



Log # 2023-0912

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

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On March 3, 2023, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an Initiation Report<sup>2</sup> from Sergeant David Dubois alleging misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). ██████████ alleged that on March 3, 2023, Police Officer Ivan Sanford pulled her hair, placed his hands around her neck and choked her causing her pain, and was verbally abusive.<sup>4</sup> Upon review of the evidence, COPA served additional allegations that Officer Sanford called and/or referred to ██████████ as an animal, failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR), placed hands at or near ██████████ neck area without justification, grabbed ██████████ by her hair without justification, and referred to unidentified individuals on scene as “wild ass motherfuckers,” “dumb goofy ass broad,” “ignorant motherfuckers,” and/or “bitch.”<sup>5</sup> Following its investigation, COPA reached Sustained findings regarding all allegations against Sanford.

### II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE<sup>6</sup>

On March 3, 2023, at approximately 6:00 pm, Officers Sanford and Julian Yu responded to a disturbance at or near ██████████.<sup>7</sup> Upon arriving on the scene, both officers encountered ██████████ and ██████████ who were actively in an argument. During the argument, ██████████ exited the house to defend ██████████ when ██████████ spat at him.<sup>9</sup> ██████████ reached into her back pocket and pulled out what appeared to be a small can of mace. At this time, Officer Sanford grabbed ██████████ hands and her upper neck area to separate her from the physical altercation with ██████████<sup>10</sup> Officer Yu called for another car due to officers being outnumbered and ██████████ having mace. Officer Sanford started to escort ██████████

---

<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> Att. 1.

<sup>4</sup> One or more of these allegations fall within COPA’s jurisdiction pursuant to Chicago Municipal Code § 2-78-120. Therefore, COPA determined it would be the primary investigative agency in this matter.

<sup>5</sup> Att. 29.

<sup>6</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 body worn camera (BWC) footage, case and arrest reports, and interviews.

<sup>7</sup> At the time of this incident, Officer Sanford was a Field Training Officer (FTO), and Officer Yu was a Probationary Police Officer completing field training cycles.

<sup>8</sup> Attempts to interview ██████████ were unsuccessful, CO-1336407. Final Summary Report | Version 1.0 | 02012023

<sup>9</sup> Att. 3, Officer Sanford’s BWC, at 09:20.

<sup>10</sup> Att. 3 at 09:29.

away and spoke to her while holding on to the back of her neck area and/or hair.<sup>11</sup> As Officer Sanford spoke to ██████████ he told her she was acting like an “animal.”<sup>12</sup> When ██████████ was secured in the patrol vehicle, Officer Sanford referred to individuals on the scene as “wild as motherfuckers,” “dumb goofy broad,” “ignorant motherfuckers,” and/or “bitch.”<sup>13</sup> Officer Yu started collecting ██████████ belongings and placed them in the trunk. Officer Sanford approached Officer Yu and told him, “Don’t get on the fucking air calling for people. We don’t need them.”<sup>14</sup> Officer Sanford berated Officer Yu for requesting additional units to the scene.<sup>15</sup> ██████████ was released<sup>16</sup> and went to Holy Cross Hospital for treatment.<sup>17</sup>

During Officer Yu’s statement,<sup>18</sup> he said he did not remember Officer Sanford saying anything to the individuals on the scene. When ██████████ pulled out the mace, Officer Yu said he saw Officer Sanford go towards ██████████ to gain control of her out of his peripheral vision. Officer Yu said he did not have a good view of Officer Sanford because he was gaining control of ██████████ and was not looking toward Officer Sanford and ██████████. Officer Yu was under the impression that Officer Sanford was using control tactics. Officer Yu said he did not hear any conversations between Officer Sanford and ██████████. Officer Yu did not recall if ██████████ complained about any pain during transport, but she complained about the entire incident. Officer Yu stated that he called for backup when he noticed ██████████ pulled out a can of mace. Officer Sanford told Officer Yu, “Don’t get on the fucking air calling for backup.” Officer Yu stated he called for additional assistance because he was taught that there was an advantage in numbers, and he did not want to fight the male alone. Officer Yu stated that since moving on to another trainer, he has hesitated to call for backup because of his experience with Officer Sanford. Officer Yu said he and Officer Sanford are not friends, and he would not like to work with him again, and he would not call him if he ever needed help.

During Officer Sanford’s statement,<sup>19</sup> he described ██████████ as an assailant due to her hostile demeanor and her having a can of mace.<sup>20</sup> When ██████████ pulled out the mace to spray ██████████, Officer Sanford said he forcefully grabbed her, pushing her away from the incident with ██████████.<sup>21</sup> Officer Sanford said he grabbed ██████████ on the back side of her puffy coat, which

---

<sup>11</sup> Att. 2, Officer Yu’s BWC, at 5:24; Att. 2, at 09:51, ██████████ asked Officer Sanford why he was grabbing her hair.

<sup>12</sup> Att. 3 at 09:48.

<sup>13</sup> Att. 3 from 11:04 to 13:30.

<sup>14</sup> Att. 3 at 10:42 and 11:21.

<sup>15</sup> Att. 3 from 10:42 to 13:00.

<sup>16</sup> Att. 16, Original Case Incident Report, Officers Sanford and Yu documented the incident with ██████████ and ██████████ in a Case Report.

<sup>17</sup> Att. 36, ██████████ told hospital staff that she was hit in her head, choked, and her hair was pulled. She also complained of pain to her head, neck, right posterior shoulder, left upper arm, low back and swelling to her head/forehead (pg 12).

<sup>18</sup> Att. 6 & 24, Audio Statements.

<sup>19</sup> Att. 24, Audio Statement; Att. 32, Audio Transcripts.

<sup>20</sup> Att. 32, pg. 24, ln. 9.

<sup>21</sup> Att. 32, pg. 7, ln. 4.

he possibly could have grabbed [REDACTED] hair.<sup>22</sup> The second time Officer Sanford grabbed [REDACTED] he said it was in the upper chest area because she was still resisting. Officer Sanford said [REDACTED] was acting like an animal because she was resisting and continued to be hostile until he placed her into his patrol vehicle.<sup>23</sup> Officer Sanford said the profanity he used on the scene was not directed towards the civilians on the scene, but he was upset and was speaking to his fellow officers. Officer Sanford said he did not believe anyone other than the officers heard him. Officer Sanford said the language he used on the scene was not appropriate.<sup>24</sup> Officer Sanford stated that during the incident, he placed his hands in [REDACTED] upper neck area to quickly separate her from attempting to attack [REDACTED]. Officer Sanford said he did not complete a Tactical Response Report because he did not use mechanical strikes, knee strikes, stuns, fists, or open-hand strikes.<sup>25</sup> Officer Sanford said [REDACTED] only complained about injuries that happened inside the house from the physical altercation. Sanford said when he told Officer Yu, “Don’t get on the air calling for fucking backup,” he was still upset.<sup>26</sup>

### III. ALLEGATIONS

#### **Officer Ivan Sanford:**

1. Called and/or referred to [REDACTED] as an “animal.”
  - Sustained in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.
2. Failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR).
  - Sustained in the violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.
3. Placed your hands at or near [REDACTED] neck area, without justification.
  - Sustained in the violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.
4. Grabbed [REDACTED] by her hair, without justification.
  - Sustained in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.
5. Referred to individuals on the scene as “wild ass motherfuckers,” “dumb goofy ass broad,” “ignorant motherfuckers,” and/or “bitch.”
  - Sustained in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

### IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

This investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to doubt the credibility of any individuals who provided statements.

---

<sup>22</sup> Att. 32, pg. 8, ln. 5.

<sup>23</sup> Att. 32, pg. 8, lns. 7 to 18.

<sup>24</sup> Att. 32, pg. 13, ln. 7.

<sup>25</sup> Att. 32, pg. 15, ln. 11.

<sup>26</sup> Att. 32, pg. 18, lns. 4 to 8.

## V. ANALYSIS<sup>27</sup>

### a. Verbal Abuse

COPA finds that Allegations #1 and #5 against Officer Sanford, in that he called and/or referred to ██████████ as an “animal” and referred to other parties on the scene as “wild ass motherfuckers,” “dumb goofy ass broad,” “ignorant motherfuckers,” and “bitch,” **Sustained**. CPD Rules 8 and 9 prohibit members from engaging in unjustified verbal altercations and/or maltreating or disrespecting any person.<sup>28</sup> Additionally, CPD policy mandates that all “members treat all persons with courtesy and dignity which is inherently due every person as a human being. Department members will act, speak, and conduct themselves in a professional manner ... and maintain a courteous attitude in all contacts with the public.”<sup>29</sup> The policy also states that members “will not exhibit a condescending attitude or direct any derogatory terms toward any person in any manner.”<sup>30</sup> Failure to follow this directive violates CPD Rules 2, 3, and 6.<sup>31</sup> Here, it is undisputed that Officer Sanford hurled insults at ██████████ and made disparaging remarks about other citizens on the scene. Officer Sanford’s verbal abuse violated CPD policy and Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

### b. Use of Force and TRR

COPA finds that Allegations #3 and 4 against Officer Sanford, that he placed his hand at or near ██████████ neck and grabbed ██████████ by the hair without justification, **Sustained**. CPD members are permitted to use force to overcome resistance.<sup>32</sup> When a member encounters a citizen who is using or threatening the use of force against another person or themselves which is likely to cause injury, that citizen is an assailant.<sup>33</sup> If the citizen’s actions are aggressively offensive with or without weapons,<sup>34</sup> members are permitted to respond with presence; verbal directions; holding and compliance techniques; control instruments; deployment of oleoresin capsicum; stunning; takedowns; canine use; taser deployment; direct mechanical strikes; and impact weapons and munitions.<sup>35</sup> Additionally, when members encounter a citizen who fails to comply with verbal or other directions, that citizen is a passive resister.<sup>36</sup> Members are permitted to respond to passive resistance with presence; verbal directions; holding and compliance techniques; control instruments; and deployment of oleoresin capsicum.<sup>37</sup> However, CPD policy does not permit the

<sup>27</sup> For a definition of COPA’s findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

<sup>28</sup> Section V., Rules 8 and 9 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

<sup>29</sup> Att. 30, G02-01 III (B), Human Rights and Resources (effective June 30, 2022 to current); Att. 33, G02-04 II (C), Prohibition Regarding Racial Profiling and Other Bias Based Policing (effective February 1, 2023 to current).

<sup>30</sup> Att. 30, G02-01 III(D).

<sup>31</sup> Section V., Rules 2, 3, and 6 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

<sup>32</sup> Att. 35, G03-02-01 generally.

<sup>33</sup> Att. 34, G03-02-01 IV(C), Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective April 15, 2021 to June 28, 2023).

<sup>34</sup> The weapons can include a deadly weapon, but the citizen’s actions did not constitute an imminent threat death or great bodily harm.

<sup>35</sup> Att. 34, G03-02-01 IV(C)(1).

<sup>36</sup> Att. 34, G03-02-01 IV(B)(1).

<sup>37</sup> Att. 34, G03-02-01 IV(B)(1)(a-d).

grabbing or pulling of hair, and/or application of pressure to the neck, unless it is in response to deadly force.

Here, [REDACTED] initially presented as an assailant, as she attempted to deploy a chemical agent at other citizens on the scene. These actions permitted Officer Sanford to use force to overcome [REDACTED] actions. However, the force Officer Sanford used was to first grab [REDACTED] by her neck and hair.<sup>38</sup> Additionally, as Officer Sanford escorted [REDACTED] to the CPD vehicle, he continued to grab and hold onto the back of [REDACTED] neck and hair.<sup>39</sup> Both of these actions occurred while Officer Sanford hurled insults at [REDACTED] and she was no longer a threat. While it is reasonable for Officer Sanford to initially use force to separate [REDACTED] from the other citizens on the scene, he continued to apply the same force to [REDACTED] who was a passive resister, which was not reasonable and did not comply with CPD policy. Therefore, Officer Sanford's use of force violated CPD policy and Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

COPA finds that Allegation #2 against Officer Sanford, that he failed to complete a TRR, **Sustained**. CPD members are required to complete a TRR detailing force used when the use of force involves a subject who is injured or alleges injury; is an active resister; actively obstructs a member by using a physical act directed at the member; physically attacks a member, to include murder, and aggravated battery or battery.<sup>41</sup> Here, by his own admission, Officer Sanford classified [REDACTED] as an assailant when he first engaged in the use of force. This alone required Officer Sanford to complete a TRR. Additionally, Officer Sanford's use of force, specifically grabbing the neck,<sup>42</sup> would have required him to complete a TRR independent of his classification of [REDACTED] as an assailant.

## VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

### a. Officer Ivan Sanford

#### i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History<sup>45</sup>

Officer Sandford has received 50 various awards. Additionally, in 2023, Officer Sanford received a SPAR for neglect of duty and received 2-days off.

#### ii. Recommended Discipline

Here, COPA has found that while serving as a Field Training Officer (FTO) and actively training a Probationary Police Officer (PPO), Officer Sanford engaged in excessive force while overcoming [REDACTED] resistance and hurled racially inappropriate language at [REDACTED]

<sup>38</sup> See Att. 28.

<sup>39</sup> See Atts. 26 and 27.

<sup>41</sup> Att. 31, G03-02-02 III (A)(1)(a-e), Incidents Requiring the Completion of a Tactical Response Report (effective April 15, 2021 to June 28, 2023).

<sup>42</sup> CPD policy prohibits this action unless deadly force is permitted.

<sup>45</sup> Att. 37.

while also disparaging other citizens. Further, COPA notes that after Officer Yu made the reasonable request for assistance, Officer Sanford admonished him while using profanities. Officer Yu also informed COPA that in the future, he would not like to work with Officer Sanford, nor would Officer Yu request assistance from Officer Sanford. Given Officer Sanford's history combined with the above, COPA recommends that Officer Sanford be re-evaluated as an FTO and be suspended for **15-days**.

Approved:



LaKenya White  
*Director of Investigations*

2-28-24

---

Date

**Appendix A**

**Case Details**

---

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	March 3, 2023/ 06:00p.m./ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	March 3, 2023 / 10:36 pm
Involved Member #1:	Ivan Sanford, star #9204, employee ID# [REDACTED] DOA: May 19, 2008, 002 District, Black, Male
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Black/Female

**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.

**Applicable Policies and Laws**

---

- G02-01: Protection of Human Rights (effective June 30, 2022, to present).<sup>46</sup>
- G02-04: Prohibitions Regarding Racial Profiling and Other Bias-Based Policing (effective February 1, 2023 to current).<sup>47</sup>
- G03-02: De-Escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force (effective April 15, 2021 to June 28, 2023).<sup>48</sup>
- G03-02-01: Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective April 15, 2021, to June 28, 2023).<sup>49</sup>
- G03-02-02: Incidents Requiring the Completion of a Tactical Response Report (effective June 28, 2023, to present).<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Att. 30.  
<sup>47</sup> Att. 33.  
<sup>48</sup> Att. 34.  
<sup>49</sup> Att. 35.  
<sup>50</sup> Att. 31.

## 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>51</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>52</sup>

---

<sup>51</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>52</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