

BEFORE THE POLICE BOARD OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL BY)
[NAME REDACTED],) **No. 24 AA 36**
APPLICANT FOR THE POSITION OF)
POLICE OFFICER,) **(Applicant/Rank No. [redacted])**
CITY OF CHICAGO.)

FINDINGS AND DECISION

[Name redacted] (hereinafter referred to as “Applicant”) applied for rehire as a police officer with the City of Chicago. In a letter dated April 3, 2024, the Office of Public Safety Administration (“OPSA”) gave Applicant written notice of its decision to remove Applicant from the list of eligible applicants for this position (“Eligibility List”) due to the results of a background investigation, along with the reason(s) for the disqualification decision (“Notice”).

On May 29, 2024, Applicant appealed this disqualification decision to the Police Board by filing a written request specifying why OPSA erred in the factual determinations underlying the disqualification decision and bringing to the Board’s attention additional facts directly related to the reason(s) for the disqualification decision, pursuant to Section 2-84-035(b) of the Municipal Code of Chicago (“Appeal”).

On July 8, 2024, OPSA filed with the Police Board a copy of the Notice and its response to Applicant’s Appeal (“Response”). Police Board Appeals Officer Mamie Alexander has reviewed the Notice, Appeal, and Response.

APPEALS OFFICER’S FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION

Appeals Officer Mamie Alexander, as a result of a review of the above material, submits the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation to the Police Board.

Filings by the Parties

Applicant filed a timely appeal as provided by Section 2-84-035(b) of the Municipal Code of Chicago, and the Response was filed within the time period allowed by the Police Board Rules of Procedure.

According to the Notice, Applicant was removed from the Eligibility List for the following reasons:

IV. Pre-employment Investigation Standards for Applicants to the Position of Police Officer

II. Policy

- A. The Chicago Police Department, as part of, and empowered by, the community, is committed to protect the lives, property, and rights of all people; to maintain order; and to enforce the law impartially. The Chicago Police Department provides quality police service in partnership with other members of the community. To fulfill our mission, we strive to attain the highest degree of ethical behavior and professional conduct at all times.
- B. Our Core Values are:¹
1. **Professionalism:** Our on and off duty conduct reflects both the highest standards of police service and personal responsibility.
 2. **Integrity:** [We are committed to] the highest standards of honesty and ethical conduct.
 3. **Courage:** We uphold and follow the law in the face of fear, danger, and temptation.
 4. **Dedication:** We are driven [by] a sense of personal duty to our work [and] the Department's Vision, Mission statement, and [other] Core Values.
 5. **Respect:** We treat each other and the communities we serve as we [would like] to be treated: with compassion and dignity.

¹ The language in Section B has been updated to reflect the Department's Core Values as defined in the current version of the Pre-Employment Disqualification Standards.

D. Disqualification Based on Prior Employment History

2. A poor employment history may result in disqualification for the position of Police Officer. An applicant who has been discharged or disciplined for offenses which include any act of dishonesty, incompetence, insubordination, excessive absenteeism or tardiness, or failure to follow regulations may be found unsuitable for employment.

3. Further, an applicant who, during previous employment, has engaged in any conduct that would have violated the Chicago Police Department's Rules and Regulations had the applicant been a Chicago Police Department employee, may be found unsuitable for employment. In addition, an applicant with a history of sporadic employment, evidenced by frequent changes in employment of short duration, may be found unsuitable for employment.

725 ILCS 5/107-14 Temporary Questioning without arrest

Chicago Police Department's Rules and Regulations-Section V. (Rules of Conduct)

Rule 1 Violation of any law or ordinance.

Rule 2 Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.

Rule 6 Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.

Rule 8 Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.

Rule 9 Engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.

General Order 01-01	Vision Mission Statement
4th Amendment	U.S. Constitution
G03-02	Law Enforcement De-escalation, Response to Resistance, And Use of Force
G03-02/01	Use of Force /Force Mitigation
G03-02-02	Tactical Response Report
Special Order 04-13-09	Investigatory Stop System
Special Order 03-14	Activate Body Warn Camera
G03-03-01	Emergency Vehicle Operations-Pursuits
G03-03	Emergency Use of Department Vehicles
G07-01	Processing Property

H. Disqualification Based on Other Conduct²

1. Police officers are required to show respect for authority, uphold the law, and defend the dignity and rights of the public. Therefore, any applicant who has engaged in conduct that exhibits a pattern of repeated abuse of authority; lack of respect for authority or law; lack of respect for the dignity and rights of others; or a combination of traits disclosed during the pre-employment investigation that would not by themselves lead to a finding that an applicant is unsuitable for employment, but when taken as a whole, exhibit that Applicant is not suited for employment as a police officer, will be found unsuitable for employment.

2. A poor employment history may result in disqualification for the position of Police Officer. An applicant who has been discharged or disciplined for offenses which include any act of dishonest, incompetency, insubordination, excessive absenteeism or tardiness, or failure to follow regulations may be found unsuitable for employment.

3. Further, an applicant who, during at would violate the Chicago Police Department's Rules and Regulations and had Applicant been a Chicago Police Officer employee, may be found unsuitable for employment.

Applicant was disqualified by OPSA based on his prior employment history, an inability to uphold the core values of the Chicago Police Department (“CPD”), and other conduct.

Applicant was employed by the CPD from 2018-2022 and amassed ten disciplinary complaints from citizens in a three-year period. These complaints included, but were not limited to excessive force, verbal abuse, and racial profiling.

Appeal and Response

Through his attorney, appeals the decision, stating that a “better barometer” to assess

² Sections H(2) and (3) in the Notice contain language that is inconsistent with the current Standards and appear to relate to the previous section (D). Since it is unclear whether the disqualification under Sections H(2) and (3) were based on the correct language, only Section H(1) will be considered as a basis for disqualification for purposes of this recommendation.

Police Board Case No. 24 AA 36
Findings and Decision

Applicant is to look at his awards rather than the list of complaints that he received.³ Applicant provides details about his background and character, and asserts that he has learned from his mistakes and knows that it is his calling to be a Chicago Police Officer.

Applicant states that while working for the CPD, he was a good police officer, and voluntarily left his position. He explains that he was at “ground zero” in downtown Chicago during the civil unrest in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd. He shares that during that time, he observed an officer related shooting and saw his sergeant run over by a car. As a result, he needed a break and decided to move his family to Colorado where his wife’s family resides.

In 2022, Applicant joined the Denver Police Department (“DPD”), where he excelled in his position. He claims that although he has enjoyed his time there, he misses his former colleagues and wants to return to Chicago. Applicant states that he reapplied to the CPD but was unjustly denied. Applicant provides explanations for each of the complaints filed against him and insists that the majority of the complaints were unfounded.

Applicant’s Appeal contains numerous documents “in support of rehire,” including a personal statement, military documentation, CPD Complimentary History, CPD case reports, and several letters of recommendation.

Applicant shares that he was recognized 159 times during his employment with the CPD, and 145 were honorable mentions. He argues that the CPD is currently at a “crisis point,” as the

³ Applicant’s Appeal was drafted and submitted by his attorney and is written in third person. For purposes of this Appeal, all statements and arguments contained therein are attributed to Applicant.

Police Board Case No. 24 AA 36
Findings and Decision

morale is low, and the need is great. Applicant states that he is an “experienced officer with a positive perspective on policing in Chicago,” and has proven that he can be an excellent officer.

OPSA’s Response states that the appeal was reviewed, and OPSA relies upon the facts and evidence relating to the disqualification contained in Applicant’s file. OPSA maintains that the pre-employment disqualification standards under which Applicant’s disqualification decision were based upon are clear (namely, Disqualification Based on Prior Employment History and Other Conduct). OPSA states that the evidence in Applicant’s file supports its decision to disqualify Applicant from hiring, and OPSA is within its right to do so, citing *Apostolov v. Johnson*, 2018 IL App (1st) 173084; ¶¶ 24, 31 and *Johnson v. O’Connor*, 2018 IL App (1st) 171930, ¶¶ 16-17, 20.

OPSA lists each of the complaints and resulting dispositions in Applicant’s file and cites the specific Standard and CPD rule violation. OPSA also notes the following history of the cases:

Ten disciplinary complaints by citizens

5 Civil Rights Violations/Improper Stop/Seizure
Person Custodial Search/Profiling
1 Verbal Abuse/Profanity
1 Excessive Force/No Injury
1 Crime Misconduct/Trespassing to Property
1 Lockup Incident
1 Misuse of Department Equipment

Penalties served and not served

0 Unfounded
3 Sustained currently
1 Not Sustained
1 Exonerated
1 Summary Punishment
4 **Left Open** due to
Applicant’s departure

OPSA adds that Applicant’s past actions revealed that when he was previously employed by the CPD, he was in violation of multiple Rule violations, each of which would serve by themselves as grounds for disqualification. OPSA states that although awards and commendations are important indicators of an officer’s capability and achievements, they can be subjective. Furthermore, they do not mitigate the serious nature of the repeated complaints

Police Board Case No. 24 AA 36
Findings and Decision

against Applicant, particularly the complaints alleging civil rights violations. OPSA notes that it is their responsibility to ensure that all officers maintain the highest standards of professional conduct and demonstrate consistent respect for the community they serve. OPSA concluded that Applicant's documented history suggests a repeated failure to meet these critical standards.

OPSA also questions Applicant's true reasons for leaving the CPD, implying that he left due to numerous pending complaints. OPSA asserts that the open investigations were initially stalled because of Applicant's refusal to cooperate, then because of his hasty departure from the CPD around the same time that the investigations were originally opened.

OPSA states that the severity and frequency of the complaints against Applicant are extremely troubling and have demonstrated that he would not be able to fulfill the CPD's mission to "strive to attain the highest degree of ethical behavior and professional conduct at all times."

Findings of Fact

Filings were timely.

OPSA provided the factual basis for its decision to disqualify Applicant and remove his name from the eligibility list. It determined that Applicant's prior employment history and other conduct were grounds for disqualification. OPSA articulated the Standards by which the conduct was assessed by section and paragraph, and articulation of the Standard gives reasonable notice as to the basis for disqualification.

Applicant was hired by the CPD on January 16, 2018 and left the position on June 23, 2022. Applicant received ten complaints, with three sustained, two not served, four open and still

Police Board Case No. 24 AA 36
Findings and Decision

being investigated, and one summary punishment. Five were civil rights complaints, including two verbal abuse and two excessive force complaints. All of Applicant's complaints were amassed in the three years that he was on the street following his probationary period. The complaints against Applicant are as follows⁴:

- Case #2020-0004726 COPA Civil Rights Violation Improper Stop/Seizure Person Custodial Search

It was alleged that Applicant engaged in an improper search and seizure of two African American males without justification, engaged in verbal abuse towards the complainant, engaged in excessive force without justification, failed to complete an Investigative Stop Report, and engaged in action which impedes the Department's effort to achieve its goals and policies.

Applicant conducted a traffic stop on an Uber vehicle for violating mandatory curfew laws instituted by the mayor during unrest. Due to earlier emergencies, Applicant believed that the people inside were a danger to himself and other officers, as the back window was down. Applicant initially took cover behind the squad car until the vehicle approached the intersection. Applicant took his weapon out for immediate use because "something in [his] mind triggered that something could potentially happen". Applicant ordered the passengers out of the vehicle and checked for weapons. The passengers cooperated but the complainant wanted to know what was happening. Applicant grabbed his wrist and redirected him to turn around.

COPA's investigation revealed via BWC that Applicant's use of profanity toward the passengers was not courteous nor dignified. Applicant admitted using profanity due to being tired and stated that it was his way of maintaining control of the situation. The complainant was cooperative and responded to verbal direction. Applicant failed to complete an ISR or provide the complainant with a receipt. During his statement, Applicant denied engaging in action or conduct which impedes the Department's goals and policies. BWC captured Applicant stating to the complainant, "play fucking games", "get back in the fucking vehicle and take your fucking ass home." When the complainant advised Applicant that seeing Applicant's gun scared him, Applicant stated: "I don't give a fuck. I can un-holster my gun whenever I want." "I don't give a fuck." The complainant stated that they were just trying to go home in the Uber and there was no reason for Applicant to have his gun out.

Sustained 10-Day Suspension

- Case #2020-0001006 COPA Operation/Personnel Violation Misuse of Department Equipment/ Supplies

⁴ The complaint details were taken from Applicant's Background Investigation Report.

Police Board Case No. 24 AA 36
Findings and Decision

It was alleged that Applicant failed to activate his body worn camera in a timely manner, failed to comply with parallel vehicles on a traffic stop, failed to drive with regard for the safety of all persons, and failed to conform to the balancing test when initiating a pursuit.

Applicant and his partner were given an assignment of a man threatening someone with a gun by OMEC. Applicant approached the man's vehicle, and after ignoring Applicant's commands, the vehicle sped off at a high rate of speed. Applicant engaged in a vehicle pursuit with other units but did not follow the vehicle in question until a supervisor called off the pursuit. Minutes later, Applicant and his partner had to respond three blocks away to a traffic crash involving the vehicle in question. The driver died, and the passenger had injuries to her face and leg. COPA concluded Applicant did not activate his BWC in a timely manner, confirmed by his admission. Applicant was exonerated of all other allegations.

Sustained 1 Day Suspension

- Case# 2021-0000700 BIA Civil Rights Violation Profiling

A witness stated that she observed Applicant drive up to a Caviar driver who was sitting in front of a restaurant "probably waiting on an order." Applicant drove up, asked the driver to step out of his vehicle, and began to search the vehicle. COPA's investigation concluded that due to no BWC or an Investigative Stop Report to refer to, this case should be referred back to the district level. This incident was addressed **Summary Punishment**, and applicant was Spurred under #564340, 564339, 564644, 564756.

- Case #2022-1597 COPA Excessive Force No Weapon No Injury

It is alleged that during a traffic stop Applicant called the complainant "Bitch" at least three times. The BWC captures an unknown male placed into custody being verbally abused, forcefully being pushed while he was cooperative as profanities were stated towards the complainant, RD#JF210063 JF210042. Applicant's written Investigatory Stop Report does not speak of the complainant being on the scene. This case is still open.

Open Case

- Case #2022-0002415 BIA Civil Rights Violation Improper Stop Seizure

It is alleged that while the complainant was sitting in his parked vehicle, an unmarked vehicle pulled up and blocked his vehicle. Applicant approached the complainant's vehicle and requested his license. The complainant took out his driver's license and gave it to Applicant and Applicant went back to his vehicle. Applicant returned with the complainant's driver license, shook the complainant's hand and left the scene. The complainant then drove to another district to complain that he was illegally detained and smelled a strong odor of alcohol coming from Applicant. Per [Name redacted], COPA Supervisor, this case is on hold due because Applicant was not served.

Sustained

- Case# 2022-0001828 District Crime Misconduct damage/Trespassing to Property

It is alleged that after the complainant's vehicle was impounded she went to retrieve the vehicle at the pound. When she arrived, her vehicle's passenger side window was broken, her property was removed, and contents were left everywhere. The BWC shows the complainant was on scene at the time of the traffic stop and was released from the scene after her boyfriend was arrested for narcotics. Applicant was seen using the following profanity towards the arrestee: "asshole," "this isn't fuckin Wisconsin," "Motherfucker has burner phones." Applicant also snatched the vehicle keys out of the complainant's hand. The complainant's vehicle was driven into the district station and secured by other officers.

According to the impoundment report and tow report (usually written by officers), the passenger side window was not broken. However, the tow truck driver's report stated that he found the vehicle to have a broken window. This case was eventually closed, but after Applicant left the CPD. The investigating Sergeant contacted Applicant to get a statement, but Applicant stated that he did not wish to cooperate because he was no longer a Chicago Police Officer. After the investigating Sergeant received Applicant's new address to send a formal statement of the allegations, Applicant told the Sergeant "He did not plan to cooperate and did not want to be contacted again regarding this investigation". The investigating Sergeant concluded that there was insufficient evidence to proceed, as Applicant was uncooperative, other officers did not recall incident, and there were conflicting stories on the tow reports.

Not Sustained

- Case# 2020-0000534 BIA Arrest/Lockup Incidents Prisoner's Property/Failed to Inventory

It was alleged by the complainant that after being arrested by Applicant his property (jewelry) wasn't inventoried. When the complainant returned to district of the arrest to retrieve property, it was missing and not on the inventory slip. This case was closed due to no cooperation, no signed affidavit, no conversion.

Closed-No Affidavit

- Case# 2019-0004968 COPA Civil Rights Violation Improper Stop/Seizure

It was alleged that Applicant conducted an unlawful search and arrest and used excessive force. No Affidavit nor interview was obtained, and the case was closed due to no contact with the complainant.

Closed/No Findings

Police Board Case No. 24 AA 36
Findings and Decision

- Case #2022-1357 COPA Verbal Abuse Profanity

It is alleged that Applicant exhibited "aggressive behavior" during a traffic stop. The complainant, a Door Dash driver, was in an unfamiliar neighborhood for a delivery when he was pulled over by Applicant and his partners. While he was letting down the window to give his driver's license, the officer on the passenger side accused him of running several stop signs and a red light almost causing an accident. When the complainant denied the allegations, his driver's side door opened, and he was taken out of his vehicle by Applicant. The complainant's vehicle was searched, and he was handcuffed. The police did not find anything, and he was free to leave.

Applicant stated that the complainant was maneuvering and swerving around in traffic almost causing an accident. The complainant was also given several verbal directions to step out of his vehicle and he refused to put down his phone. Applicant asked him to exit the vehicle due to the strong odor of marijuana coming from the inside. Due to the complainant being apologetic, he was free to go. COPA's investigation revealed that the complainant was ordered out of the vehicle, probable cause was established from the strong odor, and Applicant used appropriate language.

Closed/No Finding.

- Case# 2019-0003763 COPA Civil Rights Violation Improper Stop/Seizure

It was alleged that Applicant and his partner conducted a traffic stop without justification. The complainant alleges that his vehicle was improperly searched, and he was falsely arrested for possession of narcotics. COPA's investigation concluded based on Body Worn Camera, In-Car Camera and complainant testimony that probable cause to conduct the traffic stop existed. Evidence existed to continue the investigation (open alcohol/drugs) and concluded that an arrest was warranted. In addition, the complainant initially did not tell the truth about his possession of narcotics but stated at the time of the traffic stop on BWC that he was in possession.

Exonerated

Applicant states that he is a 32-year-old man who has spent his life dedicated to service: first with the U.S. Marines, and next as a law enforcement officer. He states that he was born in Florida but came to Chicago to live with his mother when he was eighteen. Once Applicant came to Chicago, he became fascinated with the idea of becoming a Chicago Police Officer. In order to have "something to offer," he joined the United States Marine Corp, where his father also served. Applicant states that he was deployed to Afghanistan and Romania, and

Police Board Case No. 24 AA 36
Findings and Decision

received several medals and awards, including the Combat Action Ribbon.

Following his military service, Applicant came back to Chicago to pursue his goal of becoming a police officer. Applicant states that he was a proud member of the CPD, and after completing his probationary period, served as a tactical officer for approximately three years. Applicant states that during those three years, he was able to obtain numerous awards, including a 2019 Crime Reduction Award, an Attendance Recognition Award, 3 Department Commendations, 1 Emblem of Recognition for Physical Fitness, 128 Honorable Mentions, 1 Honorable Mention Award, 1 Military Service Award, 2 Police Officer of the Month Awards, 2 Top Gun Arrest Awards, and 1 Unit Meritorious Performance Award, for a total of 141 awards. Applicant states that these awards came from his immediate supervisors, who recognized his hard work and dedication.

Applicant disputes the contents and allegations contained in the complaints and argues that while some of the complaints have not yet been investigated, most were determined to be unsubstantiated or closed. He also states that others remain open for “unknown reasons.” Applicant requested clarification on the status of several of the complaints, and states that he had no memory of some of the events. He also states that he did not cooperate with some of the investigations because while working in Denver, he received a call from his old CPD district advising him that he did not have to cooperate because he was no longer an employee of the City of Chicago.

Applicant admits that he received a ten-day suspension from COPA based on his actions and the profanity used against the Uber passengers on May 31, 2020. He states that his frustration was high due to civil unrest, stress, fatigue, and the dangerous situations that he

Police Board Case No. 24 AA 36
Findings and Decision

faced during that time. Applicant states that because COPA took nearly two years to reach a decision, he was unable to appeal. Applicant admits that the language that he used “during the civil unrest” was unsettling and inexcusable, but stresses that it was a difficult time for police officers.

Applicant shares that he and his “soulmate” [Name redacted] (a registered nurse), are the parents of a 4-year-old daughter and 2-year-old son. Applicant states that [Name redacted] family lives in Denver, and they always wanted their children to grow up with family nearby. Therefore, after witnessing the frustration of the citizens and observing violence against his fellow officers, Applicant made the decision to leave the CPD for a new, slower lifestyle in Colorado. Applicant now believes that this was a mistake.

Although Applicant took a position with the DPD, he missed the comradery of his former colleagues and “teammates” at the CPD. Applicant states that Chicago is his home, and he wants to come back to his position as a Chicago Police Officer. Applicant says that he understands the responsibilities that come with the title and job, and that police officers play a vital role in upholding the rule of law and ensuring that everyone feels secure and protected.

Applicant submitted a personal statement, along with four letters of recommendation from colleagues and supervisors. He is described by his former CPD colleagues as a "leader" who is devoted to the core values of the Chicago Police Department. He was also described as a "perceptive" officer who "rejuvenates the eagerness and love for the job" of all of the officers he works with.

Applicant’s Sergeant at the Denver Police Department states that he is a "reliable and effective officer" with "exemplary qualities" that law enforcement demands. Applicant

declares that he is called to be a Chicago Police Officer and is driven by a “deep-rooted purpose” to serve his community in the city that he loves.

Conclusions of Law

Section IV. of the Bureau of Support Services Special Order contains the Pre-Employment Investigation Standards for Applicants to the Position of Police Officer (“Standards”) that are applicable to this Appeal. Applicant was disqualified by OPSA based on his prior employment history and other conduct. Based on the details provided in the Notice and Response, Applicant’s past conduct contains numerous grounds for disqualification based on OPSA’s Standards and Section 5 of CPD’s Rules and Regulations.

Disqualification Based on Prior Employment History

Section D(2) of the Standards states: “...An applicant who has been discharged or disciplined for offenses which include any act of dishonesty, incompetence, insubordination, excessive absenteeism or tardiness, or failure to follow regulations may be found unsuitable for employment.” In the three years that Applicant was on the street as a Chicago Police Officer, he received ten disciplinary complaints from citizens, including five complaints for civil rights violations. Applicant admitted to using profanity in several of the incidents, and acknowledged that he was late turning on his body worn camera in another.

Applicant was issued a ten-day suspension for a civil rights violation, and three other complaints were sustained based on Applicant’s multiple rule violations. In addition, there are four open cases, and Applicant failed to cooperate with several of the investigations.

Section D(3) states: “...an applicant who, during previous employment, has engaged in any conduct that would have violated the Chicago Police Department's Rules and Regulations

had Applicant been a Chicago Police Department employee, may be found unsuitable for employment...” Applicant’s conduct as alleged violated CPD Rules 1, 2, 6, 8, and 9, along with numerous general orders.

Furthermore, during his employment with the Chicago Police Department, Applicant violated Illinois law, impeded the Department’s efforts to achieve its goals, discredited the Department, disrespected citizens, and engaged in several unjustified verbal and/or physical altercations. As a result, Applicant’s prior employment history could be considered grounds for disqualification based on Section D(2) and (3) of the Standards, numerous CPD Rules and Regulations, and Illinois law.

Disqualification Based on Other Conduct

Section H(1) states: “... any applicant who has engaged in conduct that exhibits a **pattern of repeated abuse of authority; lack of respect for authority or law; lack of respect for the dignity and rights of others;** or a combination of traits disclosed during the pre-employment investigation that would not by themselves lead to a finding that an applicant is unsuitable for employment, but when taken as a whole, exhibit that Applicant is not suited for employment as a police officer, **will** be found unsuitable for employment.” (Emphasis added.) Applicant received ten disciplinary complaints from citizens and admitted to using profanity during several of the incidents. In addition, several of the complaints against Applicant were sustained following an investigation. As a result, Applicant’s conduct could be found to show a lack of respect for authority, a lack of respect for the law, as well as a lack of respect for the dignity and rights of others, in violation of Section H(1). At the very least, Applicant could be found to have a combination of traits that “would not by themselves lead to a finding that

Applicant is unsuitable for employment, but when taken as a whole, exhibit that Applicant is not suited for employment as a police officer.”

Based on the numerous letters of recommendation submitted and the awards and accommodations that he has received, there is little doubt that Applicant is a dedicated, hard-working police officer who is eager to fight crime. However, two things can be true at once: Applicant can be dedicated and hardworking, while at the same time properly disqualified based on past conduct that violates OPSCA’s Standards. Applicant’s aggressive conduct while policing the citizens of Chicago lead to numerous allegations of civil rights violations, verbal abuse and other unprofessional conduct.

No additional facts, evidence or arguments were submitted in Applicant’s Appeal that support his contention that Department erred in disqualifying Applicant for rehire based upon his prior employment history and other conduct. In considering and weighing the numerous grounds for disqualification that were presented, Applicant has failed to show, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the decision to remove him from the Eligibility List was erroneous.

Recommendation

Based on my findings and conclusions set forth above, I recommend that the decision to remove Applicant from the list of eligible applicants for the position of probationary police officer be **affirmed**.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mamie A. Alexander

Mamie Alexander
Appeals Officer

Date: October 10, 2024

POLICE BOARD DECISION

The members of the Police Board of the City of Chicago have reviewed the Appeals Officer's findings, conclusions, and recommendation.

The Police Board hereby adopts the Appeals Officer's findings, conclusions, and recommendation by a vote of 9 in favor (Kyle Cooper, Paula Wolff, Claudia Badillo, Steven Block, Mareilé Cusack, Nanette Doorley, Kathryn Liss, Andreas Safakas, and Justin Terry) to 0 opposed.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the decision to remove [Name redacted] from the list of eligible applicants for the position of probationary police officer is **affirmed**.

This decision and order are entered by a majority of the members of the Police Board: Kyle Cooper, Paula Wolff, Claudia Badillo, Steven Block, Mareilé Cusack, Nanette Doorley, Kathryn Liss, Andreas Safakas, and Justin Terry.

DATED AT CHICAGO, COUNTY OF COOK, STATE OF ILLINOIS, THIS 17th DAY OF OCTOBER 2024.

Attested by:

/s/ KYLE COOPER
President

/s/ MAX A. CAPRONI
Executive Director