

SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Date of Incident:	January 26, 2020
Time of Incident:	12:48 a.m.
Location of Incident:	2400 N. Sawyer Ave.
Date of COPA Notification:	January 26, 2020
Time of COPA Notification:	3:26 a.m.

The complainant, ██████████ told Sgt. Patrick Keane of the 14th District that on January 26, 2020, at approximately 1:15 a.m., he was driving out of an alley behind 3224 W. Fullerton Ave. onto Sawyer Avenue when he saw a marked police car, with its lights off, pull up next to him on his left. ██████████ said his car almost hit the police car. ██████████ argued with a uniformed officer (from the car) about ██████████ lights being off while he drove in the alley while the police car’s lights also were off. The police car pulled behind him, and a traffic stop was conducted without the police car lights being on. The officer had ██████████ exit his vehicle. An unmarked car arrived, which contained two officers. A plain-clothes officer exited the unmarked vehicle and searched ██████████ vehicle without his consent. ██████████ was upset about receiving a citation (for not having his lights on). ██████████ said there was another uniformed officer on the scene. He could not describe two of the four officers he said were on the scene. Sgt. Keane checked computer records and found that Beat 1423, Officers “Kazmi” and “Myers,” had made a traffic stop at Fullerton and Sawyer avenues at 12:48 a.m.

II. INVOLVED PARTIES

Involved Officer #1:	Syed Kazmi, #19305, Employee # ██████████ Date of Appointment December 15, 2017, Officer, 14 th District, DOB: ██████████ 1993, Male, Asian
Involved Officer #2:	Eric Myers, #4545, Employee # ██████████ Date of Appointment November 27, 2018, Officer, 14 th District, currently detailed to Unit 214, DOB: ██████████ 1991, Male, Black
Involved Individual #1:	██████████ E. ██████████ DOB: ██████████, 1982, Male, White

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding / Recommendation
Officer Syed Kazmi	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is alleged that on January 26, 2020, at approximately 12:48 a.m., near 2358 N. Sawyer Avenue, Officer Kazmi committed misconduct by detaining ██████████ without justification. 2. That during the same incident, Officer Kazmi searched the vehicle driven by ██████████ without justification. 3. That during the same incident, Officer Kazmi searched the person of ██████████ without justification. 	<p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p>
Officer Eric Myers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is alleged that on January 26, 2020, at approximately 12:48 a.m., near 2358 N. Sawyer Avenue, Officer Myers committed misconduct by detaining ██████████ without justification. 2. That during the same incident, Officer Myers searched the vehicle driven by ██████████ without justification. 3. That during the same incident, Officer Myers searched the person of ██████████ without justification. 	<p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p>

IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

Rules

- Rule 6 – Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.
- Rule 10 - Inattention to duty.

General Orders

N/A

Special Orders

1. Investigatory Stop System, Special Order S04-13-09, effective date 10 July 2017

Federal Laws

1. Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution

State Laws

1. 725 ILCS 5/107-14
2. 725 ILCS 5/108-1.01

V. INVESTIGATION

a. Interviews

In his COPA interview on February 21, 2020,¹ ██████████ in essence, reiterated what he told Sgt. Keane as noted in the Executive Summary. In addition, ██████████ said both that he believed his vehicle's headlights were on prior to the officers stopping him and that he did not remember whether they were on. During the traffic stop, the officers asked for his driver's license and insurance document. He was able to provide his driver's license, but because the car he was driving belonged to his girlfriend, he was not able to provide proof of insurance. After the driver officer went to the police vehicle, he came back to ██████████ and the officers had him step out of his car and searched him. The officers said something about guns and ██████████ Concealed Carry License. ██████████ told the officers the CCL had expired and that he was unarmed. When one of the officers asked him why he had not renewed the CCL or why it was not valid, ██████████ replied that he had been busy with work and had not had time to renew it.

██████████ said that, while he was being patted down by the officers, the unmarked car arrived and parked nose-to-nose with his car. The plain-clothes officer exited the unmarked car and searched ██████████ car. ██████████ specified that neither of the initial two officers was the officer who searched his car. The unmarked car had tinted windows. ██████████ did not know if the plain-clothes officer had a partner. None of the officers asked him about searching his vehicle. When ██████████ asked if he could watch the search of his car, the officers had him face away. One of the first two officers gave ██████████ a ticket for not having his headlights on, although the officer said he could have given him three tickets. During the incident, one officer asked ██████████ if he always acted "like this." Although ██████████ said he did not know what the officer was referring to, ██████████ said, "I've heard that before from officers when I've been pulled over." He thought such an exchange was a way for an officer "to go further." ██████████ jokingly added, "'Cause I'm just being me. You know, suspicious." ██████████ used "air quotes" with his fingers when he said "suspicious."

██████████ described the officer who drove the squad car that pulled him over as tan, not a black person, with long, jet-black greased-back hair, 5 feet 10 inches tall, athletic and slender, 33 or 34 years old. ██████████ could not describe the tan officer's partner. The plain-clothes officer was a skinny white male who was at least 6 feet 2 inches tall and possibly 40 years old.

██████████ said his major complaint was how his attempt to help the officers by telling them their headlights were not on, turned into his being searched personally, his vehicle being searched illegally, and being given a field sobriety test and a moving violation.

In his COPA interview on September 22, 2021,² Officer Syed Kazmi said he drove the marked SUV he and his partner, Officer Eric Myers, were assigned to at the time of the incident. Officer Kazmi said he and Officer Myers first saw ██████████ in his vehicle in an alley of Sawyer Avenue. ██████████ headlights were off, and he began to drive, turning west and then south onto

¹ Att. #4

² Atts. #19, #22

Sawyer Avenue. The incident occurred on the north side of Fullerton Avenue.³ Officer Kazmi pulled up next to [REDACTED] car and informed him his lights were not on and to turn them on. [REDACTED] did not comply and was very angry at the officers, mocking them and telling the officers to turn their lights on. Officer Kazmi and Officer Myers, through Officer Myers' open window, told [REDACTED] again to turn on his lights, but he did not comply. Officer Kazmi did not recall if his own vehicle's lights were on. He said sometimes, the officers might turn off their lights if another vehicle is in an alley and they are trying not to spook that other vehicle.

Officer Kazmi continued that after [REDACTED] was not complying, Officer Kazmi reversed his vehicle behind [REDACTED] vehicle and initiated a traffic stop. He believed he used his vehicle's emergency lights, but he said officers sometimes do not turn them on when they do sobriety tests because the lights can affect a subject's eyes. Officer Kazmi exited the squad car and approached [REDACTED] who was still in his driver's seat. Officer Kazmi told [REDACTED] the reason for the stop, which included his blocking of the alley and not having his lights on. [REDACTED] continued being argumentative, complaining about Officer Kazmi still having a light in his face and telling the officer, "You're at 'eight,' come to a 'two.'"⁴ Officer Kazmi asked for [REDACTED] driver's license and proof of insurance. [REDACTED] provided his driver's license, but he said the vehicle belonged to his girlfriend, and he did not have the insurance document. Officer Kazmi went back to his squad car and ran [REDACTED] information through LEADS, which indicated a valid driver's license and an expired Concealed Carry License.

Officer Kazmi and his partner went back to [REDACTED] vehicle. Officer Kazmi suspected that because of [REDACTED] behavior, he might be intoxicated or under the influence of a substance. His behavior was not typical for a traffic stop for minor violations. Officer Kazmi asked [REDACTED] to step out of his vehicle so the officer could conduct a field sobriety test. [REDACTED] walked toward the squad car, and Officer Myers asked him if he had any weapons in the car. [REDACTED] answered, "Not that I'm aware of."⁵ Officer Kazmi believed that was a weird answer and made him suspicious. Officer Kazmi conducted the field sobriety tests. He did not detect a clue that [REDACTED] was intoxicated. Officer Kazmi did not smell alcohol on [REDACTED] breath or coming from his vehicle.

Officer Kazmi said Officer Myers searched [REDACTED] vehicle for a possible weapon because of [REDACTED] behavior and his "I'm not aware" answer to whether there was a weapon in the vehicle. The search was conducted without [REDACTED] permission, which Officer Kazmi said was not needed. No firearm was found. Officer Kazmi said he patted down [REDACTED] but did not find anything suspicious. [REDACTED] kept putting his hands in his pocket or pockets and continued to be very hostile and aggressive toward the officers. Officer Kazmi told [REDACTED] to go back to his vehicle. Officer Kazmi went back to his vehicle to write a ticket for [REDACTED] for not having his lights on. Officer Kazmi said he could have written additional tickets, for [REDACTED] for not having proof of insurance and for blocking the alley with his vehicle. While writing the ticket,

³ The officers' Investigatory Stop Report indicates the incident location as "2358 N. Sawyer Ave.," which would be south of Fullerton Avenue (2400 North), but Officer Kazmi acknowledged the incident occurred on the north side of Fullerton Avenue, based on his body-worn camera video. He also corrected the direction in which [REDACTED] drove on Sawyer Avenue.

⁴ Att.#22, page 19, line 1.

⁵ *Id.*, page 21, line 24, and page 22, lines 1 and 2.

he saw [REDACTED] exit his vehicle to try to come toward the police vehicle, but Officer Kazmi told him to get back in his car. Officer Kazmi said to himself that [REDACTED] might be a mental case, using the term “zebra.”

Officer Kazmi said neither he nor his partner called for assistance in the incident. Officer Kazmi did not know the identities of two officers who came to the scene as depicted in his body-worn camera video. Neither he nor his partner spoke with those two other officers. Officer Kazmi said he believed that one of the two officers told [REDACTED] he was being audibly and visually recorded. [REDACTED] was not happy about receiving his ticket. Officer Kazmi, who said he wears hair product, said [REDACTED] told him, “Oh, you want to know something about hair gel? That’s how you can spot douche bags a mile away.”⁶ After Officer Kazmi gave [REDACTED] the ticket, [REDACTED] drove to a parking space on Fullerton Avenue and then gestured with his hand in a mocking way. [REDACTED] exited his vehicle and approached the police vehicle. The officers left the scene.

Regarding the first allegation against him, that he detained [REDACTED] without justification, Officer Kazmi denied it in that he detained [REDACTED] because of traffic violations.

Regarding the second allegation against him, that he searched [REDACTED] vehicle without justification, Officer Kazmi denied it, stating that Officer Myers searched it, but also defending the search because of the possibility that [REDACTED] had a weapon in the vehicle, given [REDACTED] was not aware of whether there was or was not a weapon in the vehicle.

Regarding the third allegation against him, that he searched [REDACTED] without justification, Officer Kazmi denied it. Officer Kazmi said he conducted a pat down of [REDACTED] without his permission, because Officer Kazmi had a reasonable suspicion that he might have had a weapon, given that Mednivoc had an expired CCL and did not know if there was a weapon in his vehicle.

Officer Kazmi said he did not see a white male plain-clothes officer on the scene, and he did not recall that an officer of that description conducted any part of the search of [REDACTED] vehicle. Officer Kazmi did not see an unmarked police vehicle on the scene. He and his partner and the two other officers who are depicted in his BWC video were the only officers on the scene.

In his COPA interview on September 9, 2021,⁷ Officer Eric Myers provided an account of the incident that was consistent with Officer Kazmi’s account. As with Officer Kazmi, Officer Myers did not recall who the two other officers were who arrived on the scene during the traffic stop. Officer Myers did not know a plain-clothes officer came on the scene. He and his partner did not request assistance during the traffic stop.

Regarding the first allegation against Officer Myers, that he detained [REDACTED] without justification, Officer Myers denied it, saying that the officers had to detain him to conduct the field sobriety test.

⁶ Ibid., page 32, lines 13-15.

⁷ Atts. #17, 21.

Regarding the second allegation against him, that he searched [REDACTED] vehicle without justification, Officer Myers denied it. Officer Myers said the search was justified because [REDACTED] did not know if there was a firearm in the car and because of his aggressive behavior toward the officers.

Regarding the third allegation against Officers Myers, that he searched [REDACTED] without justification, Officer Myers denied it, saying that [REDACTED] was not searched, only patted down by Officer Kazmi.

b. Digital Evidence

Officer Kazmi's body-worn camera video⁸ recorded the traffic stop. After Officer Kazmi exits the squad car and approaches [REDACTED] car, he tells [REDACTED] he was blocking the alley and did not have his lights on. [REDACTED] said he turned his lights on. Officer Kazmi asks for [REDACTED] driver's license and proof of insurance. [REDACTED] occasionally interrupts Officer Kazmi, and Officer Kazmi says he is not going to argue with him. While [REDACTED] is retrieving his driver's license, Officer Kazmi shines his flashlight on him and asks if he has any weapons in the vehicle. [REDACTED] says he does not. [REDACTED] says, "Let's take it down. I'm not doing anything wrong. I didn't do anything wrong. We're at about eight. We need to be like a two. I'm not the enemy." [REDACTED] says he just came from a service call. He says he owns ATM machines at five businesses along Fullerton. Officer Kazmi asks how much [REDACTED] has had to drink, and [REDACTED] answers that he does not drink alcohol or do drugs. Officer Kazmi and Officer Meyers return to the squad car. Officer Kazmi runs [REDACTED] name and sees that he has an expired Concealed Carry License, which [REDACTED] did not mention. Both officers exit their car and go back to [REDACTED] car.

Officer Kazmi tells [REDACTED] he will do a few tests on him and if he's good to go, [REDACTED] will be out of there. As [REDACTED] steps toward the rear of his car, Officer Myers asks what sounds like a question as to whether there are any weapons in the car. [REDACTED] says he is not aware of any, but he does not own the car. While Officer Meyers moves out of view, apparently to search [REDACTED] car, [REDACTED] says he did not say he (Officer Myers) could go into the car. Officer Kazmi conducts the field sobriety test. Officer Kazmi asks if [REDACTED] is under the influence of any drugs. [REDACTED] says he is severely anemic. An unidentified uniformed officer is standing near the scene. Officer Kazmi says the reason he is asking is that [REDACTED] is acting excited. [REDACTED] explains that he has two cop cars going through his girlfriend's car, and it is late at night, and he is trying to do some work. Officer Kazmi explains that [REDACTED] is presenting a dangerous demeanor and is coming off very hostile. He says he was en route to servicing another ATM machine. When [REDACTED] puts one or both of his hands in his pockets, Officer Kazmi tells him to take his hands out of his pockets. Officer Kazmi then pats down [REDACTED]. Another unidentified uniformed officer stands next to the first unidentified uniformed officer.

Officer Kazmi references [REDACTED] hostile demeanor and then asks if that is [REDACTED] normal demeanor. [REDACTED] says it is. Officer Kazmi asks [REDACTED] to sit in his car, which he does. Officers Kazmi and Myers sit in the squad car. Officer Myers says [REDACTED] had some zip-ties in his car. Officer Kazmi, as he writes out a citation, says [REDACTED] might be "Zebra." Officer

⁸ Att. #6.

Kazmi, after Officer Myers apparently runs a background check on ██████████ and finds nothing, says he found it hard to believe. At one point, Officer Kazmi opens his own driver's door and yells, apparently to ██████████ to get back in his car. ██████████ shouts something, but it was not understandable. Officer Myers asks what is wrong with him.

Officer Kazmi brings the citation to ██████████ saying he was getting only one ticket, even though he should be getting three. Officer Kazmi says ██████████ should consider it a favor. ██████████ objects to receiving the citation. Officer Kazmi says he never said he would not give ██████████ a ticket. ██████████ asks what it is for and laughs that it was for not having his headlight on. ██████████ says the officer did not have his headlights on, either. Officer Kazmi says it does not matter. ██████████ says he had his headlights on. ██████████ asks if he can tell Officer Kazmi something about men's hair gel, and Officer Kazmi says no. What ██████████ says is not clear. Officer Kazmi says, "Oh, yeah?" and laughs as he enters his squad car.

Neither an unmarked car nor a plain-clothes officer is depicted in the video.

Officer Myers' body-worn camera video⁹ depicts him exiting his squad car and shining a flashlight into ██████████ car. After ██████████ walks to the rear of his car, Officer Myers asks him if he has any weapons in the car. ██████████ answers that he was not aware of any, but that he does not own the car. A second marked squad car is depicted on Fullerton Avenue, in the background, at one point in the video. That second marked squad car is parked facing ██████████ vehicle. The video depicts Officer Myers' search of ██████████ car. After the search, Officer Myers sits on the passenger side of the squad car. He references finding the zip ties in ██████████ car. The officers also reference what one officer calls ██████████ confrontational and hostile demeanor. Officer Kazmi can be heard telling ██████████ to get back in his car. Officer Myers asks out loud what is wrong with "this guy." When ██████████ objects to receiving the citation, a moving violation, from Officer Kazmi, ██████████ says he just got a moving violation three months ago. ██████████ asks his question about men's hair gel, but his complete comment is not audible.

No OEMC audio or in-car camera video related to the incident was available.¹⁰

c. Physical Evidence

No physical evidence was associated with the incident.

d. Documentary Evidence

The Investigatory Stop Report¹¹ about the incident indicates Officers Kazmi and Myers observed ██████████ vehicle parked in the east alley of Sawyer Avenue causing an obstruction. The officers drove in the alley behind ██████████ vehicle, which did not have its headlights on, until it reached Sawyer Avenue and turned south. The officers pulled beside ██████████ vehicle to inform him to turn on his lights. ██████████ "immediately" became hostile and said in a mocking manner that the officers' lights were not on. The officers told ██████████ to turn on his lights, but

⁹ Att. #7.

¹⁰ Atts. #10, #12.

¹¹ Att. #3.

he did not comply. [REDACTED] argued, saying again that the officers' lights were not on and it was not safe to drive at night. Because of [REDACTED] "combative" attitude and non-compliance with traffic laws, the officers conducted a traffic stop.

The report references [REDACTED] telling the officers in a demanding tone they were at an "eight" and to bring it down. Because of [REDACTED] "aggressive, excited, sarcastic and hostile" behavior, the officers suspected him of being under the influence of an intoxicating compound. The officers reported that his behavior was not the normal behavior they encounter in a traffic stop. The officers' test of [REDACTED] determined he was not under the influence of an intoxicating compound. [REDACTED] acknowledged that his being aggressive is his normal demeanor. The officers conducted a name check, finding [REDACTED] CCL was expired. [REDACTED] vehicle was searched to ensure [REDACTED] did not have access to any weapons that could be used against the officers once [REDACTED] was in his vehicle. [REDACTED] was patted down and his car searched without his consent.

The officers reported that after they gave [REDACTED] his citation, he did not immediately leave. He waved his hand out his window in an up-and-down motion, mockingly, toward the officers. [REDACTED] left but parked his vehicle and started to walk across the street toward the officers' vehicle as it drove away.

e. Additional Evidence

The response from an inquiry¹² about [REDACTED] citation to the Cook County Circuit Court indicates it was non-suited on July 29, 2020.

VI. LEGAL STANDARD

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 the conduct reviewed complied with Department policy. *See Avery v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 216 Ill. 2d 100, 191 (2005), (a proposition is proved by a preponderance of

¹² Att. #23.

the evidence when it has been found to be more probably true than not). If the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the conduct complied with Department 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. See *e.g.*, *People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036 (2016). 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." *Id.* at ¶ 28.

VII. ANALYSIS

The allegations against both officers were the same. Essentially, the officers were accused of detaining and searching [REDACTED] and searching his vehicle, without justification.

Regarding whether [REDACTED] was unjustifiably detained, the evidence indicates he was not. [REDACTED] told Sgt. Keane and COPA he parked his car in the alley. He told COPA both that he believed his vehicle's headlights were on prior to the officers stopping him and also that he did not remember whether they were on. The end of the video from Officer Kazmi's body-worn camera recorded [REDACTED] when he receives his citation, saying that both the officer's headlights and his own headlights were not on. The clear and convincing evidence is that [REDACTED] headlights were off, thereby justifying the officers' conducting the traffic stop and thereby detaining him.

In addition, [REDACTED] was justifiably detained by the officers apart from his traffic code violation. The officers conducted and documented an Investigatory Stop under the Police Department's Special Order S04-13-09.¹³

Under that Special Order, Part IV, A, Illinois state law spells out the authority to conduct an Investigatory Stop. The Order contains the following: "The statute reads as follows: 'Temporary questioning without arrest. A peace officer, after having identified himself as a peace officer, may stop any person in a public place for a reasonable period of time when the officer reasonably infers from the circumstances that the person is committing, is about to commit or has committed an offense as defined in Section 102-15 of this Code, and may demand the name and address of the person and an explanation of their actions. Such detention and temporary questioning will be conducted in the vicinity of where the person was stopped.'"

In this case, both officers were justified in conducting their Investigatory Stop after [REDACTED] provided conflicting answers when asked by the officers whether there were weapons in his car. According to Officer Karzi's body-worn camera video, at the beginning of the stop, Melnikov told Officer Karzi he did not have weapons in the vehicle. According to Officer Myers' body-worn camera video, when Officer Myers asked [REDACTED] if he had any weapons in the car, [REDACTED] answered that he was not aware of any, but that he did not own the car. During the incident, [REDACTED] acknowledged to Officer Karzi that being aggressive is his normal demeanor. During his COPA interview, [REDACTED] said he was just being himself, which he said had evoked

¹³ Att. #31

questions from other officers who had stopped him. [REDACTED] demeanor, combined with his expired CCL and his conflicting answers about weapons, made the officers reasonably suspicious as to whether there was a weapon in [REDACTED] car.

Under the same Special Order, Part V, A, “An officer may conduct an Investigatory Stop if it is based on specific and articulable facts which, combined with rational inferences from these facts, give rise to Reasonable Articulable Suspicion that criminal activity is afoot. The sole purpose of the temporary detention is to prove or disprove those suspicions.” In this case, Officer Myers’ search of the vehicle and Officer Karzi’s pat-down of [REDACTED] disproved suspicions that [REDACTED] had a firearm in the car or was illegally carrying one. Apart from the traffic violation, no criminal activity was discovered by the officers.

Regarding the second allegation against the officers, that [REDACTED] was unjustifiably searched, no evidence indicates [REDACTED] was searched. Officer Karzi patted him down. The same CPD Special Order, Part IV, B, references the Illinois State Law that delineates the authority for conducting a Protective Pat Down during an Investigatory Stop. “The statute reads as follows: ‘Search during temporary questioning. When a peace officer has stopped a person for temporary questioning pursuant to Section 107-14 of this Code and reasonably suspects that he or another is in danger of attack, he may search the person for weapons. If the officer discovers a weapon, he may take it until the completion of the questioning, at which time he shall either return the weapon, if lawfully possessed, or arrest the person so questioned.’” It is noted in this section of the Special Order that the word “search” refers to a Protective Pat Down. [REDACTED] used both terms, searched and patted down, in his COPA interview, but he did not say the officers went into his pockets.

Regarding the third allegation against the officers, that they unjustifiably searched [REDACTED] car, the same CPD Special Order, Part VIII, Procedures, A, 4, b, provides a guideline for officers who conclude there is Reasonable Articulable Suspicion that a driver may be “armed and dangerous” or “presents a danger of attack.” This guideline describes an incident in which an officer conducts a Protective Pat Down on a driver and the vehicle for weapons, which is what Officers Karzi and Myers did, although Officer Myers, specifically, searched the vehicle and found no weapon. The search of [REDACTED] car was justified because, as already noted, the officers reasonably believed [REDACTED] could have been armed.

All three allegations against both officers are Unfounded.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis set forth above, COPA makes the following findings:

Officer	Allegation	Finding / Recommendation
Officer Syed Kazmi, #19305	1. It is reported that on January 26, 2020, at approximately 12:48 a.m., near 2358 N. Sawyer Avenue, Officer Kazmi committed	Unfounded

	<p>misconduct by detaining [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>2. That during the same incident, Officer Kazmi searched the vehicle driven by [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>3. That during the same incident, Officer Kazmi searched the person of [REDACTED] without justification.</p>	<p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p>
<p>Officer Eric Myers, #4545</p>	<p>1. It is reported that on January 26, 2020, at approximately 12:48 a.m., near 2358 N. Sawyer Avenue, Officer Myers committed misconduct by detaining [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>2. That during the same incident, Officer Myers searched the vehicle driven by [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>3. That during the same incident, Officer Myers searched the person of [REDACTED] without justification.</p>	<p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p>

Approved:

[REDACTED]

4-29-2023

Angela Hearts-Glass
Deputy Chief Investigator

Date