 3 complaints each

District 005

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each

District 006

Members 1-33: 1 complaint each

Member 34-37: 2 complaints each

Member 38: 1 complaint

District 007

Members 1-23: 1 complaint each

Members 24-25: 2 complaints each

District 008

Members 1-21: 1 complaint each

District 009

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each

District 010

Members 1-28: 1 complaint each

Members 29-30: 2 complaints each

District 011

Members 1-22: 1 complaint each

Member 23: 2 complaints

District 012

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

District 013

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

Member 7: 2 complaints

District 014

Members 1-14: 1 complaint each

District 015

Members 1-19: 1 complaint each

Members 20-23: 2 complaints each

District 016

Members 1-13: 1 complaint each

Member 14: 2 complaints

District 017

Members 1-26: 1 complaint each

Member 27: 2 complaints

District 018

Members 1-18: 1 complaint each

Members 19-21: 2 complaints each

District 019

Members 1-26: 1 complaint each

Member 27: 2 complaints

District 020

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

District 022

Members 1-16: 1 complaint each

Member 17: 2 complaints

District 023

Member 1: 1 complaint

District 024

Members 1-15: 1 complaint each

District 025

Members 1-25: 1 complaint each

Member 26-27: 2 complaints each

Member 28: 3 complaints

Recruit Training (044)[1]

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Airport Law Enforcement Unit – North (050)

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Airport Law Enforcement Unit – South (051)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Marine Unit (059)

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Inactive Unit (071)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Office of News Affairs (102)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Human Resources Division (123)

Members1-2: 1 complaint

Education and Training Division (124)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Public Safety Information Technology (125)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Special Functions Division (141)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Traffic Section (145)

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

Field Services Section (166)

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Central Detention (171)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint

Forensic Services Division (177)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Bureau of Detectives (180)

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Youth Investigation Section (184)

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Narcotics Section (189)

Members 1-24: 1 complaint each

Members 25-26: 2 complaints each

Asset Forfeiture Division (192)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Gang Investigation Division (193)

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each

Members 21-22: 2 complaints each

Bureau of Patrol – Area Central (211)

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Members 11-15: 2 complaints each

Bureau of Patrol – Area South (212)

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Member 9: 2 complaints

Bureau of Patrol – Area North (213)

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

Medical Services Section (231)

Member 1: 1 complaint

OEMC - Detail Section (276)

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Gang Enforcement – Area Central (311)

Members 1-15: 1 complaint each

Member 16: 2 complaints

[1] These numbers include CPD members who are detailed to a District as part of their training, but are officially still assigned to Recruit Training.

Gang Enforcement – Area South (312)

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Gang Team – Area 4 (Former 314)

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Gang Team – Area 5 (Former 315)

Members 1-18: 1 complaint each

Member 19-20: 1 complaint each

Alternate Response Section (376)

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

Member 8-9: 2 complaints each

Crime Scene Processing Unit – ET North (377)

Member 1-2: 1 complaint each

Juvenile Intervention Support Center (384)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Gang Enforcement Division (393)

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Detached Services-Miscellaneous Detail (543)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Central Investigations Unit (606)

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Member 5: 1 complaint

Major Accident Investigation Unit (608)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Bureau of Detectives – Area Central (610)

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Detectives – Area South (620)

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Member 9: 2 complaints

Bureau of Detectives – Area North (630)

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Public Transportation Section (701)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

OCTOBER 2012

Log/C.R. No. 1013283

On January 10, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on January 10, 2008, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officer A and Officer B). It was alleged that Officers A and B stopped the Victim and searched his vehicle without justification, locked the Victim's cell phone and keys inside his vehicle, failed to return or inventory his wallet, and failed to enforce traffic violations. It was also alleged that Officer A pulled the Victim's hat over his eyes and punched the Victim on the face. It was alleged that on August 10, 2012, Officers A and B gave false statements to IPRA regarding the incident that occurred on January 10, 2008. Based on statements from the accused, the victim, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that Officer A stopped the Victim and searched him and his car without justification. IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer A locked the Victim's cell phone and keys inside his vehicle and failed to return or inventory the Victim's wallet. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer A pulled the Victim's hat over his eyes, punched the Victim on the face, failed to enforce traffic violations, and made two false statements to IPRA. IPRA recommended a finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that Officer B stopped the Victim and searched him and his car without justification. IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer A locked the Victim's cell phone and keys inside his vehicle and failed to return or inventory the Victim's wallet. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer B failed to enforce traffic violations and made two false statements to IPRA. IPRA recommended a **twenty (20) day suspension for Officer A** and a **ten (10) day suspension for Officer B.**

Log/C.R. No. 1031088

On October 18, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 18, 2009, involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the Officer physically maltreated Victim A by shoving her, and verbally abused Victim B by directing a racial slur at him. Based on an admission by the accused, statements from the victim and witnesses, and security camera footage, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that the Officer physically maltreated Victim A by shoving her. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that the Officer verbally abused Victim B by directing a racial slur at him. The Officer

apologized to Victim B independent of the investigation. IPRA recommended a **five (5) day suspension for the Officer.**

Log/C.R. No. 1026207

On May 8, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on May 8, 2009, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officer A and Officer B). It was alleged that Officers A and B handcuffed the Victim too tightly, shoved her against a car, failed to inventory or return the Victim's property, falsely imprisoned her, unnecessarily detained her, failed to complete a contact card for her, and failed to ensure that she was safe and secure. It was alleged that Officer A refused to loosen the Victim's handcuffs. It was also alleged that Officer B failed to take action against Officer A, when Officer A shoved the Victim. Based on statements from the accused Officers and the victim, photographs and video footage, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer A handcuffed the Victim too tightly, shoved her against a car, refused to loosen her handcuffs, and unnecessarily detained her. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that Officer A failed to inventory or return the Victim's property and failed to ensure the Victim's safety. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer A failed to complete a contact card for the Victim. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that Officer B handcuffed the Victim too tight, shoved her against a car, failed to inventory or return her property, falsely imprisoned her, and failed to ensure her safety. IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer B failed to take action against Officer A when he shoved the Victim and unnecessarily detained her. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer B failed to complete a contact card for the Victim. IPRA recommended a **reprimand for Officer A and Officer B.**

Log/C.R. No. 1025040

On March 27, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 27, 2009, involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer (Officer A) and two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer B and Officer C). It was alleged that Officer A verbally abused Sergeant Victim A, advanced toward Sergeant Victim A in a threatening manner and struck his hand, refused to obey the Sergeant's direct order to open the door, engaged in a verbal altercation with Victim B via the

telephone, and was intoxicated/under the influence of alcohol during the incident. It was also alleged that Officer B and Officer C failed to follow proper procedure, and took Officer A's wallet and failed to secure/return it to him. Based on statements from the accused, the victim and witnesses, and police reports, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A verbally abused Sergeant Victim A, advanced toward him in a threatening manner and struck his hand, refused to obey the Sergeant's direct order, engaged in a verbal altercation with Victim B via the telephone, and was intoxicated/under the influence of alcohol during the incident. IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that Officer B and Officer C failed to follow proper procedure. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer B and Officer C took Officer A's wallet and failed to secure/return it to him. IPRA recommended a **thirty (30) day suspension for Officer A.**

Log/C.R. No. 1018945

On August 10, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on August 9, 2008, involving one on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the Officer used excessive force in striking the Victim about the body with a metal baton, stomped him about the body, kicked him about the body, and violated his Fourth Amendment rights by falsely arresting him. It was also alleged that the Officer failed to properly document his encounter with the Victim. Based on statements from the accused, the victim and witnesses, photographs, medical records, and police reports, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the Officer used excessive force in striking the Victim about the body with a metal baton and failed to properly document his encounter with the Victim. IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that the Officer stomped and kicked the Victim about the body. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that the Officer violated the Victim's Fourth Amendment rights by falsely arresting him. IPRA recommended a **ninety (90) day suspension for the Officer.**

Log/C.R. No. 1027703

On June 27, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on June 27, 2009, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A pushed Victim A, hit him about the face and body with a metal object, verbally abused Victims A and B, failed to provide Victim B his name and star

number upon her request, and used inappropriate language on the radio. It was also alleged that Officer B used inappropriate language on the radio. Based on statements from the accused, the victims and witnesses, photographs, medical records, and police reports, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer A pushed Victim A, hit him about the face and body with a metal object, verbally abused Victims A and B, failed to provide Victim B his name and radio number upon her request, and used inappropriate language on the radio. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer B used inappropriate language on the radio. IPRA recommended a **written reprimand for Officer B.**

Log/C.R. No. 1052493

On March 12, 2012, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 11, 2012, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the officer pushed the Victim and pulled her hair. Based upon a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a **suspension of twenty (20) days.**

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

NOVEMBER 2012

Log/C.R. No. 1021573

On November 9, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on November 9, 2008, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Captain and Sergeant. It was alleged that the Captain was intoxicated while off-duty; failed to identify himself; used excessive force in that he pepper-sprayed the Sergeant; and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report. It was also alleged that the Sergeant was intoxicated while off-duty; was insubordinate to the Captain; directed profanities at the Captain; grabbed the Captain without justification; failed to identify himself; and released his dog at the Captain. Based on statements from the accused and witnesses, OEMC transmissions, department reports, and drug and alcohol results, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that the Captain was intoxicated while off-duty; failed to identify himself; and pepper-sprayed the Sergeant. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that the Captain did not complete a Tactical Response Report. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that the Sergeant was intoxicated while off-duty and failed to identify himself. IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that the Sergeant was insubordinate to the Captain and released his dog at the Captain. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the Sergeant directed profanities at the Captain and grabbed the Captain without justification. IPRA recommended a **written reprimand for the Captain** and a **three (3) day suspension for the Sergeant.**

Log/C.R. No. 1010082

On October 12, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 12, 2007, involving one known on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer (Officer A) and several unknown CPD Officers. It was alleged that Officer A was inattentive to duty in that a prisoner, the Victim, escaped while in his custody; pushed the Victim to the ground without justification; punched the Victim; and stepped on the Victim's neck. It was also alleged that the unknown Officers pushed the Victim to the ground without justification; choked the Victim; and struck the Victim about the body several times with their fists. Based on statements from the accused, the Victim and witnesses, photographs, medical records, and department reports, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer A was inattentive to duty in that a prisoner, the Victim, escaped while in his custody. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the

allegations that Officer A pushed the Victim to the ground without justification; punched the Victim; and stepped on the Victim's neck. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations pushed the Victim to the ground without justification; choked the Victim; and struck the Victim about the body several times with their fists. IPRA recommended a **two (2) day suspension for Officer A.**

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

DECEMBER 2012

Log/C.R. No. 1051989

On February 19, 2012, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on February 19, 2012 in the 5th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer discharged her weapon in the air. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a **suspension of two (2) days.**

Log/C.R. No. 1045076

On May 1, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding two incidents that both occurred on May 1, 2011 in the 25th District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer on May 1, 2011 in the 25th District removed Victim A from his bike; pointed his gun as he gave instructions to Victims A through D to show themselves and one of the Victims remained out of view; stated that he would damage Victims A through D's residences; handcuffed Victim A too tightly; stated that he would push Victims A through D through the wall; pushed Victims A through D against the garaged and to the ground. It was also alleged that later that day, the accused Officer yelled at Victims A through D and verbally abused Victim B. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he removed Victim A from his bike; pointed his gun as he gave instructions to Victims A through D to show themselves and one of the Victims remained out of view; stated that he would damage Victims A through D's residences; handcuffed Victim A too tightly; stated that he would push Victims A through D through the wall; yelled at Victims A through D; and verbally abused Victim B. The Officer agreed though mediation to accept a **suspension of five (5) days.**

Log/C.R. No. 1014796

On March 9, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 9, 2008 in the 8th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer (Complainant Officer A), two on-duty CPD Officers (Officers B and C), one on-duty CPD Sergeant (Sergeant D), one on-duty CPD Lieutenant (Lieutenant E), and one on-duty CPD Deputy Chief (Deputy Chief F). It was alleged that Complainant Officer A was intoxicated while off-duty; resisted a lawful arrest; failed to maintain control of his weapon; threatened improper government action; carried his firearm while consuming alcoholic beverages in

violation of a General Order; and brought discredit upon the Department by creating a disturbance by attempting to kick in a door. It was alleged that Officer B called Complainant Officer A and Complainants B and C a racial epithet; physically abused Complainant Officer A; discriminated against Complainant Officer A based on his racial status; falsely arrested Complainant Officer A; submitted false reports regarding the arrest of Complainant Officer A; failed to report misconduct; and subsequently provided a false statement to IPRA. It was alleged that Officer C failed to prevent misconduct; physically abused Complainant Officer A; discriminated against Complainant Officer A based on his racial status; falsely arrested Complainant Officer A; submitted false reports regarding the arrest of Complainant Officer A; failed to report misconduct; and subsequently provided a false statement to IPRA. It was alleged that Sergeant D, Lieutenant E and Deputy Chief F individually discriminated against Complainant Officer A based on his racial status; submitted false reports regarding the arrest of Complainant Officer A; and failed to report misconduct. Based upon statements from the accused, complainants and witnesses, ET photographs, Department, OEMC, medical and alcohol/drug reports, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused Complainant Officer A was intoxicated while off-duty; resisted a lawful arrest; failed to maintain control of his weapon; threatened improper government action; carried his firearm while consuming alcoholic beverages in violation of a General Order; and brought discredit upon the Department by creating a disturbance by attempting to kick in a door. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that the accused Officer B called Complainant Officer A and Complainants B and C a racial epithet; physically abused Complainant Officer A; discriminated against Complainant Officer A based on his racial status; falsely arrested Complainant Officer A; submitted false reports regarding the arrest of Complainant Officer A; failed to report misconduct; and subsequently provided a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that Officer C failed to prevent misconduct; physically abused Complainant Officer A; discriminated against Complainant Officer A based on his racial status; falsely arrested Complainant Officer A; submitted false reports regarding the arrest of Complainant Officer A; failed to report misconduct; and subsequently provided a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that Sergeant D, Lieutenant E and Deputy Chief F individually discriminated against Complainant Officer A based on his racial status; submitted false reports regarding the arrest of Complainant Officer A; and failed to

report misconduct. IPRA recommended a **thirty (30) day suspension for the accused Complaint Officer A.**

Log/C.R. No. 1043164

On February 7, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on February 7, 2011 in the 15th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he discharged his weapon twice. Based upon a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a **"Violation Noted".**

Log/C.R. No. 1052912

On March 28, 2012, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 28, 2012 in the 15th 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. 1043770

On March 6, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding two incidents that both occurred on March 6, 2011 in the 16th District, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer verbally abused his minor son, the Victim, and struck his minor son, the Victim, on the mouth. It was also alleged that later that day the accused Officer grabbed and pushed his minor son, the Victim, inside a vehicle. Based upon statements by the accused, the victim and witnesses, ET photos, 911 recordings, DCFS investigation finding, department and medical reports, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that the accused Officer verbally abused his minor son, the Victim. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that the accused Officer struck his minor son, the Victim, on the mouth. IPRA recommended a finding of **"EXONERATED"** for allegation that the accused Officer grabbed and pushed his minor son, the Victim, inside a vehicle. IPRA recommended a **two (2) day suspension for the accused Officer.**

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

DECEMBER 2012

Log/C.R. No. 1033369

On January 6, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents that occurred between January 6, 2010 through January 20, 2010 in the 5th District involving two off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officer A and Complainant Officer B). It was alleged that Officer A harassed Complainant Officer B by sending him numerous text messages after he informed her to cease contact with him and verbally abused Complainant Officer B by directing profanities and derogatory names at him via text message between January 6, 2010 through January 20, 2010. Based upon statements from Officer A and Complainant Officer B, department reports, and text messages, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A harassed Complainant Officer B by sending him numerous text messages after he informed her to cease contact with him and verbally abused Complainant Officer B by directing profanities and derogatory names at him via text message between January 6, 2010 through January 20, 2010. IPRA recommended a **reprimand for the accused member.**

Log/C.R. No. 1036894

On June 4, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents that occurred between April 4, 2009 through June 9, 2010 in the 4th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that between April 4, 2009 through June 9, 2010, the accused Officer violated an active Order of Protection by calling Complainant and/or sending the Complainant text messages. Based upon statements from the accused, the Complainant, and witnesses, department and court reports and documents, text messages and phone records, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused Officer violated an active Order of Protection by calling Complainant and/or sending the Complainant text messages between April 4, 2009 through June 9, 2010. IPRA recommended a **three (3) day suspension for the accused Officer.**

Log/C.R. No. 1045794

On May 31, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on May 29, 2011 in Hazel Crest, Illinois involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer engaged in a public verbal altercation with the Complainant and kicked the Complainant's vehicle. Based upon statements from the accused, the Complainant, CPD and Hazel Crest Police Department

reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused Officer engaged in a public verbal altercation with the Complainant and kicked the Complainant's vehicle. IPRA recommended a **two (2) day suspension for the accused Officer.**

Log/C.R. No. 1035710

On April 23, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 23, 2010 in the 2nd District involving three on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A though C). It was alleged that Officer A struck the Victim on the chest; struck the Victim on the leg; choked the Victim; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR); and failed to arrest and appropriately charge the Victim. It was also alleged that Officer B failed to report misconduct. It was alleged that Officer C failed to register Victim's complaint. Based upon statements by the accused, the victim and witnesses, photographs, and department reports, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer B failed to report misconduct. Further, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer C failed to register Victim's complaint. Based upon a mediation, the Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he struck the Victim on the leg; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR); and failed to arrest and appropriately charge the Victim. The Officer agreed though mediation to accept a **suspension of one (1) day.**

Log/C.R. No. 1028778

On August 1, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on August 1, 2009 in the 19th District involving one on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer (Officer A). It was alleged that Officer A pursued and harassed Complainant Nurse by following her throughout the emergency room and demanding that a DUI kit be administered to a DUI arrestee; threatened to arrest Complainant Nurse if the DUI kit was not administered to the DUI arrestee; pulled Complainant Nurse's arms behind her back and handcuffed her too tightly; unnecessarily detained Complainant Nurse; directed profanities at Complainant Nurse; released Complainant Nurse from custody without proper authorization; failed to complete a Field Contact Card regarding his contact with Complainant Nurse; failed to properly secure and handcuff the DUI arrestee; arrested Complainant Nurse without probable cause; and by his overall actions brought discredit

upon the Department. It was alleged that Sergeant B allowed Officer A to release Complainant Nurse from custody without proper authorization. Based upon statements from the accused Officer and Sergeant, the Complainant Nurse, witnesses, OEMC and medical records, CPD, Chicago Fire Department and medical ambulance service reports, ET photographs, surveillance video and still photographs, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A pursued and harassed Complainant Nurse by following her throughout the emergency room and demanding that a DUI kit be administered to a DUI arrestee; threatened to arrest Complainant Nurse if the DUI kit was not administered to the DUI arrestee; pulled Complainant Nurse's arms behind her back and handcuffed her too tightly; unnecessarily detained Complainant Nurse; released Complainant Nurse from custody without proper authorization; failed to complete a Field Contact Card regarding his contact with Complainant Nurse; failed to properly secure and handcuff the DUI arrestee; arrested Complainant Nurse without probable cause; and by his overall actions brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer A directed profanities at Complainant Nurse. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Sergeant B allowed Officer A to release Complainant Nurse from custody without proper authorization. IPRA recommended a **one hundred and twenty (120) day suspension for Officer A** and a **fifteen (15) day suspension for Sergeant B.**