



Log # 2023-0454

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On February 01, 2023, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a telephone call from Complainant, ██████████ reporting alleged misconduct by members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). ██████████ alleged that on February 01, 2023, Officers Adam Wallace, star #14953 and Clifford Hall, star #12115, detained and searched him and/or his personal property without justification, handcuffed him without justification, and pushed him against a gate without justification.² Following its investigation, COPA did not reach sustained findings regarding the allegations against Officers Wallace and Hall.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

On February 01, 2023, at approximately 1:15 pm, Officers Wallace and Hall (collectively “the officers”) assigned to Unit 189 Narcotics Division, were tasked with assisting in a Federal Investigation in obtaining an identification of ██████████⁴ ██████████ was the target of an undercover narcotics investigation.⁵ Officers surveilling the area observed ██████████ get off a Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) bus and cross the street toward his apartment building at ██████████ ██████████.⁶ Officers Wallace and Hall were nearby and immediately drove to the front of the building. The officers stopped, exited their vehicle, and approached ██████████⁷ Officer Wallace grabbed ██████████ right arm and escorted him to the gate.⁸ According to ██████████ Officer Wallace

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 ██████████ statement to COPA, BWC footage, POD video, third-party video, department reports, and Officers Wallace and Hall’s statements to COPA.

⁴ Att. 18, Pgs. 35-36. Officer Wallace and Hall were assisting an active on-going federal investigation involving ██████████ COPA attempted to schedule the statements of the officers from December 2023 to May 2024. The officers did not want to provide statements because of the federal investigation. *Refer* to Column notes for specific details.

⁵ Att. 18, Pgs. 8-10. Undercover officers from Unit 189 were tracking ██████████ cell phone by GPS. Officers Wallace and Hall were provided a physical description of ██████████ and were only tasked with obtaining his identification.

⁶ Att. 11 at 1:09: 44 pm to 1:10:34 pm-POD video (6665W) located at 2900 S. Michigan Avenue.

⁷ Atts. 11 and 12 at 0:18-third-party video from South Commons Condominiums and attachment 16-BWC of PO Hall at 2:00. Officer Wallace stated that he used a ruse to have a conversation with ██████████ (att. 18, Pg. 16).

⁸ Att. 11 at 1:10:49.

“threw” him against the gate for no reason.⁹ █████ became agitated and argumentative with the officers because he felt that they had no reason to stop and detain him.¹⁰

Officer Wallace attempted to speak with █████ but he kept yelling loudly. Officer Wallace then handcuffed █████ because he was moving around anxiously, creating a scene, and the officers did not know if he was armed since he was a security guard.¹¹ █████ gave the officers verbal consent to search his backpack and pants pockets.¹² Officer Hall located █████ identification card in his pants pocket and went to the squad car to run █████ name in the Portable Data Terminal (PDT) system.¹³ Officer Wallace conducted a pat down for weapons and looked inside █████ bookbag.¹⁴ Officer Hall returned to his partner and █████ requested Officer Wallace’s name and badge number, and Officer Wallace provided the information.¹⁵ Officer Hall informed Officer Wallace that █████ name came back clear, and that █████ lived at that address. Officer Wallace then removed the handcuffs.¹⁶ The Officers provided █████ with their names and badge numbers and left the area.¹⁷

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officers Adam Wallace and Clifford Hall:

1. Stopped and detained █████ without justification.
 - Exonerated
2. Searched █████ coat and/or bookbag without justification.
 - Exonerated
3. Failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Receipt (ISR) for █████
 - Unfounded

Additional allegations against Officer Wallace:

4. Pushed █████ against a fence without justification.
 - Unfounded

⁹ Att. 4 at 2:06 and 5:49. COPA statement of █████ The BWC of PO Hall, att. 16 at 2:04, contradicts █████ accusation. PO Wallace denied pushing █████ against the fence (att. 18, Pgs. 26-27).

¹⁰ Att. 16 beginning at 2:08.

¹¹ Att. 18, Pg. 22 and Pg. 21, Pgs. 12-13.

¹² Att. 16, from 2:41 to 3:49 (video depicts █████ irate and calling Officer Wallace profanities) and att. 18, Pgs. 27-29.

¹³ Att. 18 at 3:58 to 5:59. Video from South Commons Condominiums.

¹⁴ Att. 12 from 2:04 to 4:23. South Commons video.

¹⁵ Att. 18 at 6:02

¹⁶ Att. 18, from, 6:11 to 6:28.

¹⁷ Att. 18, from 7:32 to 8:18. Officer Wallace completed an Investigatory Stop Receipt (ISR) for █████ and inventoried the physical copy (att. 15).

5. Handcuffed ██████ without justification.
 - Exonerated

IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

This investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to question the credibility of ██████ or Officers Wallace and Hall. At the time of the incident, ██████ was unaware that he was the subject of a narcotics investigation. The officers' accounts were corroborated by the video and therefore reliable.

V. ANALYSIS¹⁸

COPA finds that the Allegations 1, 2, and 5 against Officer Wallace and Allegations #1 to #2 against Officer Hall that they detained, searched, and handcuffed ██████ without justification are **Exonerated**. While ██████ believed Officers Wallace and Hall stopped and detained him for no reason, the officers were tasked with assisting in an active federal investigation. ██████ cell phone was being tracked by the surveillance team, who notified Officers Wallace and Hall of his location.¹⁹ Officers Wallace and Hall were tasked with obtaining ██████ name and home address. The officers used a ruse to speak with ██████ because they did not want to alert him and/or divulge information about the investigation.²⁰ Officers Wallace and Hall stated that they knew ██████ worked as a security guard, but they did not know if he was an armed guard. When Officers Wallace and Hall approached ██████ he immediately became irate. ██████ behavior coupled with the officers' uncertainty if ██████ was armed, resulted in Officer Wallace handcuffing ██████ for their safety.²¹ Officers Wallace and Hall stated that they searched ██████ backpack and pockets after ██████ gave them consent.²² The officers released ██████ after his name came back clear in the PDT system. For these reasons, COPA found that Officers Wallace and Hall did not violate CPD policy. Therefore, Allegations 1, 2, and 5 are **Exonerated**.

COPA finds that the **Allegations 3 and 4** against **Officer Wallace** that he pushed ██████ against a fence and failed to complete a ISR and **Allegation 3** against **Officer Hall** that he failed to complete an ISR are **Unfounded**. The BWC of Officer Hall clearly contradicted ██████ account that Officer Wallace pushed him against the fence. Rather, the video shows Officer Wallace's hand behind ██████ back while Officer Wallace escorted him to the fence.²³ At no point, does Officer Wallace push ██████ against the fence. Therefore, COPA finds Allegation 4 is **Unfounded**.

COPA finds Allegation 3 is similarly **Unfounded**. COPA served this allegation after a search for an ISR turned up negative results. However, during his statement to COPA, Officer

¹⁸ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

¹⁹ Att. 21, Pgs. 27 and 28.

²⁰ Att. 18, Pgs. 8-10

²¹ Att. 18, Pgs. 21 and 22. Pgs. 12-13. Att. 21, Pgs. 21 and 22.

²² Att. 16, from 2:41 to 3:49 and Att. 18, Pgs., 27 to 29.

²³ Att. 16, from 2:05 to 2:12.

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	February 01, 2023/1:15 pm/ [REDACTED]
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	February 01, 2023/2:00 pm
Involved Member #1:	Adam Wallace, star #14953, Emp ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: July 31, 2006, Unit of Assignment: 189, male, white.
Involved Member #2:	Clifford Hall, star #12115, Emp ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: September 27, 2004, Unit of Assignment: 189, male, white.
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] male, black.

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]*

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.²⁶ 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.”²⁷

²⁶ 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).

²⁷ *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