



Log # 2023-5870

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

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On December 17, 2023, the Chicago Police Department's (CPD) Crime Prevention and Information Center (CPIC) notified the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) of an officer-involved shooting that occurred earlier that day, at approximately 10:55 pm, near [REDACTED]. [REDACTED].<sup>2</sup> COPA learned that an off-duty CPD member, Officer Willie Carodine, discharged his firearm at an unidentified person after that person, along with two others, attempted to carjack Officer Carodine's personal vehicle. When initially confronted by the subjects, Officer Carodine accidentally gave them his house keys instead of his car keys. When one of them pursued him and raised a firearm in his direction, Officer Carodine fired at the subject four times, and all three subjects fled on foot. Following its investigation, COPA determined that Officer Carodine's use of deadly force complied with CPD policy, and no allegations related to this incident were served on him.

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

On January 9, 2024, Officer Carodine sat for an interview with COPA as part of the COPA investigation.<sup>4</sup> Officer Carodine told COPA that, on Sunday, December 17, 2023, he was off duty<sup>5</sup> and spent his evening visiting his mother at her home, [REDACTED].<sup>6</sup> His car, a gray 2019 Dodge Durango,<sup>7</sup> was parked outside her home on W 80th St. at the intersection with Sacramento on the north side of the street, facing west.<sup>8</sup> Shortly before 10:55 pm,<sup>9</sup> Officer Carodine made preparations to leave, including using his remote starter to start his car's engine.<sup>10</sup> Five minutes after starting his car, Officer Carodine looked out the window in the vicinity of the

---

<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 CPD member discharges their firearm. Therefore, COPA determined it would be the primary administrative investigative agency in this matter.

<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 an officer interview, third party video, and police reports.

<sup>4</sup> Att. 46.

<sup>5</sup> Att. 46, pg. 5.

<sup>6</sup> Att. 46, pg. 7.

<sup>7</sup> Att. 46, pgs. 8 and 27.

<sup>8</sup> Att. 46, pg. 11.

<sup>9</sup> Att. 4, pg. 1.

<sup>10</sup> Att. 46, pg. 7.

car to check for anyone lurking nearby and saw no one.<sup>11</sup> When he approached his car, Officer Carodine observed a brick on the ground next to his car and scratches on his rear driver's side window.<sup>12</sup> He told COPA that he opened his car door and heard someone yell, "Don't move. Give me everything."<sup>13</sup> He turned around to see three people all pointing guns at him ("the Carjackers").<sup>14</sup> All three were black males wearing hoodies and masks, and Officer Carodine gave them his keys and began to walk away.<sup>15</sup> Officer Carodine told COPA that the keys he gave to the men "wound up being my house keys... I just reached in my pocket and gave them what I had... I didn't realize that they weren't the keys to the car."<sup>16</sup>

Officer Carodine stated that he backed up to the corner with Sacramento, pulled out his phone, and began to dial 911.<sup>17</sup> As he was beginning to dial, one of the men jumped out of the car and ran at Officer Carodine, yelling, "Hey."<sup>18</sup> The man raised his gun at Officer Carodine, who had his gun out by that point and fired at his pursuer.<sup>19</sup> All three ran off.<sup>20</sup> Officer Carodine returned to the corner to ensure they were gone and called 911.<sup>21</sup> He told the dispatcher that he was an off-duty officer and had just been the victim of an attempted carjacking.<sup>22</sup> When asked if he had notified dispatch that he had fired his weapon, he could not recall.<sup>23</sup>

COPA obtained video evidence from two houses that showed parts of the incident. The house at [REDACTED] had a doorbell camera that captured Officer Carodine as he fired at one of the subjects.<sup>24</sup> The house on the corner, at [REDACTED], had multiple camera angles, which captured other parts of the incident, including the attempted carjacking.<sup>25</sup>

Before Officer Carodine left his mother's house, a camera on the front of [REDACTED] showed the three black males in hoodies approaching the house.<sup>26</sup> One of the carjackers grabbed a large paving brick.<sup>27</sup> All three then began walking north.<sup>28</sup> Next, a camera on the north side of [REDACTED], facing north, showed one male walking towards Officer Carodine's Dodge Durango and throwing something large and heavy – later determined to

---

<sup>11</sup> Att. 46, pg. 10.

<sup>12</sup> Att. 46, pg. 12.

<sup>13</sup> Att. 46, pg. 7, lns. 13-14.

<sup>14</sup> Att. 46, pg. 12.

<sup>15</sup> Att. 46, pg. 16.

<sup>16</sup> Att. 46, pg. 16, lns. 19-24.

<sup>17</sup> Att. 46, pg. 18.

<sup>18</sup> Att. 46, pg. 18, lns. 17-20.

<sup>19</sup> Att. 46, pgs. 23-24.

<sup>20</sup> Att. 46, pg. 19.

<sup>21</sup> Att. 46, pg. 25.

<sup>22</sup> Att. 46, pg. 26.

<sup>23</sup> Att. 46, pg. 26. Officer Carodine's 911 call was recorded, and he did inform dispatch that he had fired his weapon. Att. 28 at 1:15.

<sup>24</sup> Att. 17 and Att. 41.

<sup>25</sup> Att. 18, Att. 36, Att. 37, Att. 38, Att. 39, Att. 40, and Att. 42.

<sup>26</sup> Att. 36 at 0:00.

<sup>27</sup> Att. 36 at 0:17.

<sup>28</sup> Att. 36 at 20.

be a large paving brick – at the rear driver’s side window of the vehicle.<sup>29</sup> The brick bounced off, and the person who threw it ran away to the east as a vehicle passed from east to west along 80<sup>th</sup> Street.<sup>30</sup> Approximately ninety seconds later (according to camera time stamps), Officer Carodine walked up to his vehicle and was immediately, rapidly approached by one of the carjackers, followed seconds later by the other two – before Officer Carodine had a chance to open his car door.<sup>31</sup> Due to poor lighting and their distance from the camera, it could not be confirmed that the carjackers were pointing guns at Officer Carodine, but the video showed that at least two of the three pointed *something* at Officer Carodine in a threatening manner consistent with brandishing a firearm.<sup>32</sup>

Officer Carodine appeared to hand something over,<sup>33</sup> he then walked towards the southwest corner of 80<sup>th</sup> and Sacramento while pulling out his cell phone and firearm.<sup>34</sup> Officer Carodine’s vehicle never moved, and one of the carjackers exited it and began running after Officer Carodine and shouting at him to “give it to me.”<sup>35</sup> The camera on the front of [REDACTED] showed Officer Carodine, who had begun looking at his cell phone, look up and then start running north along Sacramento while looking behind him.<sup>36</sup> One of the carjackers ran into view of the camera, pursuing Officer Carodine, and began to point something at him.<sup>37</sup> Officer Carodine turned around and fired his weapon at the carjacker four times; the carjacker immediately turned around and ran away.<sup>38</sup> The camera on the side of [REDACTED] then showed the pursuer running on screen and began running west along 80<sup>th</sup> Street. At the same time, the other two carjackers exited Officer Carodine’s vehicle and started running west along 80<sup>th</sup>. Officer Carodine then walked back to the southwest corner of the intersection, briefly pointed his gun west down 80<sup>th</sup>, and began walking back to his vehicle.

### III. ALLEGATIONS

Pursuant to section 2-78-120 of the Municipal Code of Chicago, COPA has a duty to investigate all incidents in which a CPD member discharges their firearm. During its investigation of this incident, COPA did not find evidence to support any allegations related to Officer Carodine’s firearm discharge.

---

<sup>29</sup> Att. 37 at 0:00-0:10.

<sup>30</sup> Att. 37 at 0:10-0:20.

<sup>31</sup> Att. 38.

<sup>32</sup> Att. 38 at 0:11-0:20.

<sup>33</sup> Att. 38 at 0:20-0:26.

<sup>34</sup> Att. 39 at 0:00-0:14.

<sup>35</sup> Att. 39 at 0:20-0:29.

<sup>36</sup> Att. 40 at 0:00-0:17.

<sup>37</sup> Att. 40 at 0:17-0:20.

<sup>38</sup> Att. 40 at 0:19-0:20.

#### IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

The credibility of an individual relies primarily on two factors: 1) the individual's truthfulness and 2) the reliability of the individual's account. The first factor addresses the honesty of the individual making the statement, while the second factor speaks to the individual's ability to accurately perceive the event at the time of the incident and ability to recall the incident from memory.

COPA finds that Officer Carodine provided a generally credible account in his interview with COPA. However, a few statements he made were not entirely consistent with the video evidence. However, these discrepancies were both immaterial to the investigation and are likely attributable to the general unreliability of memory, particularly in tense, fast-paced situations. Officer Carodine's account was otherwise consistent with the video evidence.

#### V. ANALYSIS<sup>39</sup>

COPA finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the use of deadly force by Officer Carodine was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional to the circumstances he faced. COPA further finds that Officer Carodine engaged in de-escalation tactics as required by CPD policy before using deadly force and that the circumstances did not allow the officer to engage in de-escalation tactics due to the totality of the circumstances. Specifically, Officer Carodine attempted to hand over his keys without resistance and attempted to stabilize the situation by using time, distance, and tactical positioning and calling for support. Later, once he was being pursued and threatened by an armed attacker, there was no opportunity to use de-escalation tactics, and using deadly force was justified by the threat to Officer Carodine's life. COPA further finds that Officer Carodine used deadly force as an option of last resort. COPA thus concludes by a preponderance of the evidence that Officer Carodine's use of deadly force complied with CPD policy.

CPD's stated highest priority is the sanctity of human life. In all aspects of their conduct, CPD expects that its members act with the foremost regard for the preservation of human life and the safety of all persons involved.<sup>40</sup> CPD members are only authorized to use force that is objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional, under the totality of the circumstances, to ensure the safety of a member or a third person, stop an attack, make an arrest, control a subject, or prevent escape.<sup>41</sup> This means that CPD members may use only the amount of force necessary to serve a lawful purpose. The amount and type of force used must be proportional to the threat, actions, and level of resistance a person offers.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> For a definition of COPA's standard of proof, *see* Appendix B.

<sup>40</sup> G03-02 (II)(A), De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Uses of Force (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

<sup>41</sup> G03-02 (III)(B)

<sup>42</sup> G03-02(III)(B)(3).

The use of deadly force is permitted only as a “last resort” when “necessary to protect against an imminent threat to life or to prevent great bodily harm to the member or another person.”<sup>43</sup> A CPD member may use deadly force in only two situations: (1) to prevent “death or great bodily harm from an imminent threat posed to the sworn member or to another person;” or (2) to prevent “an arrest from being defeated by resistance or escape, where the person to be arrested poses an imminent threat of death or great bodily harm to a sworn member or another person unless arrested without delay.”<sup>44</sup>

A threat is considered imminent “when it is objectively reasonable to believe that: (a) the person’s actions are immediately likely to cause death or great bodily harm to the member or others unless action is taken; **and** (b) the person has the means or instruments to cause death or great bodily harm; **and** (c) the person has the opportunity and ability to cause death or great bodily harm.”<sup>45</sup> Officers are expected to modify the use of force as circumstances change and in ways that are consistent with officer safety, including stopping the use of force when it is no longer necessary.<sup>46</sup>

Based on the review of the evidence, COPA finds that it is more likely than not that Officer Carodine’s use of deadly force was objectively reasonable in light of the imminent threat he faced. Officer Carodine reported, and video corroborated, that he fired his weapon only after the carjacker pointed the firearm towards him in a manner Officer Carodine believed was threatening to his life. Specifically, Officer Carodine noted that one of the carjackers was pursuing him and yelled at him. Officer Carodine also saw the carjacker begin to raise his weapon in a manner that Officer Carodine found threatening. It was thus objectively reasonable for Officer Carodine to believe that the carjacker’s actions were immediately likely to cause death or great bodily harm.<sup>47</sup> Additionally, COPA finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the carjacker had the means or instruments and the opportunity and ability to cause death or great bodily harm.

The evidence further indicates that Officer Carodine used only the amount of force necessary based on the circumstances he faced. Specifically, the evidence shows that he continually assessed the necessity for the use of force and employed de-escalation techniques prior to using deadly force.<sup>48</sup> When Officer Carodine first encountered the carjackers, the officer immediately engaged in verbal communication with them and attempted to surrender his car keys as demanded of him, then walked away and prepared to dial 911. It was only when one of the carjackers chased after Officer Carodine and pointed a weapon toward him that the officer resorted

---

<sup>43</sup> G03-02(IV)(C).

<sup>44</sup> G03-02(IV)(C)(1-2).

<sup>45</sup> G03-02(IV)(B) (emphasis added).

<sup>46</sup> G03-02(II)(D)(2).

<sup>47</sup> By his actions, the person met the definition of an “assailant” under CPD policy. *See* G03-02-01(IV)(C), Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

<sup>48</sup> Namely, Officer Carodine attempted to use communication, tactical positioning, and time as a tactic to de-escalate the encounter. *See* G03-02-01(III).

to the use of deadly force. In addition, Officer Carodine’s use of deadly force was proportional to the threat he faced. Officer Carodine fired his weapon only after one of the carjackers threatened him with a firearm, he fired four times, and he stopped firing once the carjackers no longer posed a threat. Based on a totality of the circumstances, COPA finds by a preponderance of the evidence that Officer Carodine’s use of deadly force complied with CPD policy.

Approved:

[Redacted Signature]

Sharday Jackson  
*Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator*

August 27, 2024

Date

[Redacted Signature]

Andrea Kersten  
*Chief Administrator*

August 27, 2024

Date

Appendix ACase Details

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Date/Time/Location of Incident: | December 17, 2023 / 10:50 pm / ██████████, Chicago, IL 60652   |
| Date/Time of COPA Notification: | December 17, 2023 / 11:44 pm   |
| Involved Member #1:             | Officer Willie Carodine, Star #11351, Employee ID #██████ Date of Appointment: September 27, 2004, Unit of Assignment: 19 <sup>th</sup> District, Male, African American |
| Involved Individual #1:         | Unknown, Male, African American  |
| Involved Individual #2:         | Unknown, Male, African American  |
| Involved Individual #3:         | Unknown, Male, African American  |

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

- G03-02, De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Uses of Force (effective June 28, 2023 to present).
- G03-02-01, Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

## Appendix B

### **Definition of COPA's Standard of Proof**

COPA applies a preponderance of the evidence standard to determine whether allegations of excessive force are warranted or well-founded.<sup>49</sup> A **preponderance of evidence** is evidence indicating that it is more likely than not that a proposition is proved.<sup>50</sup> For example, if the evidence COPA gathers in an investigation establishes that it is more likely than not that misconduct occurred, even if by a narrow margin, then the preponderance of the evidence standard is met.

---

<sup>49</sup> See Municipal Code of Chicago, §2-78-110

<sup>50</sup> *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 has been found to be more probably true than not.”).



**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