



Log # 2021-0004087

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On October 17, 2021, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an Initiation Report from the Chicago Police Department (CPD) which alleged misconduct by a member of the CPD. ██████████ alleged that on October 17, 2021, she and Officer Solomon Ing (Officer Ing) were involved in a verbal altercation, which turned physical, while in the parking garage of Officer Ing's residence.² According to ██████████ Officer Ing stopped and exited his vehicle and opened ██████████ door. He allegedly forcibly removed ██████████ from his vehicle, causing ██████████ to fall, resulting in skin abrasions from the pavement.

Based partially on ██████████ recantation of her original statement to police, conflicting statements, and a lack of witness corroboration and/or video evidence of the event, it was determined that there was insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations by a preponderance of the evidence. The allegations against Officer Ing are therefore Not Sustained.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

At approximately 9:04 am on October 17, 2021, ██████████ placed a call to 911 and reported ██████████ Officer Ing, tried to enter her apartment at ██████████, without permission, using his own key.⁴ ██████████ asked him to leave five times, but he attempted to push his way past a cabinet that was blocking the door and broke a crystal object in the process.⁵

When CPD Officer John Schumack and Sergeant Robert Podkowa responded to the call they learned that Officer Ing and ██████████ were involved in a verbal altercation that turned physical at approximately 12:00 am in the parking garage located at ██████████, the home of Officer Ing.⁶ ██████████ and Officer Ing had planned to meet at his condo when he got off

¹ 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.

² 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.

³ The following is a summary of what COPA finds most likely occurred during this incident. This summary utilized information from several different sources, including but not limited to Body Worn Camera Footage, Recorded Interviews, and various police reports.

⁴ Att. 2.

⁵ Att. 6, 05:50 minutes.

⁶ Att. 1 and 5, 09:27 minutes.

work. ██████ had a key to the condo and planned to stay with Officer Ing overnight, then go out for breakfast the next morning.

██████ first told Officer Schumack and Sergeant Podkowa that she went to Officer Ing's condo and arrived so late he started yelling at her.⁷ She met him outside of his building. After she got in his car, they drove part way up into the garage. ██████ stated that Officer Ing dragged her out of his car by her hair.⁸ She then ran out of the building and drove her own car home. ██████ told the CPD members that she suffered scratches on her "butt" as a result of the incident in the garage.⁹

██████ further told Officer Shumack that when she got to Officer Ing's condo building, he told the front desk to deny her access to his condo.¹⁰ When Officer Ing arrived, he let ██████ into his vehicle and they began to drive up into the parking lot, but the conversation got so heated Officer Ing stopped the vehicle.¹¹ Officer Ing exited the vehicle, opened her door, and dragged her out.¹² Officer Shumack asked ██████ how Officer Ing grabbed her and she responded he grabbed her by the hand and dragged her out of the vehicle by her arm.¹³ When Officer Shumack tried to clarify her earlier statement that Officer Ing dragged her by the hair, she responded that it felt like the hair was pulled too, and that she believed he grabbed both her arm and hair at the same time.¹⁴ ██████ went on to say that Officer Ing dragged her on the floor, then she got up and left.¹⁵

During her COPA interview, ██████ said that while out with her friends, she drank a significant amount of alcohol that evening, which was more than usual.¹⁶ When the party was over, she went to Officer Ing's condo and the doorman on duty did not know her because he was on the night shift and called Officer Ing for permission to let her enter. He denied permission and ██████ became angry, called Officer Ing, and began swearing and yelling at him over the phone.¹⁷ When Officer Ing arrived at the building, ██████ stood in front of Officer Ing's car, prompting Officer Ing to let her in.¹⁸ Officer Ing offered his hand and said, "Peace," at which time ██████ expressed anger over not being granted permission to enter the condo.¹⁹ After yelling and cursing at Officer Ing some more, Officer Ing parked the car in a space between the 6th and 7th floors, which was on an angle, and repeatedly asked ██████ to leave the vehicle.²⁰ ██████

⁷ Att. 6, 04:06 minutes.

⁸ Att. 6, 04:40 minutes.

⁹ Att. 6, 05:50 minutes.

¹⁰ Att. 5, 09:30 minutes.

¹¹ Att. 5, 09:50 minutes.

¹² Att. 5, 10:00 minutes.

¹³ Att. 5, 10:18 minutes.

¹⁴ Att. 5, 10:38 minutes.

¹⁵ Att. 5, 11:03 minutes.

¹⁶ Att. 4, 30:45 minutes.

¹⁷ Att. 4, 09:35 minutes.

¹⁸ Att. 4, 10:40 minutes.

¹⁹ Att. 4, 11:45 minutes.

²⁰ Att. 4, 12:55 minutes.

said no, because she did not know what to do, she was drunk, angry, and did not want to go home.²¹ Officer Ing then exited the vehicle, walked around to the passenger side door, and pulled ██████ out of the vehicle. She also mentioned again this time that Officer Ing grabbed her hair when he grabbed her shoulder. ██████ said that Officer Ing then let her go, at which time she fell backward because of the angle of the floor, her momentum, and her heels slipping on the garage floor. ██████ explained that Officer Ing did not pull her that hard.²² When she slipped, she ended up sliding down the garage floor, which is when she received the scratches.²³ ██████ also mentioned that she hit her head.²⁴

██████ went on to explain that when she lived in Poland, she was a victim of domestic violence perpetrated by her ██████ so when she fell, she became very afraid she was going to be hit and covered her head.²⁵ Officer Ing tried to help ██████ up and hug her, but because she was in a panic, she felt he was trying to attack her and she ran away and went home.²⁶ When she got there she moved a cabinet in front of her door in case Officer Ing came and tried to get in. She was still in shock and in a state of being “scared and horrified.” ██████ believed she was dragged. However, she did not remember everything until the following Monday, after she finally spoke with Officer Ing. Over the phone, while they were both calm, he reminded her about the things she said. It was then she realized she made a mistake when she accused him of dragging her because he was too far away from her at the time to have done so, and she made a mistake filing the report.²⁷ Officer Ing at some point asked ██████ if she remembered certain things, and then walked her through how he experienced the event, after which she claimed to remember everything.²⁸

During his interview, Officer Ing told COPA that on the date in question, he and ██████ had plans to meet when he got off work. ██████ had gone out with friends, and she called Officer Ing when the gathering was over. Because she sounded drunk on the phone, Officer Ing told her to stay home, and said they would meet another day. According to Officer Ing, ██████ did not like that, so she showed up at his condo building and blocked the entrance to the garage door when he pulled up. At that point Officer Ing told ██████ to get into his vehicle so she wouldn't make a scene. ██████ got in and they drove up six flights. At that point she was not being “peaceful,” so he asked her to leave. Officer Ing then parked the vehicle on an incline. He exited the vehicle, opened ██████ door and guided her out as best he could. ██████ then fell on the garage floor and for some reason believed that Officer Ing had dragged her. Then she left. Officer Ing tried to catch ██████ when she fell but was unable to because it happened so fast.²⁹

²¹ Att. 4, 15:15 minutes.

²² Att. 4, 15:24 minutes.

²³ Att. 4, 17:45 minutes.

²⁴ Att. 12, Pg. 90, Lns. 3-15.

²⁵ Att. 4, 17:00 minutes.

²⁶ Att. 4, 21:33 minutes.

²⁷ Att. 4, t 26:00-30:49 minutes.

²⁸ Att. 4, 31:25 minutes.

²⁹ Att. 8, 06:49-08:36 minutes.

When asked what he meant when he said he “guided” ██████ out of the vehicle, Officer Ing responded by saying that as she got out of the vehicle, he just put his hands up near her back, close to her armpits, in case she fell backward. Officer Ing explained that when ██████ hit the ground, she believed she was being dragged, but the feeling was actually from the incline of the garage floor and the heels she wore that night. Officer Ing said he did not drag ██████ and neither made contact with nor pulled her hair with his hands.³⁰ According to Officer Ing, ██████ landed on her “butt” when she fell, was possibly on her back for a brief moment, and then she got up on her own and left.³¹

Officer Ing stated that he went to ██████ apartment the next morning. He described the interaction in more or less the same way as ██████ and described her demeanor as aggressive. Officer Ing left when ██████ said she was going to call the police.³² Officer Ing learned ██████ did, in fact, call the police when he saw the case report a few days later while inside ██████ residence. He told her it was a very serious matter. At that point ██████ said she would take care of it and went to a police district to see if she could retract the report.³³ Officer Ing also told ██████ about all the consequences the report would cause, and she offered to help with his mortgage payments if necessary if he were to be suspended.³⁴

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Solomon Ing:

It is alleged that on or about October 17, 2021, at approximately 1:00 am, at or near ██████, Police Officer Solomon Ing committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by:

1. Forcibly removing ██████ from your vehicle, without justification.
 - **Not Sustained**
2. Pulling ██████ hair, without justification.
 - **Not Sustained**
3. Dragging ██████ on the ground, without justification.
 - **Not Sustained**

³⁰ Att. 8, 16:00 minutes.

³¹ Att. 8, 19:15 minutes.

³² Att. 8, 20:33 minutes.

³³ Att. 8, 21:40 minutes.

³⁴ Att. 8, 33:24 minutes.

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 then accurately recall the event from memory.

COPA finds that the account given by ██████████ was somewhat unreliable for several reasons. First, she admitted she consumed an unusually large amount of alcohol just prior to the event and went so far as to characterize herself as "drunk." Second, she stated that she did not recall everything until the following Monday when she finally spoke with Officer Ing. She told COPA that she remembered more about the evening only after speaking with Officer Ing, who "reminded her of the things she said" and then gave her his account of what happened. When Officer Ing disclosed that ██████████ offered to help him with his rent if it became necessary seemed to signal that the status of the relationship with Officer Ing may have also exerted undue pressure on her to see things his way. And it is reasonable to consider that someone who has suffered long term domestic abuse as a young person may have difficulty fully processing this experience easily or quickly and may even be left open to "suggestion" to fill in any blanks in memory.

Even though Officer Ing was in a better position to recall the events more clearly, there is not enough evidence to either completely discount ██████████ earliest recollections of the incident or elevate Officer Ing's account to meet the preponderance of the evidence standard. The fact that he discussed this matter with ██████████ who was possibly still in a weakened and suggestible state, in a manner that served his own best interests, reduced the reliability of his account of the incident as well.

V. ANALYSIS³⁵

COPA finds Allegations #1-3 against Officer Ing, in that he committed misconduct by forcibly removing ██████████ from his vehicle, without justification, by pulling ██████████ hair, without justification, and by dragging ██████████ on the ground, without justification, to be **not sustained** by the evidence.

Although ██████████ did sustain a physical injury in the form of scratches on her backside,³⁶ her explanation of how she obtained the injuries varied. In her initial statement to the police, ██████████ stated that Officer Ing forcibly pulled her out of the car by her hair and then dragged her on the ground. However, she also told the responding officers that Officer Ing pulled her out of the car by her hand, that she felt like her hair was pulled, and that she believed Officer Ing grabbed both her arm and hair at the same time. In her statement to COPA, however, she indicated that Officer Ing grabbed her hair when he grabbed her shoulder and that he did not pull her that hard

³⁵ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

³⁶ Att. 7.

Appendix ACase Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	October 17, 2021/00:01:00/ [REDACTED].
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	October 17, 2021/10:34:43
Involved Member #1:	Solomon Ing, star # 4117, employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment December 17, 2018, Unit of Assignment 008, Male, API.
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Female, White.

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

- Not applicable for this investigation.

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.³⁷ 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.”³⁸

³⁷ 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).

³⁸ *People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036, ¶ 28 (quoting Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions, Criminal, No. 4.19 (4th 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