



Log # 2022-3284

## FINAL SUMMARY REPORT<sup>1</sup>

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On August 4, 2022, the Chicago Police Department's Crime Prevention and Information Center (CPIC) notified the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) of an officer-involved shooting that occurred at approximately 9:53 pm that evening on the Interstate I-55 Northbound Stevenson Expressway in Chicago, Illinois.<sup>2</sup> COPA learned that while driving on his way to work, off-duty Chicago Police Officer (CPD), Ivan Razo, discharged his firearm from inside his personal vehicle at another vehicle on the expressway. The incident, which was captured on dash camera video footage from Officer Razo's vehicle, began when Officer Razo was getting onto the expressway, and he encountered [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in a vehicle ahead of his vehicle. As Officer Razo and [REDACTED] entered the expressway, [REDACTED] engaged in road rage and attempted to strike Officer Razo's vehicle. As the two vehicles were in motion, [REDACTED] pointed a firearm with a laser attached at Officer Razo and gunfire was exchanged between the two vehicles. [REDACTED] was struck in the head by gunfire and her vehicle subsequently crashed into a cement expressway barrier.

Upon review of the evidence, COPA served allegations that Officer Razo failed to use de-escalation techniques, fired from a moving vehicle and into a moving vehicle, failed to immediately notify OEMC of his firearm discharge, failed to take precautions to minimize the risk to people other than the target, and left the scene of the incident without justification. Following its investigation, COPA reached a sustained finding regarding one of the allegations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix A includes case identifiers such as the date, time, and location of the incident, the involved parties and their demographics, and the applicable rules and policies.

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to § 2-78-120 of the Chicago Municipal Code, COPA has a duty to investigate all incidents in which a Chicago Police Department (CPD) member discharges their firearm. However, because the incident occurred on the expressway, the Illinois State Police (ISP) would be the primary agency processing the scene and investigating the criminal aspect in this matter.

## II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE<sup>3</sup>

On August 4, 2022, CPD Officer Ivan Razo was on his way to work at the 007<sup>th</sup> District Station.<sup>4</sup> As he drove southbound on Kedzie Avenue toward 35<sup>th</sup> Street, a Blue Nissan Maxima<sup>5</sup> occupied by ██████████ (driver) and ██████████ (front passenger) was in front of his vehicle. Both vehicles stopped in the left turning lane at 35<sup>th</sup> Street, which led to the entrance of the I-55 northbound Stevenson Expressway. When the streetlight turned green, ██████████ did not move, and Officer Razo honked his car horn once to alert her that the light had changed. ██████████ reached out her window and displayed her middle finger at Officer Razo.<sup>6</sup> She then did an “aggressive brake-check” to get Officer Razo to hit the rear of her vehicle.<sup>7</sup> Before entering the ramp of the expressway, ██████████ again, abruptly stopped her vehicle, which caused Officer Razo to do the same. ██████████ then proceeded onto the expressway, and Officer Razo followed behind. When Officer Razo entered the expressway ██████████ was in front of his vehicle. When Officer Razo had an opportunity to merge, he drove towards the farthest left lane to get away from ██████████ because she was driving aggressively.<sup>8</sup> ██████████ aggressively sped up closely behind Officer Razo’s vehicle and began flashing her headlights and/or bright lights. As Officer Razo attempted to get to the farthest left lane (lane one), ██████████ struck the rear passenger side of Officer Razo’s vehicle and tried to run him off the road.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The following is a summary of what COPA finds most likely occurred during this incident. This summary utilized information from several different sources, including dash camera video footage from PO Razo’s vehicle, BWC video footage of CPD officers (post incident), the Illinois State Police (ISP) Evidence Manifest Report, OEMC 911 calls and radio transmissions, CFD and ISP calls, PO Razo’s firearm registration records and qualification history, and the COPA statement of PO Razo.

<sup>4</sup> PO Razo was driving a 2020 Black Honda Accord, bearing license plate ██████████. His vehicle was equipped with dash cameras in the front and rear. During the investigation, COPA made numerous attempts to obtain a copy of the dash camera videos relative to the incident from ISP and the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office (SAO). The attempts were unsuccessful. On August 24, 2022, at the ISP headquarters in Des Plaines, ISP personnel agreed to show COPA personnel, the dash camera footage. COPA personnel were permitted to take notes of the events depicted in the video footages but were not provided with a copy of the videos. There were approximately 12 video clips, 6 clips from the front of the vehicle and 6 clips from the rear of the vehicle. Refer to attachment 2, Pgs. 4-5, for a detailed summary of COPA’s notes regarding the video footage. COPA made additional attempts to view the footage after interviewing the accused by reaching out to the SAO and ISP. To date, ISP has not provided COPA with copies of this video evidence or allowed COPA to watch the videos again.

<sup>4</sup> In the dash camera video footage of PO Razo’s vehicle, both vehicles appeared to be driving at rapid speeds, with PO Razo ahead of ██████████.

<sup>5</sup> License Plate # ██████████. The vehicle had tinted rear windows.

<sup>6</sup> Att. 46, pg. 15, lines 17-24 and pg. 16, lines 1-4.

<sup>7</sup> Att. 46, pg. 16, lines 6-13 and pg. 18, lines 15-19.

<sup>8</sup> Att. 46, Pg. 24, lines 19-24.

<sup>9</sup> Att. 46, Pg. 26: PO Razo stated that there were approximately three to four traffic lanes and that he wanted to get to lane one (fastest lane- near the concrete barrier that divides in-bound and out-bound traffic), because it was the furthest lane from ██████████. Att. 46, pgs. 25 and 29. ██████████ tried to get PO Razo to hit the concrete barrier (pgs.120-121).

Next, Officer Razo sped up to get away from ██████ and she followed and was parallel to his vehicle in traffic lane two.<sup>10</sup> Officer Razo stated that he was not driving reckless, aggressively, erratically and/or did not do anything to provoke ██████ actions.<sup>11</sup> As both vehicles passed the Indiana exit/Lake Shore Drive expressway sign, ██████ pointed a firearm with a laser attachment and a green light at Officer Razo's face from the rear seats of the Nissan. In fear for his life, Officer Razo grabbed his firearm from a authorized department holster attached underneath his steering wheel and fired at ██████<sup>12</sup> Gunfire was exchanged between the two vehicles.<sup>13</sup> ██████ was struck in the head by gunfire and her vehicle subsequently swerved to the right traffic lanes and crashed into a cement expressway barrier, which caused damage to the passenger's side of the vehicle and caused the airbags to deploy.

According to Officer Razo, at the time of the gun exchange, there were no other vehicles in the traffic lanes to the right of the Nissan.<sup>14</sup> Officer Razo stated that he attempted to de-escalate and prevent the incident when he tried to drive away from the Nissan and maintain a safe distance from it. Officer Razo explained that there was nothing he could have done differently to prevent the incident from happening. ██████ was an active participant who initiated the incident. She aggressively pursued Officer Razo, struck his vehicle, and tried to run him off the road. ██████ escalated the situation when he pointed the laser light at Officer Razo's face and discharged his weapon.<sup>15</sup>

At approximately 9:53 pm, immediately after the shooting, Officer Razo drove slightly ahead of the Nissan and at the interchange of the I-55 and Lake Shore Drive (exit 292B), stopped his vehicle, and called OEMC.<sup>16</sup> He reported that gang members in a vehicle shot at him on the expressway, and that ██████ vehicle had crashed but he was unaware of injuries to anyone inside the vehicle.<sup>17</sup> Officer Razo identified himself as an off-duty officer and that he was going to drive to the 007<sup>th</sup> District, his district of assignment, because he was afraid that the occupants of the Nissan would still come after him and kill him.<sup>18</sup> At that time, Officer Razo did not report that he had discharged his weapon. He explained that he was in shock and thought that he had provided all the information to the dispatcher.

---

<sup>10</sup> In the dash camera video footage of PO Razo's vehicle, both vehicles appeared to be driving at rapid speeds, with PO Razo slightly ahead of ██████ PO Razo does not recall how fast he was driving or the volume of traffic and/or their placement in the traffic lanes (Att. 46. pg. 32).

<sup>11</sup> Att. 46, pgs. 33 and 32.

<sup>12</sup> Numerous gunshots were heard in PO Razo's dash camera videos and his vehicle swerved at the time of the shots. PO Razo stated that all his windows were up at the time that he fired his weapon. Att. 46. Pgs. 40 and 41.

<sup>13</sup> ShotSpotter recorded 23 gunshots at the location of the incident (Att. 3). Att. 15 (OEMC zone 13 at 37:13 from the start of the recording). PO Razo discharged his firearm eleven times. Refer to Att. 43, for ISP evidence collection of fired cartridges from ██████ firearm.

<sup>14</sup> Traffic lanes three and four. Att. 46, pg. 54.

<sup>15</sup> Att. 46, pgs. 60 and 61. PO Razo could not get off the expressway prior to the shooting because his vehicle was in the furthest lane from the exits.

<sup>16</sup> Atts. 4 (event query) 5 (OEMC call) and 6 (OEMC call to ISP) and 8. PO Razo stated that he could see the Nissan in his rear-view mirror.

<sup>17</sup> PO Razo was unaware of ██████ injuries at the time he placed the call to OEMC.

<sup>18</sup> Atts. 46, pgs. 77 and 78.

At approximately 9:56 pm, a 911 caller stopped on the expressway near the Nissan and reported that ██████ was badly injured and that ██████ attempted to put ██████ in the back seat so he could escape the Nissan. The caller reported that ██████ asked him not to call 911.<sup>19</sup>

At approximately 10:08:33 pm, CPD Officers Daniel Casey, star #18026 and Sang Tran, #7527, were the first officers to respond at the location of the incident.<sup>20</sup> The officers asked ██████ if he was involved in the incident and if he had any weapons. ██████ denied having any weapons and told the officers that they could search the Nissan. At approximately 10:13:26pm,<sup>21</sup> ██████ stated to an ISP (M/B) officer that a black car cut them off when they were getting on the expressway. The driver wanted to switch lanes and “one thing led to another” and the white male<sup>22</sup> hit them and then began shooting at them and they crashed. ██████ stated that ██████ was shot in the head. He did not know how many times the male shot at them. At approximately 10:20:50 pm, CPD Officer Laura McDonald located a firearm on the expressway on top of the embankment near the Nissan,<sup>23</sup> at which time, the ISP officer handcuffed ██████ and placed him inside his vehicle.

As Officer Razo proceeded to drive, he notified the 007<sup>th</sup> District of the incident and reported that he discharged his firearm.<sup>24</sup> Officer Razo exited the expressway at 63<sup>rd</sup> Street and at approximately 232 W. 63<sup>rd</sup> Street, he encountered on duty officers<sup>25</sup> from the 007<sup>th</sup> District who were in a marked SUV vehicle. Officer Razo and officers spoke briefly and then they all drive to the 007<sup>th</sup> District station parking lot.<sup>26</sup> Officer Razo explained that he left the scene of the incident because he was in reasonable believe that ██████ and/or ██████ would “finish the job” (kill him).<sup>27</sup> Officer Razo explained that he drove to the 007<sup>th</sup> District instead of the nearest police station to the location of the incident because he knew his way to the 007<sup>th</sup> District and was unfamiliar with the location of the nearest district. He explained that because he was afraid and paranoid and needed to get somewhere where he felt safe.<sup>28</sup>

Officer Razo received medical treatment at Jesse Brown Hospital<sup>29</sup> and ██████ was transported via ambulance to Northwestern Hospital where she underwent surgery for the gunshot

---

<sup>19</sup> Atts. 9, 10, 20, and 23 (OEMC, ISP and CFD calls).

<sup>20</sup> Atts. 24 (BWC Casey) and 25 (BWC Tran). Additional CPD officers also responded to the scene (Atts. 27 to 31-BWC videos).

<sup>21</sup> Att. 24. Beginning at 10:13:26 pm.

<sup>22</sup> Presumably PO Ivan Razo.

<sup>23</sup> Att. 26, BWC of PO Laura MacDonald at 10:20:40.

<sup>24</sup> Atts. 17 and 18 (at 2 mins from the start of recording). While on the phone with the 007<sup>th</sup> District, PO Razo received a call from ISP trooper Adam Rodger, #7063, to whom he also reported the details of the incident. All three calls were recorded on the dash camera footage.

<sup>25</sup> POs Yousef Almaru, star #5327 (Att. 32 at 11:00:55) and Triston Eiland, star #13052 (Att. 33 at 11:00:55). Officers Almaru and Eiland were instructed by Sgt. Lopez to meet PO Razo when he exited the expressway (Att. 18 OEMC call).

<sup>26</sup> Atts. 32 and 33-BWCs of POs Yousef Almari, star #5327 and Triston Eiland, star #13052, beginning at 10:00:53 pm. The dash camera footage from PO Razo’s vehicle ended at the parking lot of the station.

<sup>27</sup> Att. 46, pgs. 81 to 83.

<sup>28</sup> Att. 46, pgs. 84 and 85.

<sup>29</sup> PO Razo sustained abrasions to his hands and face from broken glass inside his vehicle.

wound to her head.<sup>30</sup> [REDACTED] was taken into custody by ISP and transported to Riverdale Police Station.<sup>31</sup>

ISP recovered the weapon used by [REDACTED] at the location of the incident.<sup>32</sup> The weapon had five live rounds in the magazine and one in the chamber. Ten fired cartridge casings were recovered from the roadway at the scene near the Nissan and seven fired cartridge casings and/or fired projectiles were collected from the front passenger floorboard and rear driver side floorboard of the Nissan.<sup>33</sup>

ISP also recovered Officer Razo's weapon with no live rounds in the magazine or chamber. An empty magazine was recovered from Officer Razo's front passenger seat and two holsters from the center console and driver side door compartment. Live rounds were collected from a magazine and cup holder inside the center console. Eleven fired cartridge casings were recovered from inside Officer Razo's vehicle.<sup>34</sup>

### III. ALLEGATIONS

#### **Officer Ivan Razo:**

1. Failed to use de-escalation techniques to prevent or reduce the need for force in violation of General Order G03-02.
  - Not Sustained
2. Fired from a moving vehicle and/or into a moving vehicle without justification, in violation of G03-02-03.
  - Not Sustained
3. Failed to immediately notify OEMC that he discharged his weapon in violation of General Order G03-06.
  - Sustained, Violation of Rules 2, 5, 6, and 10.
4. Discharged his weapon without taking precautions to minimize the risk to people other than the target in violation of G03-02-03.
  - Not Sustained

---

<sup>30</sup> Att. 38. CFD ambulance report. On August 19, 2022, ISP personnel informed COPA that [REDACTED] was still in the hospital in a vegetative state (Att. 43).

<sup>31</sup> Atts. 36 and 37.

<sup>32</sup> [REDACTED] weapon was located on scene by CPD in an embankment on I-55 in the vicinity of the Nissan (Att. 26 at 10:20:40). The weapon was a Glock 17, 9mm pistol, serial number # [REDACTED] with a Highlight laser pointer. Att. 43 (ISP evidence manifest report, item #3).

<sup>33</sup> Att. 43, items #1, #27 and #28. [REDACTED] weapon had mixed ammunition.

<sup>34</sup> Atts. 41 (qualification history), 42 (Smith & Wesson M+P Shield 2.0, serial No. [REDACTED] and 43. The capacity of PO Razo's firearm was ten rounds in the magazine and one in the chamber (11 rounds). PO Razo carries this weapon when he is off duty.

5. Left the scene of the incident without justification in violation of G03-06.
  - Exonerated

#### IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

This investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to doubt the credibility of Officer Razo's statement to COPA. The dash camera video footage of Officer Razo's vehicle and the BWC video footage of CPD Officer Casey depicted evidence that questions the credibility of [REDACTED]

#### V. ANALYSIS

##### a. Officer Razo Failed to Accurately Notify OEMC

COPA finds Allegation 3, that Officer Razo failed to immediately notify OEMC that he discharged his weapon is **Sustained**. The Department requires all involved members to "immediately notify the Office of Emergency Management and Communications (OEMC) providing all relevant information" (including which parties discharged), and requesting additional resources.<sup>35</sup> In this case, Officer Razo did call OEMC immediately after the incident and reported that gang members in a vehicle shot at him on the expressway; but he did not include that he also discharged his weapon. Following his call to OEMC, Officer Razo then called the 007<sup>th</sup> District and reported his firearm discharge to the front desk. Moreover, while on the phone with the 007<sup>th</sup> District, Officer Razo received a call from ISP Trooper Adam Rodger, to whom he also reported his firearm discharge. While Officer Razo timely notified the 007<sup>th</sup> District and an ISP trooper notification of his firearm discharge, he did not include that information in his immediate to OEMC. Department General Order G03-06 requires members notify OEMC of "all relevant information," including which parties discharged.<sup>36</sup> Therefore, COPA finds Allegation 3 is **Sustained**.

##### b. Officer Razo's Use of Deadly Force

COPA finds Allegation 1, that Officer Razo failed to use de-escalation techniques to prevent or reduce the need for force is **Not Sustained**. Department members are "required to use de-escalation techniques to prevent or reduce the need for force, unless doing so would place a person or Department member in immediate risk of harm."<sup>37</sup> In this case, Officer Razo recounted several attempts to create space and flee from the pursuing vehicle before deadly force was ultimately used. Following its investigation, COPA could not independently verify Officer Razo's

---

<sup>35</sup> Att. 50, G03-06 V. A., effective April 15, 2021

<sup>36</sup> Att. 50

<sup>37</sup> Att. 52, G03-02 III. C., effective April 15, 2021

recollection due to lack of cooperation from the Illinois State Police (ISP).<sup>38</sup> However, Officer Razo did not present any credibility issues that would have led COPA to question his accounting of the facts. Therefore, COPA finds that Allegation 1 is **Not Sustained**.

COPA also finds Allegation 2, that Officer Razo fired from a moving vehicle and/or into a moving vehicle without justification is **Not Sustained**. The Department prohibits members from firing from, at, or into a moving vehicle, “unless such force is a last resort and necessary, based on the specific circumstances . . . to protect against an imminent threat to life or to prevent great bodily harm” to the member, another person, or group of people.<sup>39</sup> In this case, Officer Razo told COPA he tried to flee from the vehicle aggressively chasing him, but ██████ (the driver) continued to follow him. As ██████ vehicle eventually got parallel with Officer Razo, he told COPA he could see ██████ passenger, ██████ pointing a firearm with a laser attachment at him. At this point, Officer Razo grabbed his firearm and the two cars exchanged gun fire. Following its investigation, COPA could not independently verify Officer Razo’s recollection due to lack of cooperation from the Illinois State Police (ISP).<sup>40</sup> However, Officer Razo did not present any credibility issues that would have led COPA to question his accounting of the facts. Therefore, COPA finds that Allegation 2 is **Not Sustained**.

Finally, COPA finds Allegation 4, that Officer Razo discharged his weapon without taking precautions to minimize the risk to other people is **Not Sustained**. The Department requires members to take precautions to “minimize the risk” to other people before discharging their firearm. In this case, Officer Razo told COPA it was not until he saw the firearm with a laser sight pointed at him, that he reached for his own weapon as a last resort. COPA could not independently verify Officer Razo’s recollection of the events due to lack of cooperation from the Illinois State Police (ISP). However, Officer Razo did not present any credibility issues that would have led COPA to question his accounting of the facts. Therefore, COPA finds that Allegation 4 is **Not Sustained**.

### c. Officer Razo Left the Scene to Ensure His Safety

COPA finds Allegation 5, that Officer Razo left the scene of an officer-involved shooting without justification is **Exonerated**. The Department requires members involved in a firearm discharge to “remain on the scene,” if the scene is safe and secured, and report to a field supervisor.<sup>41</sup> In this case, Officer Razo told COPA he left the scene because he believed ██████

---

<sup>38</sup> Note: When COPA responded to the scene of the Officer-Involved shooting, Illinois State Police (ISP) declined to provide COPA personnel access, refused to give COPA a walkthrough of the scene or factual overview of the incident. Moreover, ISP only permitted COPA to review available video once, without any pausing or rewinding. And ISP declined to provide COPA with a copy of the relevant video evidence.

<sup>39</sup> Att. 51, G03-02-03 II. D. 6 and 7, effective April 15, 2021

<sup>40</sup> Note: When COPA responded to the scene of the Officer-Involved shooting, Illinois State Police (ISP) declined to provide COPA personnel access, refused to give COPA a walkthrough of the scene or factual overview of the incident. Moreover, ISP only permitted COPA to review available video once, without any pausing or rewinding. And ISP declined to provide COPA with a copy of the relevant video evidence.

<sup>41</sup> Att. 50, G03-06 VI. B. 3, effective April 15, 2021

and/or ██████ would try to kill him. Because Officer Razo did not know the condition of either ██████ or ██████ he drove to the 007<sup>th</sup> District, to get safe. COPA finds Officer Razo's explanation compelling and within the parameters set by the Department's General Orders. Therefore, COPA finds Allegation 5 is **Exonerated**.

**VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION**

**a. Police Officer Ivan Razo**

**i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History<sup>42</sup>**

Officer Ivan Razo has received 10 total complimentary awards, including three honorable mentions and 1 complimentary letter. Officer Razo received a 3-day suspension for a conduct unbecoming incident that occurred in 2019.

**ii. Recommended Discipline**

COPA has considered Officer Razo’s complimentary history and disciplinary history. Officer Razo failed to notify OEMC that he discharged his weapon. COPA recommends a suspension of up to 10 days.

Approved:



Sharday Jackson  
*Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator*

January 26, 2024

Date



Andrea Kersten  
*Chief Administrator*

January 26, 2024

Date

<sup>42</sup> Att. 59

Appendix ACase Details

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Date/Time/Location of Incident: | August 4, 2022/9:53 pm/I-55 Stevenson Expressway (IB)  |
| Date/Time of COPA Notification: | August 4, 2022/10:26 pm  |
| Involved Member #1:             | Ivan Razo, star #11703, employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: April 17, 2017, Unit of Assignment: 007/Detailed to Unit 376, Male Hispanic |
| Involved Individual #1:         | [REDACTED] 25 YOA, Female Hispanic   |
| Involved Individual #2:         | [REDACTED] 23 YOA, Male Hispanic   |

Applicable Rules

- Rule 2:** Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.
- Rule 3:** Any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals.
- Rule 5:** Failure to perform any duty.
- 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.
- Rule 10:** Inattention to duty.
- Rule 14:** Making a false report, written or oral.
- Rule 38:** Unlawful or unnecessary use or display of a weapon.
- Rule \_\_:** *[Insert text of any additional rule(s) violated]*

Applicable Policies and Laws

- General Order G03-02, De-escalation, Response to Resistance, And Uses of Force (effective April 15, 2021 – present).
- General Order G03-02-03, Firearm Discharge Incidents - Authorized Use and Post-Discharge Administrative Procedures (effective April 15, 2021 – present).
- General Order G03-06, Firearm Discharge and Officer-Involved Death Incident Response and Investigation (effective April 15, 2021 – present).

## Appendix B

### **Definition of COPA’s Findings and Standards of Proof**

For each Allegation, COPA must make one of the following findings:

1. Sustained – where it is determined the allegation is supported by a preponderance of the evidence;
2. Not Sustained – where it is determined there is insufficient evidence to prove the allegations by a preponderance of the evidence;
3. Unfounded – where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that an allegation is false or not factual; or
4. Exonerated – where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that the conduct described in the allegation occurred, but it is lawful and proper.

A **preponderance of evidence** can be described as evidence indicating that it is **more likely than not** that a proposition is proved.<sup>43</sup> For example, if the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the conduct complied with CPD policy than that it did not, even if by a narrow margin, then the preponderance of the evidence standard is met.

**Clear and convincing evidence** is a higher standard than a preponderance of the evidence but lower than the “beyond-a-reasonable doubt” standard required to convict a person of a criminal offense. Clear and convincing can be defined as a “degree of proof, which, considering all the evidence in the case, produces the firm and abiding belief that it is highly probable that the proposition . . . is true.”<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> See *Avery v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 216 Ill. 2d 100, 191 (2005) (a proposition is proved by a preponderance of the evidence when it is found to be more probably true than not).

<sup>44</sup> *People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036, ¶ 28 (quoting Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions, Criminal, No. 4.19 (4<sup>th</sup> ed. 2000)).

**Appendix C**

**Transparency and Publication Categories**

Check all that apply:

- Abuse of Authority
- Body Worn Camera Violation
- Coercion
- Death or Serious Bodily Injury in Custody
- Domestic Violence
- Excessive Force
- Failure to Report Misconduct
- False Statement
- Firearm Discharge
- Firearm Discharge – Animal
- Firearm Discharge – Suicide
- Firearm Discharge – Unintentional
- First Amendment
- Improper Search and Seizure – Fourth Amendment Violation
- Incidents in Lockup
- Motor Vehicle Incidents
- OC Spray Discharge
- Search Warrants
- Sexual Misconduct
- Taser Discharge
- Unlawful Denial of Access to Counsel
- Unnecessary Display of a Weapon
- Use of Deadly Force – other
- Verbal Abuse
- Other Investigation