



## **CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD**

January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2026

### **MEETING MINUTES**

#### **CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS**

Brandon Brown, Chair  
Kenneth Mountcastle, Vice Chair  
Diana Cyganovich  
David Gatian  
Chenoa Miller  
Edwin Moore  
Glenn Parker III  
Billy Sharp

#### **OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS**

Kristen Traxler, Interim Administrator  
Jessyca Watson, Interim General Manager  
Art Bowker, Investigator  
Adam Eisen, Investigator  
Hamza Khabir, Investigator  
James Ouk, Investigator

#### **LEGAL COUNSEL**

Michael Hess, Asst. Director of Law  
Dalya Oprian, Asst. Director of Law

---

### **MEETING AGENDA**

- I. **Call to Order (00:12 -01:36)** **Brandon Brown, Chair**
1. Chair Brown called January 13<sup>th</sup> CPRB meeting to order at 9:01 am EST.
  2. Roll Call
    - a. Members Waverly Willis had an excused absence.
    - b. Member Miller nor Member Moore were present of roll call.
    - c. Member Miller entered the meeting @ 9:13 am EST, due to log on issues.
    - d. Member Moore entered the meeting @ 9:37 am EST due to a confusion of whether this the CRPB meeting was in person or virtually.
    - e. A quorum was present
  3. OPS Interim Administrator Kristen Traxler was present for meeting but was having connection issues that affect her ability to use her microphone and camera. Until Admin Traxler could fix her connection issues; General Manager Watson took over the Presentation of Investigations, and OPS Status Report.
  4. OPS Investigator Khabir entered the meeting @ 9:53 am EST.
- II. **Approval of Minutes (01:37 – 03:49)** **CPRB**
1. **December 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes – City Hall**

**Motion:** Approve December 9<sup>th</sup>, 2025 CPRB Meeting Minutes  
Motion By: Member Sharp



Second By: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Status: Carried

Abstention:

Member Gatian – Was not present at CPRB meeting

Member Cyganovich – Was not present at CPRB meeting

## **2. December 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting Minutes – Special Virtual**

**Motion:** Approve December 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2025 CPRB Meeting Minutes

Motion By: Member Sharp

Second By: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Status: Carried

### **III. Public Comment (03:50 – 04:02)**

**Brandon Brown, Chair**

1. No individuals were present for Public Comment

### **IV. Presentation of Investigations with Citizen Or CDP Subject Employee Present**

**Jessyca Watson**

Interim General Manager

1. No individuals were present for Public Comment

### **V. Presentation of Investigations**

**Jessyca Watson**

Interim General Manager

**OPS2022-0192**

**Timestamp: 05:15 – 16:52**

**Complainant: Matthew McGrath**

**Presented by: Lampkin**

**P.O. Lawrence Smith, #882**

**Allegation A: Biased Policing**

**Summary of Case Presentation:** On August 5, 2022, Mr. McGrath alleged biased policing by Officer Lawrence Smith #882 during a dispute at the residence of Ms. Diamond Willis. Mr. McGrath claimed that Officer Smith made a prejudicial remark by stating “I know you” and further telling Ms. Willis that Mr. McGrath’s family was fraudulent. Officer Smith denied any biased intent, explaining that his comment was not meant to disparage Mr. McGrath and that he expressed sympathy toward Ms. Willis because she was close in age to his daughter. The investigation reviewed the facts against applicable rules, including requirements to treat all parties with dignity, respect, and equality under the Cleveland Division of Police policies.

OPS initially recommended a Sustained finding for biased policing, concluding that the preponderance of evidence supported Mr. McGrath’s allegation. However, in a subsequent



addendum dated January 7, 2026, OPS clarified that Officer Smith’s conduct aligned with the Division’s General Police Orders on bias-free policing. The addendum emphasized that Officer Smith addressed both parties’ concerns and de-escalated the situation in a fair and professional manner. Accordingly, OPS revised its recommendation to Unfounded, determining that the officer’s actions did not constitute biased policing under the governing standards.

**Board Discussion Summary:** Member Sharp clarified that while the officer did state “I know who you are,” the more inflammatory comment about the complainant’s family being fraudulent was not made by the officer but by the complainant’s associate’s mother over a phone call. Sharp emphasized that this distinction was important to avoid attributing statements incorrectly, and Member Cyganovich agreed that this clarification addressed the key issue.

Other members raised procedural questions regarding why the OPS report shifted from an initial recommendation of “Unfounded” to “Sustained” and then back to “Unfounded” in the addendum. The explanation provided was that the case was reconsidered after review of the officer’s remark comparing the complainant’s situation to his own daughter, but ultimately the definition of bias policing under the General Police Orders was applied strictly, leading to the final “Unfounded” recommendation.

The Board emphasized the importance of distinguishing bias policing, which requires evidence of demographic discrimination and carries a presumption of termination if sustained, from unprofessional conduct, which may involve partiality or inappropriate remarks but does not meet the threshold of bias policing. Members agreed that while the officer’s conduct might raise questions of professionalism, it did not constitute bias policing as defined, and they stressed the need for clarity in the record to explain the change in recommendations for transparency.

### Case Findings:

**Allegation A:** Biased Policing (Manual Rules 5.01, GPO 1.07.08)

**OPS Recommendation:** Unfounded

**CPRB Decision:** Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>P.O. Lawrence Smith, #882</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, WCS footage and written documentation supports the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Gatian Motion Status: Carried

---

**OPS2023-0222**

**Timestamp: 16:32 – 30:22**

**Complainant: Torrean Williams**

**Presented by: Eisen**



## **Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service**

**Sgt. Mark Bickerstaff, #9001**  
**Det. Cassandra Grace, #229**  
**Dispatcher Makeba Greer, #111**  
**P.O. Carlos Munguia, #1813**

**P.O. Robert Langley, #1930**  
**Sgt. Albert Oliver, #9220**  
**P.O. Diovanni Smith, #285**

**Summary of Case Presentation:** On September 11 and September 14, 2023, Mr. Torrean Williams alleged a lack of service against multiple officers and one dispatcher after seeking a stolen property report but receiving lost property reports instead. He reported that his bag was stolen at Harbor Light, but staff refused to show him surveillance footage, and when he later contacted Cleveland Police, Officer Robert Langley, and #1930 documented the items as “lost” rather than stolen. Mr. Williams also stated he wished to file three separate reports, but officers combined them into one report under case number 2023-284210. He further alleged that Sgt. Albert Oliver, #9220 refused to take his complaint for assault and criminal damaging, and that Officer Harvey, #225 issued him an accident report number instead of an assault report. Additional incidents included the theft of his wallet at Charley Biggs Chicken, which was again recorded as “lost” property, a 911 call on September 16, 2023 regarding a blinking red light at a gas station that received no police response, and an assault at 2100 Lakeside Avenue where he was transported to University Hospital but never received follow-up from a detective.

OPS reviewed these allegations against P.O. Langley, P.O. Diovanni Smith, #285, Det. Cassandra Grace, #229, Sgt. Oliver, P.O. Carlos Munguia, #1813, and Dispatcher Makeba Greer, #111. The investigation determined that P.O. Langley had no direct interaction with Mr. Williams, leading to a finding of Unfounded. Allegations against P.O. Smith, Det. Grace, and P.O. Munguia were found Exonerated, as each officer documented reports consistent with CDP Manual Rule 4.18 despite Mr. Williams’ dissatisfaction with the categorization of incidents. Sgt. Oliver’s involvement was limited to reviewing a supplemental report, resulting in a finding of Unfounded. Dispatcher Greer’s handling of Mr. Williams’ call was deemed appropriate given the volume of higher-priority calls, leading to a finding of Exonerated under Manual Rule 5.01. Overall, OPS concluded that while Mr. Williams experienced frustration with how his complaints were categorized and processed, the officers and dispatcher acted within Division rules and procedures, and no violations of policy were substantiated.

**Board Discussion Summary:** There were no further questions, comments, concerns raised by the board beyond case presentation.

***Additional Information to note:*** Chair Brown noted that while several allegations in the case shared the same category (lack of service), they were based on different conduct by different officers and staff. He emphasized that even if the allegations appear similar, the rationale and wording of the board’s recommendations may differ. Therefore, he advised the board to err on the side of making separate motions and recommendations for each individual allegation rather than consolidating them. Chair Brown acknowledged this approach might take more time but



*stressed it was the proper and more accurate way to handle the case. He also reminded members that the investigative reports provide clear language such as facts, rule analysis, and conclusions that can be used to guide motions.*

## Case Finding

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.18)

**OPS Recommendation:** Unfounded

**CPRB Decision:** Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>P.O. Robert Langley, #1930</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, WCS footage, and written reports supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.18)

**OPS Recommendation:** Unfounded

**CPRB Decision:** Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>Sgt. Albert Oliver, #9220</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, WCS footage, and written reports supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Miller Motion Status: Carried

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.18)

**OPS Recommendation:** Exonerated

**CPRB Decision:** Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>Det. Cassandra Grace, #229</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, WCS Footage, and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur, but was consistent with CDP Manual Rule 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.18)

**OPS Recommendation:** Exonerated

**CPRB Decision:** Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>Dispatcher Makeba Greer, #111</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, WCS Footage, and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur, but was consistent with CDP Manual Rule 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.18)

**OPS Recommendation:** Exonerated

**CPRB Decision:** Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
---------	-----------	--------



<b>P.O. Carlos Munguia, #1813</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, WCS Footage, and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur, but was consistent with CDP Manual Rule 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried
-----------------------------------	--	---

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.18)

**OPS Recommendation:** Exonerated

**CPRB Decision:** Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>P.O. Diovanni Smith, #285</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, WCS Footage, and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur, but was consistent with CDP Manual Rule 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

**Sgt. Mark Bickerstaff, #9001**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.18)

**OPS Action:** **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 11/18/2023

**CPRB Recommendation:** **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 11/18/2023

*Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 11/18/2023. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).*

**OPS2023-0231**

**Timestamp:** 30:230 – 39:25

**Complainant:** Nehemiah Jackson

**Presented by:** Ouk

**P.O. Sean Mandzak, #1235**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

**Summary of Case Presentation:** On September 17, 2023, Mr. Nehemiah Jackson alleged misconduct by Patrol Officer Sean Mandzak, #1235 after reporting that his neighbor, Mr. Billy Lyons, damaged his fence. Mr. Jackson presented video evidence of Mr. Lyons striking the fence with his car door and requested that Officer Mandzak make an arrest for criminal damaging. Officer Mandzak declined, explaining that the damage did not rise to the level of criminal conduct, and his supervisor, Sgt. Charles Boddy, concurred. Officer Mandzak advised Mr. Jackson to consult a property surveyor and documented the incident using a misdemeanor complaint form, modifying the title to reflect a property damage statement due to the absence of an official non-criminal property damage form. Mr. Jackson alleged falsification of reports and tampering with evidence, but OPS found no support for these claims.



The Office of Professional Standards reviewed body-worn camera footage, incident reports, and interviews, concluding that Officer Mandzak acted within Division policy and exercised appropriate discretion. The investigation determined that the damage did not meet the threshold for criminal damaging, as it lacked intent and substantial risk of harm. Mr. Jackson was provided a report and guidance on how to pursue the matter through the prosecutor's office. OPS recommended a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service, as the officer's actions were consistent with law, General Police Orders, and training. Allegation B: Unprofessional Conduct was recommended as Unfounded, as no evidence supported Mr. Jackson's claim of falsified reporting or misconduct.

**Board Discussion Summary:** There were no further questions, comments, concerns raised by the board beyond case presentation.

**Case Findings:**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rules 4.18, 9.05)

**OPS Recommendation:** Exonerated

**CPRB Decision:** Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>P.O. Sean Mandzak, #1235</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in Manual Rules 4.18 and 9.05.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rule 3.12)

**OPS Recommendation:** Unfounded

**CPRB Decision:** Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>P.O. Sean Mandzak, #1235</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

---

**OPS2023-0252**

**Timestamp:** 39:26 – 50:09

**Complainant:** Martha Figueroa

**Presented by:** Ouk





**Bi-Lingual Communications Specialist Sonia Alvarez, #031**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: No Service

**Dispatcher Mary Grsela-Mwaipyana, #151**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: No Service

**Dispatcher Constance Hollinger, #104**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: No Service

**Dispatcher Sara Koch, #183**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: No Service

**Dispatcher Jacqueline Ortiz-Melendez, #132**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: No Service

**Dispatcher Paige Vargo, #005**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: No Service

**Dispatcher Jackie Williams, #174**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: No Service

**P.O. Luis Melendez Jr., #1562**

**Allegation B:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

**Allegation C:** Biased Policing

**P.O. Spencer Camp, #1516**

**Allegation B:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

**Allegation C:** Biased Policing

**Dispatcher Linda Voll, #127**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: No Service

**Summary of Case Presentation:** On October 12, 2023, Ms. Martha Figueroa filed a complaint alleging lack of service and racial bias in the Cleveland Division of Police's response to an incident involving her daughter, who has an intellectual disability. Ms. Figueroa reported that dispatchers mishandled her 911 call by marking a police unit "on scene" when it was not, causing delays. She further stated that officers failed to listen to her side of the story, relied on other parties' accounts, and threatened her daughter with arrest despite her claim of self-defense. Ms. Figueroa also alleged that her daughter was treated unfairly due to race and disability, and that the process was biased in favor of the other household member.

The Office of Professional Standards reviewed dispatch audio, body-worn camera footage, and incident reports. The investigation found that the dispatch delay was caused by a mistaken "arrived" entry and workload demands, not neglect, leading to a finding of Exonerated for the dispatchers. Allegations that officers failed to listen were determined Unfounded, as evidence showed they interviewed all parties, documented injuries, consulted supervisors, and provided report numbers in compliance with Division rules. The allegation of racial bias was also found Unfounded, as no evidence indicated race influenced officer actions; decisions were based on juvenile procedures and policy requirements under Manual of Rules 3.12. Overall, OPS concluded that both dispatchers and officers acted within policy, and no misconduct was substantiated.

**Board Discussion Summary:** Board members focused on the issue of response time and the error in reporting arrival. It was clarified that the officer mistakenly marked himself as "arrived" while





still en route, which was then recorded by dispatch. This error led to confusion, as the complainant was told the officer was on scene when he was not.

The Board noted that the officer promptly corrected the mistake by advising radio that he had accidentally hit the arrival button. Once corrected, the chronology report accurately reflected the actual sequence of events. Members discussed whether such an error constituted a violation of General Police Orders, but agreed that because it was promptly acknowledged and corrected, it did not rise to the level of a GPO violation.

Overall, the deliberation emphasized that the incident was a technical error rather than intentional misconduct. The Board recognized the complainant's frustration but concluded that the officer's immediate correction and the updated report ensured accountability, and therefore the matter did not warrant further disciplinary action.

***Additional Information to Note:** In the original investigation report and agenda, Bi-Lingual Communications Specialist Sonia Alvarez, #031 and Dispatcher Linda Voll, #127 were identified under Allegation A: Lack of Service – No Service, with the Office of Professional Standards recommending a finding of Exonerated. However, both employees separated from the Cleveland Division of Police in March 2025. Pursuant to OPS Manual Section 703(a), once an employee is no longer with the Division, OPS/CPRB cannot issue a recommendation regarding that individual. Accordingly, the allegations are formally recorded as Administrative Dismissals, as reflected in the Case Findings.*

### **Case Findings:**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: No Service – Delay in Response Time  
(Manual Rule 4.10, GDP 1.1.18)

**OPS Recommendation: Exonerated**

**CPRB Decision: Exonerated**

Against	Rationale	Motion
Dispatcher Mary Grsela-Mwaipyana, #151 Dispatcher Constance Hollinger, #104 Dispatcher Sara Koch, #183 Dispatcher Jacqueline Ortiz-Melendez, #132 Dispatcher Paige Vargo, #005 Dispatcher Jackie Williams, #174	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in Manual Rules 4.10 and General Dispatching Procedures 1.1.18</i>	Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

**Allegation B:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service – Failure to Listen or Investigate  
(Manual Rules 4.18)

**OPS Recommendation: Unfounded**

**CPRB Decision: Unfounded**

Against	Rationale	Motion
---------	-----------	--------



<b>P.O. Spencer Camp, #1516</b> <b>P.O. Luis Melendez Jr., #1562</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, WCS footage and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried
---	---	--

**Allegation C: Biased Policing (Race) (Manual Rule 3.12, GPO 1.07.08)**

**OPS Recommendation: Unfounded**

**CPRB Decision: Unfounded**

<b>Against</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Motion</b>
<b>P.O. Spencer Camp, #1516</b> <b>P.O. Luis Melendez Jr., #1562</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, WCS Footage, and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

**Bi-Lingual Communications Specialist Sonia Alvarez, #031**

**Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.18)**

**OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY  
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 03/10/2025**

**CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY  
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 03/10/2025**

*Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 03/10/2025. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).*

**Dispatcher Linda Voll, #127**

**Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.18)**

**OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY  
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 03/25/2025**

**CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY  
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 03/25/2025**

*Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 03/25/2025. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).*

---

**OPS2023-0256**

**Timestamp: 50:10 – 56:13**

**Complainant: Adaira Martin**

**Presented by: Ouk**

**Det. Michael Cox, #163**

**Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service**

**Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct**

**P.O. James Ortells, #104**

**Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service**

**Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct**

**Summary of Case Presentation:** On October 13, 2023, Ms. Adaira Martin was involved in a traffic collision after running a red light, resulting in her vehicle being struck on the driver's side. Patrol Officer James Ortells, #104 and Detective Michael Cox, #163 responded to the scene and



reviewed RTCC footage, which confirmed that both Ms. Martin and the other driver had entered the intersection against the red light. An OH-1 accident report was completed listing both drivers at fault, in accordance with GPO 8.1.02. Ms. Martin, who was driving without a valid license, was transported with her children via EMS. On October 20, 2023, Ms. Martin visited the 5th District station, alleging that the officers falsified her OH-1 report and spoke negatively about her. Officer Ortells met with her, explained the reasoning behind the report, and remained professional throughout the encounter.

The Office of Professional Standards reviewed RTCC footage, body-worn camera recordings, and incident documentation. The investigation confirmed that the OH-1 report was properly completed and consistent with Division policies, and that both officers acted within the law and training requirements. Evidence showed that Officer Ortells calmly explained the report to Ms. Martin, granted her request for a supervisor, and maintained courtesy throughout. No evidence was found to substantiate claims of falsification or unprofessional behavior. OPS recommended findings of Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service against both Officer Ortells and Detective Cox, as their actions were consistent with CDP General Police Orders. Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior was recommended as Unfounded for both officers, as the evidence demonstrated that the alleged conduct did not occur.

**Board Discussion Summary:** There were no further questions, comments, concerns raised by the board beyond case presentation.

#### Case Findings:

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: No Service (GPO 8.1.02, ORC 4510.12)

**OPS Recommendation:** Exonerated

**CPRB Decision:** Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>Det. Michael Cox, #163</b> <b>P.O. James Ortells, #104</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, WCS Footage, and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in General Police Order 8.1.02 and ORC 4510.12.</i>	Motion by: Moore Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rule 5.09)

**OPS Recommendation:** Unfounded

**CPRB Decision:** Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>Det. Michael Cox, #163</b> <b>P.O. James Ortells, #104</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Moore Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried



---

**OPS2023-0280**

**Timestamp: 56:14 – 1:00:35**

**Complainant: Lynn Cartellone**

**Presented by: Ouk**

**Det. Lemmy Griffin, #1611**

**Sgt. John Kubas, #9276**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

**Summary of Case Presentation:** On July 27, 2011, Ms. Lynn Cartellone's son Brandon was murdered in his apartment, and she later filed a complaint alleging that Cleveland Division of Police personnel mishandled the investigation. Ms. Cartellone stated that responding officer Sgt. John Kubas made disturbing comments at the scene and that retired Detective Lemmy Griffin mishandled evidence, failed to use available evidence, and did not address the case in a timely manner. Witness testimony indicated Sgt. Kubas asked whether the victim was "into anything kinky, like BDSM," which the witness later acknowledged could have been related to the nature of the crime. Sgt. Kubas, however, did not recall making such statements during his OPS interview. Because body-worn cameras were not issued in 2011, no direct evidence exists to substantiate the allegations.

The Office of Professional Standards determined that the allegation of Lack of Service against Detective Griffin could not be investigated, as he retired from CDP in January 2015, and therefore recommended an Administrative Dismissal under OPS Manual 703(a). Regarding Sgt. Kubas, OPS found that the evidence was insufficient to establish whether the alleged unprofessional behavior occurred, as the claim relied solely on hearsay without corroboration. Accordingly, OPS recommended a finding of Insufficient Evidence for Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior against Sgt. Kubas. The case remains open and has been transferred to the FBI for continued investigation.

**Board Discussion Summary:** There were no further questions, comments, concerns raised by the board beyond case presentation.

**Case Findings:**

**Det. Lemmy Griffin, #1611**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

**OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY  
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 01/28/2015**

**CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY  
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 01/28/2015**



*Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 01/28/2015. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).*

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

**OPS Recommendation:** Insufficient Evidence

**CPRB Decision:** Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>Sgt. John Kubas, #9276</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written documentation, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried

---

**OPS2024-0005**

**Timestamp:** 1:00:36 – 1:09:26

**Complainant:** Donnie Brown

**Presented by:** Khabir

**Sgt. Andrew Harhay, #9136**

**P.O. Jordan Tipton, #1591**

**Allegation A:** Improper Procedure: Arrest

**Allegation B:** Lack of Service:

**Summary of Case Presentation:** On December 2, 2023, Mr. Brown alleged that he was improperly arrested for domestic violence and not provided adequate service by members of the Cleveland Division of Police. He stated that his wife and daughter had assaulted him, knocking him unconscious, and that officers failed to ask if he wanted medical attention. Mr. Brown initially claimed to have video evidence proving his innocence but was unable to produce it at the time of arrest. He later located the footage after his release, and the charges against him were dropped on December 3, 2023, when the victim declined to cooperate with the investigation.

The Office of Professional Standards reviewed body-worn camera footage and determined that officers acted in compliance with CDP General Police Orders and Ohio Revised Code requirements for domestic violence enforcement. The footage showed that officers contacted a supervisor, Sgt. Harhay, #9136, who assessed the situation and found no visible injuries on Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown appeared alert and did not request medical assistance from officers, though he later alleged denial of care by correctional staff, which falls outside OPS jurisdiction. Based on the evidence, OPS recommended a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Improper Arrest against Sgt. Harhay, as the arrest decision was consistent with law and policy. Allegation B: Lack of Service against P.O. Jordan Tipton, #1591 was recommended as Unfounded, as the evidence showed the alleged conduct did not occur.



**Board Discussion Summary:** There were no further questions, comments, concerns raised by the board beyond case presentation.

**Additional Information to Note:** The Board clarified that although the agenda listed both the Sergeant and the Patrol Officer under a single allegation of improper procedure/improper arrest, the investigation report identified a separate allegation of lack of service. It was confirmed that Sgt. Harhay was charged only with improper arrest, while P.O. Tipton faced the allegation of lack of service, specifically tied to the failure to ask about medical attention and concerns regarding the adequacy of the investigation. For purposes of motions and case findings, the Board agreed the allegations must be recorded distinctly, Allegation A for improper arrest against Sergeant Harhay and Allegation B for lack of service against Officer Tipton, ensuring accuracy in the record and transparency in adjudication.

Also the agenda listed Sgt. Harhay badge number incorrectly. It was corrected from #136 to #9136.

#### Case Findings:

**Allegation A:** Improper Procedure: Arrest (GPO 5.05.01, ORC 2925.03, 2919.25)

**OPS Recommendation:** Exonerated

**CPRB Decision:** Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Andrew Harhay, #9136	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in ORC 2925.03 and ORC 2919.25.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

**Allegation B:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.18)

**OPS Recommendation:** Unfounded

**CPRB Decision:** Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Jordan Tipton, #1591	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried





**Complainant: Jon Hillegass**

**Presented by: Lampkin**

**P.O. Spencer Camp, #1516**

**Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service**

**Summary of Case Presentation:** On July 22, 2023, Mr. Hillegass alleged that Patrol Officer Spencer Camp (#1516) treated him unfairly during a domestic dispute with his former partner. Mr. Hillegass stated that Officer Camp instructed him to go to McDonald's rather than address the situation at his residence. Review of the incident showed that Mr. Hillegass was verbally aggressive, loud, and confrontational toward his partner. Officer Camp identified him as the aggressor and, in an effort to de-escalate the situation, advised him to leave the residence temporarily and calm down. Mr. Hillegass complied without incident.

The Office of Professional Standards reviewed body-worn camera footage, incident reports, and interviews, concluding that Officer Camp's communication was direct but professional and consistent with best practices for preventing escalation in domestic disputes. Advising Mr. Hillegass to leave the residence was a reasonable measure to avoid further confrontation or potential arrest. Based on the evidence, OPS recommended a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service, as the officer's actions were consistent with law, Division General Orders, and training.

**Board Discussion Summary:** In deliberating of the case, board members examined whether Officer Camp's handling of a domestic dispute—specifically suggesting that Mr. Hillegass leave the residence temporarily to cool off—aligned with General Police Orders and best practices. Investigator Lampkin clarified that the officer initiated the suggestion after the complainant was unable to find someone to help him de-escalate, and that the situation did not rise to the level of requiring an arrest. Members debated whether sending one party away constituted proper separation, noting that GPO Section 2B requires officers to separate parties for investigation and make every effort to identify a primary aggressor, but does not explicitly endorse sending someone out of the home.

Member Cyganovich expressed concern that only one officer responded, limiting the ability to interview both parties individually and undermining the thoroughness of the investigation. Others acknowledged that while the officer's actions may have been intended as a de-escalation tactic, they reflected outdated practices and did not fully meet the expectations of domestic violence response protocols. The absence of body-worn camera footage further complicated the Board's ability to determine whether the officer conducted a complete investigation.

### **Case Findings:**

**Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service (Manual Rule 5.09, GPO 5.05.01)**

**OPS Recommendation: Exonerated**

**CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence**

Against	Rationale	Motion
---------	-----------	--------





<b>P.O. Spencer Camp, #1516</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried
---------------------------------	--	---

---

**OPS2024-0015**

**Timestamp: 1:32:30 – 1:38:50**

**Complainant: Marquona Tippens**

**Presented by: Eisen**

**Det. Joseph Edwards, #1940**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: No Service

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

**Summary of Case Presentation:** On January 25, 2024, Ms. Marquona Tippens filed allegations of lack of service and unprofessional conduct against Detective Joseph Edwards (#1940) regarding his investigation into the sexual assault of her 14-year-old daughter. Ms. Tippens requested that a female detective be assigned to the case, but was informed by Det. Edwards and his supervisor that assignments were made by rotation and would not be reassigned. She was advised that a female social worker or detective could be present during interviews to support her daughter. Det. Edwards accepted all evidence provided and his work contributed to the conviction of the suspect, Demarion Seawright.

The Office of Professional Standards reviewed statements, emails, body-worn camera footage, and interviews. The investigation found that Det. Edwards acted in accordance with the CDP Detective Manual, which requires equitable assignment of cases by the Officer in Charge. His handling of the case was consistent with policy and professional standards. Regarding the allegation of unprofessional conduct, OPS determined that his question to the juvenile victim—asked in the presence of Ms. Tippens, was appropriate given the nature of the crime, and that he remained professional throughout his interactions. OPS recommended findings of Exonerated for both Allegation A: Lack of Service and Allegation B: Unprofessional Conduct, as the officer's actions were consistent with Division rules, training, and procedures.

**Board Discussion Summary:** There were no further questions, comments, concerns raised by the board beyond case presentation.

**Case Findings:**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: No Service (Detective Manual, Pg.7)

**OPS Recommendation:** Exonerated

**CPRB Decision:** Exonerated



Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>Det. Joseph Edwards, #1940</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in Detective Manual Rules on page 7.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rule 5.01)

**OPS Recommendation:** Exonerated

**CPRB Decision:** Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>Det. Joseph Edwards, #1940</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in Manual Rule 5.01.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

---

**OPS2024-0019**

**Timestamp: 1:38:51 – 1:49:40**

**Complainant: Karima Marshall**

**Presented by: Eisen**

**P.O. Michael Dieghan, #1931**

**Allegation A:** Biased Policing

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

**P.O. Lewis Stevens, #2051**

**Allegation A:** Biased Policing

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

**Sgt. Roland Brown, #9138**

**Allegation C:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

**Summary of Case Presentation:** On January 29, 2024, Ms. Karina Marshall filed allegations of bias policing, unprofessional conduct, and lack of service against members of the Cleveland Division of Police. She alleged that Patrol Officer Michael Deighan (#1931) and Patrol Officer Lewis Stevens (#2051) engaged in inappropriate conduct during a neighbor dispute, and that Sgt. Roland Brown (#9138) refused to assist her when she spoke to him by phone. Ms. Marshall claimed that a conversation around race made one officer uncomfortable, and that she was treated unfairly. Review of the incident showed that Officer Deighan spoke with both parties, asked clarifying questions about medication, and advised them to avoid further conflict until they moved. Officer Stevens remained outside during the interaction, and Sgt. Brown did not recall receiving a phone call from Ms. Marshall.



The Office of Professional Standards reviewed body-worn camera footage, incident reports, and interviews. The investigation found no evidence of racial bias or unprofessional conduct by Officer Deighan, whose actions were consistent with CDP Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, and 5.09, leading to findings of Exonerated for both allegations. Allegations against Officer Stevens were determined Unfounded, as he did not engage in the interaction and no evidence supported claims of bias or misconduct. The allegation of lack of service against Sgt. Brown was recommended as Insufficient Evidence, as OPS could not establish whether the alleged phone conversation occurred. Overall, OPS concluded that the officers acted within Division policy and no misconduct was substantiated.

**Board Discussion Summary:** Chair Brown clarification on the nature of the complaint and how it related to the finding of exoneration. The allegation involved biased policing, with the complainant, Ms. Marshall, stating that officers appeared uncomfortable with a conversation she was having about race. Upon review, Investigator Eisen confirmed that the complainant did not allege any specific statements or actions by the officers, only that they seemed uncomfortable.

Board members discussed the distinction between findings of exonerated versus unfounded, noting that the allegation described discomfort rather than identifiable conduct. The investigation revealed that the incident stemmed from a neighbor dispute over medication, during which the officer returned the medicine and expressed frustration at repeatedly responding to the same dispute. While the officer raised his voice slightly, members agreed this did not rise to misconduct and was consistent with normal human interaction.

Ultimately, the Board concluded that there was no evidence of biased policing or improper conduct. The officer's actions were deemed appropriate to the circumstances, and the finding of exonerated was changed to unfounded, reflecting that the alleged conduct did not occur.

***Additional Information to Note:*** Sgt. Brown retired on January 12, 2026, the day prior to the scheduled CPRB meeting, after the agenda had already been distributed and posted for public notice. In accordance with OPS Manual Section 703(a), once an employee separates from the Division, OPS/CPRB cannot issue any recommendation against the individual. Therefore, all allegations have been administratively dismissed and are formally recorded as Administrative Dismissals in the Case Findings below.

### Case Findings:

**Allegation A:** Biased Policing (Manual Rule 5.01, 5.09, GPO 1.07.08)

**OPS Recommendation:** Unfounded

**CPRB Decision:** Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Michael Dieghan, #1931 P.O. Lewis Stevens, #2051	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried



**Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rule 5.01)**

**OPS Recommendation: Exonerated**

**CPRB Decision: Exonerated**

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>P.O. Michael Dieghan, #1931</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in Manual Rules 5.01</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

**Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rule 5.01)**

**OPS Recommendation: Unfounded**

**CPRB Decision: Unfounded**

Against	Rationale	Motion
<b>P.O. Lewis Stevens, #2051</b>	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

**Sgt. Roland Brown, #9138**

**Allegation C: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.18)**

**OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY  
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 01/12/2026**

**CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY  
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 01/12/2026**

*Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 01/12/2026. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).*

---

**OPS2024-0037**

**Timestamp: 1:49:40 – 1:55:16**

**Complainant: Andrea Manning**

**Presented by: Eisen**

**P.O. Bryce Carmichael, #1525**

**Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service**

**Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct**

**P.O. Zachary Scanlon, #1339**

**Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service**

**Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct**

**Summary of Case Presentation:** On February 23, 2024, Ms. Andrea Manning filed a complaint alleging unprofessional conduct by Patrol Officers Zachary Scanlon (#1339) and Bryce Carmichael (#1525). She stated that the officers displayed disrespectful attitudes, mocked her, stereotyped her, and implied she was a drug addict. Ms. Manning also alleged lack of service, claiming the officers failed to properly assist her in connection with her civil dispute against the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority (CMHA). Review of body-worn camera footage



confirmed that both officers declined to take a report on the matter, explaining that it was civil in nature and outside the scope of police reporting.

The Office of Professional Standards determined that both officers acted in accordance with Division policy. Allegations of lack of service against Officer Scanlon and Officer Carmichael were recommended as Exonerated, as their decision not to take a civil report was consistent with Manual Rule Sections 3.01 and 4.18. Allegations of unprofessional conduct against both officers were recommended as Unfounded, as the evidence, including body-worn camera footage, showed no disrespectful or mocking behavior, and their actions complied with Manual Rule 5.01 requiring professional and courteous conduct. Overall, OPS concluded that the officers' actions were consistent with law, Division General Orders, and training.

**Board Discussion Summary:** There were no further questions, comments, concerns raised by the board beyond case presentation.

**Case Findings:**

**Allegation A:** Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rules 3.01, 4.18)

**OPS Recommendation:** Exonerated

**CPRB Decision:** Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Bryce Carmichael, #1525 P.O. Zachary Scanlon, #1339	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rules 3.01 and 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rule 5.01)

**OPS Recommendation:** Unfounded

**CPRB Decision:** Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Bryce Carmichael, #1525 P.O. Zachary Scanlon, #1339	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

---

**OPS2024-0077**

**Timestamp: 1:55:16 – 2:00:25**

**Complainant:** DeLorese Pearson

**Presented by:** Bowker

**P.O. Michael Guion, #1926**

**Allegation A:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

**P.O. Evan Tremaglio, #2510**

**Allegation A:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct



**Summary of Case Presentation:** On April 10, 2025, Ms. Delorese Pearson filed a complaint alleging unprofessional conduct by Patrol Officers Michael Guion (#1926) and Evan Tremaglio (#2510) in their response to a neighbor's assault allegation against her children. Ms. Pearson claimed the officers contacted her landlord and told him she was a nuisance, which allegedly led to her landlord asking her to leave the property. She acknowledged she did not witness the officers speaking to the landlord, but based her allegation on what the landlord reportedly told her. Review of body-worn camera footage showed both officers interacting professionally with Ms. Pearson and her neighbor, listening to both sides, and advising Ms. Pearson to keep her children in her yard to avoid further complaints. The footage reflected that the neighbor had contacted the landlord, but there was no evidence of either officer doing so.

The Office of Professional Standards interviewed the landlord, who denied ever being contacted by CDP officers regarding Ms. Pearson's conduct. Based on the evidence—including body-worn camera footage, incident documentation, and the landlord's statement—OPS recommended findings of Unfounded for Allegation A: Unprofessional Conduct against both Officer Guion and Officer Tremaglio. The investigation concluded that the alleged conduct did not occur, and the officers' actions were consistent with CDP Manual Section 5.01 and Division protocol.

**Board Discussion Summary:** There were no further questions, comments, concerns raised by the board beyond case presentation.

#### Case Findings:

**Allegation B:** Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rule 5.01)

**OPS Recommendation:** Unfounded

**CPRB Decision:** Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Michael Guion, #1926 P.O. Evan Tremaglio, #2510	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried

---

#### Meeting Recess:

**Chair Brown called for a 10- minute meeting recess starting at 11:02 am EST.**

**Meeting Resumed promptly at 11:12 am EST.**

---

#### VI. Executive Session (2:00:25 – 4:21:42)

**CPRB**

- **Motion:** To enter executive session for personnel, Employment and discipline Matters will be considered. Inviting Legal Michael Hess, Dayla Oprian, Administrator Traxler, and GM Watson.

Motion by: Chair Brown



Seconded by: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

- Executive Session began at 11:15 am EST
- Adjourn back into open session at 1:22 pm EST

**VII. OPS Status Report (4:21:43 – 4:22:56)**

**Jessyca Watson**

Interim General Manager

In December, OPS received a total of 19 new complaints. Of those, 8 were administratively dismissed, resulting in a net total of 11 cases for the month.

**VIII. Old Business (4:22:57 – 4:25:53)**

**Brandon Brown, Chair**

**A. OPS Investigator Position Posting**

- i. New OPS Investigator Job Position posted and will be open for a couple of weeks.

**B. OPS Senior Investigator Position Job Position**

- i. New OPS Senior Investigator Job Position posted and will be open for 30 days.

**C. OPS Administrator Search Update**

- i. In December 2025 the OPS Administrator Job Position was closed. Chair Brown provided an update on the OPS Administrator hiring process, noting that the application period closed at the beginning of December with 173 submissions. The Board is now working through the large volume of applications using predetermined hardline criteria as an initial screening tool. This approach was adopted to streamline the process, avoid requiring the entire Board to participate in the first round of cuts, and ensure objectivity in eliminating candidates who do not meet the agreed-upon standards.

He emphasized that all resumes are being retained, even those not meeting the criteria, and that updates will continue to be shared given the public and monitoring team's interest in the position. Chair Brown explained that the process is multi-step, involving interviews and further review, with the goal of finalizing a selection by the March meeting. While February had been considered as a possible target, March remains the firm deadline due to the extensive number of applications to review.

**IX. New Business (4:25-54 – 4:34:37)**

**Brandon Brown, Chair**

**A. Update on OPS case 2025-0264**

- i. Internal Affairs investigations are done with their investigation.





- ii. **Motion:** CPRB instruct the Law Department facilitate the hiring of outside counsel, specifically Zashion and Rich or another firm under the existing contract, to review the completed investigation before it is presented to the Board.

Motion By: Member Cyganovich

Seconded By: Member Moore

Motion Status: Carried

#### B. Case Review Acknowledgement of Board Members

- i. Chair reminded members of the charter requirement to complete case review acknowledgements prior to each meeting, noting that the acknowledgement link is included in the OPS email sent by GM Watson and appears on the cover page when accessing case files. Members must click the acknowledgement only after reviewing all assigned cases, as it serves as confirmation that materials were read in advance, and this step must be completed each time cases are reviewed rather than as a one-time confirmation. This process ensures OPS can document that all board members fulfilled their responsibility, and members were advised to contact Jessyca directly if they have difficulty locating the link.

#### C. Citizen Commendation for CDP Employee

- i. On October 24, 2025, at approximately 3:00 p.m., Mr. Eric Fagerholm, age 71, experienced an accidental fall at Cleveland Hopkins International Airport while searching for his Uber pickup location. He sustained a bruised and bleeding lip and a minor head scrape. Two Cleveland Division of Police officers (which included P.O. Rafael Rodriguez, #1146), along with EMS personnel, immediately responded to his aid. Mr. Fagerholm expressed gratitude for their compassion and professionalism, noting that they ensured he was safely assisted into his ride-share vehicle. He later sought medical care in Virginia and reported no serious injuries. Mr. Fagerholm, originally from Cleveland, praised the city and offered a “shout out” to Cleveland PD for their service.

Chair Brown remarked that while the Civilian Police Review Board and OPS review cases involving allegations against officers, it is equally important to highlight the times CDP employees demonstrate professionalism and compassion. He emphasized the duality of oversight—ensuring accountability while also recognizing that many officers do good work every day.



X. **Adjournment** (4:34:38 – 4:35:08)

**CPRB**

**Motion:** To Adorn January 13<sup>th</sup> CPRB Meeting

Motion By: Member Cyganovich

Seconded By: Member Moore

Motion Status: Carried

- The CPRB January 13, 2026 meeting was adjourned at 1:36 pm EST.
- Following January Meeting
  - The next CPRB Meeting will be held virtually January 20, 2026 at 9:00 am EST.
  - The last January CPRB Meeting will be held virtually January 27, 2026 at 9:00 am EST.