



CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

January 13th, 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
Waverly Willis

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

Jessyca Watson, Interim General Manager
Art Bowker, Investigator
Adam Eisen, Investigator
Hamza Khabir, Investigator
Tammi Lampkin, Investigator
James Ouk, Investigator
Angela Schwark, Investigator
Alayne Koenig, Investigator Assistant
Samantha Montanez, Community
Engagement Officer

LEGAL COUNSEL

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

MEETING AGENDA

- I. **Call to Order** (Not Recorded) **Brandon Brown, Chair**
1. Chair Brown called January 27th CPRB meeting to order at 9:09 am EST.
 2. Roll Call
 - a. Members Glenn Parker III and Waverly Willis had an excused absence.
 - b. A quorum was present
 3. Moving forward, Chair Brown requests that the CPRB Administrative Assistant distribute Outlook calendar invitations to all Board Members. These invitations should include the meeting link, agenda, case material SharePoint Link, meeting minutes requiring approval, and any additional documents for review. This will establish a centralized location for all meeting information, ensuring easier access and improved organization.
 4. The full meeting was not recorded due to a WebEx error but partially live streamed via YouTube starting in the middle of case 2023-0171 during the board's deliberation.
- II. **Approval of Minutes** (Not Recorded) **CPRB**



1. January 13th Meeting Minutes – Virtual

Motion: Approve January 13th, 2026 CPRB Meeting Minutes as Amended in discussion.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Second By: Gatian

Motion Status: Carried

2. January 27th Meeting Minutes – Special Virtual

Motion: Approve January 27th CPRB Meeting Minutes

Motion By: Sharp

Second By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

Abstention: Member Miller – was no present for meeting

III. Public Comment (Not Recorded)

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**

OPS2024-0009

Timestamp: Not Recorded

Complainant: Ryan Bethards (Present)

Presented by: Ouk

***John Snyder (Witness/Caseworker- Present)**

Sgt. Quinton Harrison, #941

P.O. Cecelia Kochevar, #864

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

P.O. Lamar Heath, #817

P.O. Bruce Smith III, #2328

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Summary of Case Presentation: On January 11, 2024, Mr. Ryan Bethards contacted police after an altercation with Ms. Savanha Heller, stating he had deployed his taser after she struck him. Patrol Officers Quinton Harrison, #941, Lamar Heath, #817, Cecelia Kochevar, #864, and Bruce Smith III, #2328 responded to the scene. Ms. Heller was found crying in the hallway and reported that Mr. Bethards had tasered her. Officers separated the parties, gathered statements, and detained Mr. Bethards while investigating the manner in which he used the taser. He was



read his Miranda rights, placed in the squad car, and his taser was collected as evidence. Sgt. Urbania directed that a report be completed listing Mr. Bethards as the suspect, with referral to the prosecutor. Mr. Bethards was later released.

The following day, Mr. Bethards filed a complaint alleging improper detention and procedural violations. The Office of Professional Standards reviewed the incident, including officer reports and actions, and determined that the officers had probable cause and reasonable suspicion to detain him while investigating the assault. OPS concluded that the officers acted within law, Division General Police Orders, and training. OPS recommended a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Improper Procedure against Patrol Officers Harrison, Heath, Kochevar, and Smith III. The investigation found that the alleged conduct did occur, but the officers' actions were consistent with law, CDP policy, and professional standards.

Case Statements:

Ryan Bethards (Complainant): Mr. Bethards provided a detailed four-minute account of the incident, explaining the sequence of events that led to his use of the Taser. He stated that Ms. Heller repeatedly ignored his requests to follow the house rules and that, after several warnings, she struck him and began damaging his property. Mr. Bethards said he deployed the Taser in response to being physically assaulted and to stop further damage to his belongings. He described his actions as defensive and proportional to the immediate threat he perceived. Mr. Bethards also explained how the encounter unfolded after officers arrived: he was handcuffed, read his rights, and placed in the squad car while officers collected his Taser as evidence. He reiterated that he felt the detention was unnecessary given the context and asked the Board to consider whether the officers' response appropriately accounted for the circumstances he described.

John Snyder (Complainant's Disability Representation): Mr. Snyder identified himself as Mr. Bethards' representative and provided contextual information about Mr. Bethards' disability and support needs. He explained that Mr. Bethards requires certain accommodations and that those needs can affect how he communicates and responds during stressful encounters. Mr. Snyder asked the Board to consider that Mr. Bethards' disability may have influenced both the interaction with Ms. Heller and the officers' perception of the incident, and he requested that the record reflect any accommodations provided or needed during the investigation and hearing. He emphasized the importance of ensuring Mr. Bethards had a fair opportunity to present his account and to have his statements understood in the proper context when the Board evaluates the reasonableness of the officers' actions.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members began by confirming the factual record: officer reports, WCS footage, the investigator's timeline, and the complainant's written statement. Discussion opened on the legal and practical distinction between a temporary detention and an arrest. Several members noted that the officers read Miranda warnings and placed Mr. Bethards in the squad car, which can appear arrest-like to a layperson, but the Board emphasized that the operative question is whether officers had reasonable suspicion or probable cause to detain while



investigating an alleged assault. Members reviewed the sequence of events leading to the Taser deployment, including the complainant’s account that Ms. Heller struck him and damaged property, and contrasted that with Ms. Heller’s statement to officers that she had been tasered.

The Board then examined the proportionality of Mr. Bethards’ response and whether officers’ actions in detaining him were consistent with policy. Several members raised concerns about clarity in allegation language and the potential legal implications if motions used the term “arrest” when the conduct was a detention; the Chair and counsel agreed that motions should reflect the actual conduct under review. Members also discussed the evidentiary weight of the Taser being retained as evidence and the absence of subsequent criminal charges by the prosecutor. Finally, the Board considered Mr. Bethards’ disability and whether officers reasonably accommodated or recognized it during the encounter; members concluded that while the disability context was important for interpretation, the record did not show officer misconduct in failing to provide accommodations during the initial response. On balance, the Board found OPS’s factual findings persuasive and that the detention was supported by reasonable suspicion and probable cause.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure (Manual Rules 4.01, 4.08, 4.18, 9.04)

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Quinton Harrison, #941 P.O. Lamar Heath, #817 P.O. Cecelia Kochevar, #864 P.O. Bruce Smith III, #2328	<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 Manual Rules 4.01, 4.08, 4.18, 9.04.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried



V. Presentation of Investigations

Jessyca Watson
Interim General Manager

OPS2023-0271

Timestamp: 00:00:01 – 00:16:39

Complainant: Muhammed Dye
Canaan Dye

Presented by: Ouk

Det. Vasile Nan, #2310

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Arrest
Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Search
Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Citation
Allegation D: WCS Violation

Det. Prebhirandip Singh, #1381

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Arrest
Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Search
Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Citation
Allegation D: WCS Violation

Lt. Frank Woyma, #8580

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Arrest
Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Search
Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Citation
Allegation D: WCS Violation

Summary of Case Presentation: On October 24, 2023, Mr. Muhammad Dye Jr. and Mr. Canaan Dye alleged that Cleveland police officers improperly arrested, searched, and ticketed them, and violated body-worn camera rules. The incident began when detectives stopped a Jeep Grand Cherokee for illegal window tint in a neighborhood known for drug activity. During the stop, officers detected marijuana odor, observed suspicious packaging, and ultimately discovered firearms, narcotics, and drug paraphernalia. Witness testimony further implicated the occupants in drug trafficking.

The OPS investigation reviewed the arrests, searches, citation, and camera use. Evidence showed the officers had probable cause for the stop and acted within Ohio law and Division policy. The tint violation was valid, and the body-worn cameras were only turned off briefly to discuss investigative procedures, which is permitted under policy. OPS recommended findings of Exonerated for all officers involved. The arrests, searches, citation, and camera use were consistent with law, Division General Orders, and professional standards.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board's deliberation focused on the justification for the initial traffic stop and the chain of events that led to discovery of contraband. Members reviewed the tint violation documentation, officer observations (odor, packaging), and the investigative steps that followed. A central point of debate was the brief deactivation of WCS during investigative discussion; some members expressed concern that any interruption could



undermine transparency, while OPS counsel and investigators explained policy allowances for limited deactivation when officers need to coordinate investigative strategy or protect sensitive information.

Board members weighed the totality of the evidence: WCS footage, officer statements, and physical evidence recovered and discussed whether any procedural missteps materially affected the lawfulness of the stop or subsequent searches. Several members asked whether alternative, less intrusive measures were available at the time of the stop; investigators responded that the officers' observations provided probable cause that justified the search. The Board also addressed potential community perception issues around stops in neighborhoods known for drug activity and emphasized the importance of clear documentation when investigative discretion is exercised. Ultimately, the Board concluded the stop and searches were supported by probable cause and consistent with statutory and departmental standards.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Arrest

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Vasile Nan, #2310 Det. Prebhirandip Singh, #1381 Lt. Frank Woyma, #8580	<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, 2925.11, 2923.12, 2923.16.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Gatian – He knows one of the officer's father

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Search

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Vasile Nan, #2310 Det. Prebhirandip Singh, #1381 Lt. Frank Woyma, #8580	<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 General Police Order 2.02.02.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Gatian – He knows one of the officer's father

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Citation – Window Tint

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Vasile Nan, #2310 Det. Prebhirandip Singh, #1381	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp



Lt. Frank Woyma, #8580	<i>alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in ORC 4513.241 and 437.28.</i>	Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Gatian – He knows one of the officer’s father
-------------------------------	---	--

Allegation D: WCS Violation

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Vasile Nan, #2310 Det. Prebhkirandip Singh, #1381 Lt. Frank Woyma, #8580	<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 General Police Order 4.06.04.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Gatian – He knows one of the officer’s father

OPS2024-0042

Timestamp: 00:16:39 – 00:24:08

Complainant: Albert Rodriquez

Presented by: Ouk

Det. Dylan Demas, # 1701

Sgt. Andrew Thomas, # 9329

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation C: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/ Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On March 1, 2024, Mr. Albert Rodriguez filed a complaint alleging lack of service and unprofessional conduct by Detective Dylan Demas, #1701 and Sergeant Andrew Thomas, #9329. The complaint stemmed from an incident on February 27, 2024, when Mr. Rodriguez reported his firearm and keys stolen by his girlfriend, Tia Hunter. He stated that Detective Demas failed to provide adequate service and hung up abruptly during a phone call, and that Sgt. Thomas delayed his ability to file a report. OPS reviewed the incident and found that Detective Demas investigated the matter, spoke with the suspect, located the missing property, and properly referred Mr. Rodriguez to the City Prosecutor since the matter involved a misdemeanor. Sgt. Thomas ensured a theft report was completed by Patrol Officer Wesley Reyes despite a busy station, and the case was referred for follow-up investigation.

OPS determined that Detective Demas provided sufficient service consistent with CDP policy and recommended a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service. Regarding Allegation B: Unprofessional Conduct, OPS noted that while Mr. Rodriguez alleged the detective hung up abruptly, the phone call was not recorded and interviews reflected otherwise positive interactions. As a result, OPS recommended a finding of Insufficient Evidence. For Allegation C against Sgt. Thomas, OPS found that although there was a slight delay, Mr. Rodriguez’s needs were met and a theft report was completed. OPS recommended a finding of



Exonerated for Sgt. Thomas, concluding his actions were consistent with law, Division policies, and procedures. The investigation concluded that both officers acted within CDP standards and provided appropriate service to Mr. Rodriguez.

Board Discussion Summary: Deliberations centered on whether Detective Demas and Sgt. Thomas met the standard of service expected in a property-theft investigation and whether the complainant’s perception of being hung up on reflected unprofessional conduct. Members reviewed call logs, investigator notes, and the absence of a recorded phone call. Several Board members expressed sympathy for the complainant’s frustration with perceived delays but noted that the investigative record showed the detective located the missing property and referred the matter appropriately to the prosecutor.

The Board discussed the evidentiary threshold for unprofessional conduct versus a credibility dispute. Some members argued that even if the detective’s tone felt brusque to the complainant, the absence of corroborating evidence (call recordings or contradictory witness statements) made it difficult to sustain an allegation. Others urged OPS to consider whether additional training on victim communication would be appropriate even when conduct does not rise to a sustained finding. The Board agreed that while service could be improved in some interactions, the record did not support a finding of sustained misconduct for either officer.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Dylan Demas, #1701	<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 Rule 4.11 and Detective Responsibilities #8.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Dylan Demas, #1701	<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: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

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



Sgt. Andrew Thomas, #9329	<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 4.03, 4.08, 4.11, Detective Responsibilities #1</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried
----------------------------------	--	--

OPS2024-0047

Timestamp: 00:24:08 – 00:31:07

Complainant: Jennifer Woodward

Presented by: Eisen

Dispatcher Melody Howard, #24

Dispatcher Courtney Tabb, #178

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/ Conduct

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/ Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On March 8, 2024, Ms. Jennifer Woodward filed a complaint alleging unprofessional conduct by dispatchers Courtney Tabb, #178 and Melody Howard, #24. She stated that she and her boyfriend, Dramail Lett, called 911 to report an attempted break-in at their home on March 4, 2024. According to Ms. Woodward, the dispatchers repeatedly placed them on hold, did not take the calls seriously, and one dispatcher allegedly said “just hang up on him” before ending the call. She believed the dispatchers’ actions caused responding officers to treat the incident less seriously.

OPS reviewed dispatch records, audio recordings, and body-worn camera footage. The investigation found that callers were not placed on hold, and there was no evidence that the alleged “hang up” comment was made. Audio recordings showed Dispatcher Tabb ended the call only because Ms. Woodward was already connected with another dispatcher, while Sgt. Howard advised that police were being sent before ending her call. WCS footage confirmed that responding officers did take the matter seriously. OPS recommended findings of Unfounded for Allegation A against Dispatcher Tabb and Allegation B against Sgt. Howard. The evidence demonstrated that the alleged conduct did not occur and that both dispatchers acted in compliance with CDP Manual of Rules Section 5.01.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members examined dispatch audio, WCS footage, and call logs to determine whether dispatchers placed callers on hold or made dismissive remarks. The discussion emphasized the importance of objective audio evidence in resolving conflicting recollections. Several members noted that the complainant’s perception of being minimized by dispatch could have downstream effects on how responding officers prioritize calls, so they carefully reviewed WCS and officer response times.

The Board also discussed dispatcher workload and call-handling protocols, asking OPS to clarify whether the actions taken were consistent with training and policy. Counsel explained permissible call-handling practices and the circumstances under which a dispatcher may transfer or end a call. After reviewing the recordings, the Board concluded the evidence contradicted the



complainant’s recollection and supported OPS’s recommendation that the alleged conduct did not occur.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Dispatcher Melody Howard, #24	<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: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Dispatcher Courtney Tabb, #178	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was consistent with Manual Rule 5.01.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0063

Timestamp: 00:31:08 – 00:46:44

Complainant: Matthew Boczek

Presented by: Eisen

Sgt. Robert Goines, #9215

P.O. Brittany Bankston, #2558

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation C: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Allegation D: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Summary of Case Presentation: Between March and October 2024, Mr. Matthew Boczek filed three separate complaints alleging lack of service and improper arrest by Sgt. Robert Goines, #9215 and Det. Brittany Bankston, #2558. The complaints were consolidated under OPS case 2024-0063. Mr. Boczek alleged that Sgt. Goines failed to investigate allegations against him and was responsible for his arrest, and that Det. Bankston failed to properly investigate his case and also improperly arrested him. OPS reviewed the complaints, incident reports, and officer statements.

The investigation found that Sgt. Goines acted only in a supervisory capacity, conferring with another officer and reviewing reports, but had no direct interaction with Mr. Boczek. His arrest was based on a valid Cuyahoga County probation violation warrant, not on Sgt. Goines’ actions. OPS therefore recommended findings of Unfounded for both allegations against Sgt. Goines. For



Det. Bankston, OPS determined she failed to follow Detective Manual requirements by not obtaining a statement from Mr. Boczek, despite being assigned to the case. OPS recommended a finding of Sustained for failure to investigate. However, regarding the allegation of improper arrest, OPS found Mr. Boczek was arrested on a valid probation violation warrant and Det. Bankston was not the arresting officer. OPS recommended a finding of Unfounded for that allegation. The investigation concluded that Sgt. Goines acted appropriately in his supervisory role, while Det. Bankston failed to meet investigative requirements but did not improperly arrest Mr. Boczek.

Board Discussion Summary: Deliberation began with a separation of issues: supervisory conduct by Sgt. Goines and investigative performance by Det. Bankston. Members reviewed timelines, assignment records, and interview notes across the consolidated complaints. The Board gave particular attention to the detective’s investigative steps and the absence of a recorded statement from the complainant. Several members expressed concern that failing to obtain a complainant statement is not a clerical omission but a substantive investigative lapse that can impede case development and prosecutorial review.

Board members discussed whether the omission reflected a systemic workload issue or an individual failure to follow Detective Unit Manual requirements. Some members recommended remedial training and supervisory follow-up; others argued that the omission warranted a sustained finding because it materially affected the completeness of the investigative record. The Board also considered mitigating factors, such as competing assignments and resource constraints, but concluded the responsibility to secure essential witness statements remained with the assigned detective. For Sgt. Goines, the Board reviewed supervisory actions and found no evidence of misconduct. The Board’s sustained finding for Det. Bankston included a Group Level justification reflecting the investigative significance of the omission.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service- Failure to Investigate

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Robert Goines, #9215	<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

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Robert Goines, #9215	<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



Allegation C: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service- Failure to Investigate

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Brittany Bankston, #2558</p>	<p><i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in CDP Detective Unit Manual Rule 5.</i></p> <p>Group Level Explanation: <i>Detective did not interview the suspect before closing her case for the day, resulting in unsatisfactory service and an incomplete investigative report. This omission compromised the integrity of the investigative record and could materially affect prosecutorial decisions and public confidence.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level I – Deficient Investigation & Report Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p>

Allegation D: Improper Procedure: Arrest

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Brittany Bankston, #2558</p>	<p><i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p>

OPS2024-0106

Timestamp: 00:46:44 – 00:52:04

Complainant: Carlee Davenport

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. DeAngelo Rembert, #1574

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Biased Policing

Summary of Case Presentation: On April 27, 2024, Ms. Davenport requested police assistance after what she believed was an assault on her daughter by an associate of her ex-husband. During the approximately 90-minute interaction, she took offense to Patrol Officer DeAngelo Rembert, #1574 stating, “She was just trying to get her child’s father in trouble,” which she interpreted as favoritism toward her ex-husband. Ms. Davenport also alleged that the officer’s comments were unprofessional. She clarified she did not wish to file a complaint against Officer Rembert’s partner, P.O. Jordan Tipton, #1591.

The OPS investigation found that while Officer Rembert admitted becoming irritated during the encounter, the contentious period was brief. His personal response to Ms. Davenport’s remark



about him being a “scorned baby daddy” was defensive but did not rise to the level of unprofessional conduct. His comment about “throwing her ex-husband under the bus” was made in response to Ms. Davenport’s attempt to influence her daughter’s statement. OPS determined that Officer Rembert remained impartial, operated in good faith, and provided Ms. Davenport with options for handling future disputes. His actions were consistent with CDP Manual Rules on professional conduct, courtesy, and bias-free policing. OPS recommended a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior, as the conduct did occur but did not rise to unprofessionalism. OPS recommended a finding of Unfounded for Allegation B: Bias Policing, as the evidence supported that no bias occurred.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board’s discussion examined whether Officer Rembert’s brief defensive remarks crossed the line into unprofessional conduct or biased policing. Members reviewed body worn camera footage, officer statements, and the complainant’s account. Several members acknowledged the emotionally charged nature of domestic-related encounters and discussed how officers’ tone can escalate or de-escalate situations.

Some members argued that a single defensive comment, taken in context, did not demonstrate a pattern of unprofessionalism or bias; others suggested that even brief lapses in professionalism should be documented and addressed through coaching. The Board weighed the totality of the interaction duration, officer demeanor overall, and whether the officer’s actions affected the fairness of the investigation—and concluded the conduct did not meet the threshold for sustained findings on unprofessional behavior or bias.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. DeAngelo Rembert, #1574	<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 5.01, 5.08, and 5.09.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Biased Policing

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. DeAngelo Rembert, #1574	<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: Moore Motion Status: Carried



Complainant: Maxton Stallworth

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Matthew Ratti, #2318

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Summary of Case Presentation: On May 11, 2024, Mr. Stallworth was involved in a domestic altercation with his ex-wife, Ms. Sours. He alleged that she attempted to pour spider killer into his food, and when he knocked it away, the substance got onto her face. Ms. Sours contacted police and reported that Mr. Stallworth had poured the poison on her. Patrol Officers Matthew Ratti, #2318 and Russo, #231 responded to the scene and found the parties separated. Both provided conflicting accounts of the incident. Ms. Sours was transported to the hospital for evaluation due to her injuries, and Mr. Stallworth was arrested for domestic violence. He later expressed frustration that Ms. Sours was not also arrested.

OPS reviewed the incident, noting Mr. Stallworth's prior convictions for domestic violence and that Ms. Sours was the first to contact 911. Officer Ratti consulted with his supervisor and determined Mr. Stallworth was the primary aggressor, based on the comparative severity of injuries. Officer Ratti explained to Mr. Stallworth that the matter would be resolved in court. The prosecutor later declined to indict Ms. Sours, while Mr. Stallworth was indicted for domestic violence by the Court of Common Pleas Criminal Division. OPS recommended a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Improper Arrest against Officer Ratti. The investigation, supported by body-worn camera footage, concluded that the arrest did occur but was consistent with CDP General Police Order 5.05.01, which requires officers to identify and arrest the primary physical aggressor in domestic violence cases.

Board Discussion Summary: Deliberations focused on the domestic violence framework and the officers' application of GPO 5.05.01 to identify the primary physical aggressor. Members reviewed bodyworn camera footage, medical reports, and prior history. Several members discussed the evidentiary indicators used by officers: comparative injuries, statements at the scene, and corroborating witness accounts, and whether those indicators reasonably supported the arrest decision.

The Board also considered the role of prosecutorial review in domestic cases and noted that a prosecutor's later decision not to indict one party does not necessarily indicate an improper arrest at the scene. Members emphasized the need for officers to document their decision-making thoroughly in domestic incidents. After reviewing the record, the Board found the arrest decision reasonable and consistent with departmental policy.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Arrest

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated



Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Matthew Ratti, #2318	<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 General Police Order 5.05.01.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0128

Timestamp: 00:57:52 – 00:58:03

Complainant: Sandra Reyes

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Nathan Farrell, #1594

P.O. Sean Mandzak, #1235

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Tabled: The Office of Professional Standards tabled case due to additional WCS footage in need to review to constitute a full investigation.

OPS2024-0278

Timestamp: 00:58:04 – 00:58:08

Complainant: Robert Bennet

Presented by: Lampkin

P.O. Colin Gill, #171

P.O. Jerome Krakowski, #585

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Board Discussion Summary: Board members reviewed the investigator’s summary and identified gaps in the WCS evidence cited in the report. Several members expressed concern that proceeding without the full video record could lead to an incomplete or inaccurate finding. The Board therefore voted to table the matter until Investigator Lampkin confirmed all referenced WCS recordings were available in the case folder. Members stressed that transparency and completeness of the record are essential for public trust and fair adjudication.

Motion: Table case until Investigator Lampkin confirm all WCS footage is available in the SharePoint Case Folder.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Second By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried



OPS2024-0280

Timestamp: 00:58:08 – 01:08:47

Complainant: Devon Harris

Presented by: Lampkin

P.O. James Brooks, #1014

P.O. Rashaun Searles- Fowler, #2157

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Stop

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Stop

Summary of Case Presentation: On November 7, 2024, Mr. Devon Harris filed a complaint alleging that Patrol Officers Rashaun Searles-Fowler, #2157, resigned April 2025 and James Brooks, #1014 illegally detained him at his home without explanation. The incident stemmed from a dispatch call reporting a missing person who was last seen with Mr. Harris. When officers arrived, they found Mr. Harris visibly upset and holding a razor tucked under his thumb. Officer Brooks secured Mr. Harris in handcuffs and explained that he was being detained while officers searched for the missing person.

During the encounter, Officer Brooks maintained communication with Mr. Harris, informing him that he was considered a potential suspect in a kidnapping. Once the missing person was located unharmed, Mr. Harris was released. OPS determined that the detention was temporary, directly connected to the missing person investigation, and carried out in a professional manner. Body-worn camera footage and officer reports confirmed that communication was open and respectful throughout the incident. OPS recommended a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Improper Procedure against Officer Brooks. The investigation concluded that while the detention did occur, the officer's actions were consistent with law, Division General Police Orders, and training. Officer Searles-Fowler's conduct was also found to be professional, with no violations of procedure, but since is no longer an employee of the Cleveland Department of Police all allegations were Administratively Dismissed.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board examined the missing person context that precipitated the detention and reviewed WCS footage and officer reports. Members discussed whether officers provided adequate explanation to Mr. Harris at the time of detention and whether the use of handcuffs was reasonable given the circumstances (a missing person report and the complainant holding a razor). Several members noted that officers maintained communication with Mr. Harris and that the detention was brief and directly tied to the ongoing search. The Board also considered community expectations about notification and transparency during detentions and encouraged clear officer communication in similar future encounters. The Board concluded the temporary detention was justified and consistent with policy.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Stop

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated



Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. James Brooks, #1014	<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 Rule 4.01.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

P.O. Rashaun Searles- Fowler, #2157

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Stop

OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED – CDP Separated 04/10/2025

CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED – CDP Separated 04/10/2025

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 04/10/2025. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board’s Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

OPS2024-0298

Timestamp: 01:08:48 – 01:42:27

Complainant: Sharea Means

Presented by: GM Watson

P.O. Zachary Musarra, #2133

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: WCS Violation

P.O. Steven Obed, #2134

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: WCS Violation

Summary of Case Presentation: On December 15, 2024, Ms. Sharea Means, a Lyft driver, filed a complaint alleging unprofessional conduct and body-worn camera violations by Patrol Officers Zachary Musarra, #2133 and Steven Obed, #2134. Ms. Means stated she was waiting for a passenger outside P.J. McIntyre’s Irish Pub with her hazard lights on when the officers approached and asked her to move. After relocating to a parking spot, the officers pulled up again, and further words were exchanged. Ms. Means felt the second encounter was adversarial and unnecessary. OPS reviewed duty assignments, AVL records, and officer statements, confirming Musarra and Obed were the officers involved.

The investigation found that Ms. Means’ vehicle was double-parked, which constituted a minor traffic violation under city and state codes. The officers exercised discretion by issuing a verbal warning rather than a citation. The initial encounter lasted only seconds and did not require WCS activation. However, the second interaction, during which Officer Obed remarked “Was that so hard?”, escalated into an adversarial exchange. OPS determined that WCS should have been activated during this second contact in accordance with GPO 4.06.04. Because the interaction was not recorded, there was insufficient evidence to determine whether the officers’ conduct violated professionalism standards under Manual Rules 5.08 and 5.09. OPS recommended Insufficient Evidence for Allegation A: Unprofessional Conduct against both Officers Musarra



and Obed. OPS recommended Sustained for Allegation B: WCS Violation against both officers, as the failure to activate cameras during an adversarial encounter violated Division policy.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members began by reviewing the factual timeline and the physical context of the contact: Ms. Means was double-parked with hazard lights on while waiting for a Lyft passenger, officers initially asked her to relocate, and a subsequent second contact occurred after she moved. The discussion emphasized that the first interaction appeared routine and resolved with a verbal warning, but the second engagement involved renewed officer direction and a dispute over compliance that several members characterized as adversarial in tone. The absence of WCS footage for that second contact was immediately identified as the central evidentiary gap, and members agreed that the missing recording materially limited the Board's ability to assess tone, commands, and officer-citizen dynamics.

Deliberation then turned to policy interpretation and the threshold for WCS activation under GPO 4.06.04. Some members argued that WCS activation is a bright-line requirement whenever an encounter reasonably escalates or becomes adversarial, while others asked whether a brief, de-escalatory exchange could justify not recording. Investigators and counsel explained that the policy is intended to preserve transparency and that officers should err on the side of activation when there is any reasonable anticipation of escalation. The Board weighed the officers' written explanations against the complainant's account and found the lack of objective video evidence created an accountability concern that could not be resolved by testimony alone.

Members also examined the operational and community implications of sustaining a WCS violation versus sustaining an unprofessional conduct allegation. Several members emphasized that sustaining the WCS violation addresses a clear policy breach (failure to record) without necessarily concluding the officers acted unprofessionally in tone or demeanor, which the Board could not definitively determine absent footage. Others stressed the reputational impact on public trust when routine contacts lack recording, noting that consistent WCS compliance is essential to maintain transparency and to protect both officers and community members from disputed accounts. The Board therefore framed a sustained WCS finding as a corrective, policy-focused response intended to reinforce recording practices rather than as a punitive judgment about the officers' overall professionalism.

Finally, the Board discussed remedial and supervisory steps to prevent recurrence and to strengthen documentation when recordings are not available. Recommendations included targeted refresher training on WCS activation thresholds, supervisory review of WCS compliance trends, and a requirement that officers document contemporaneous reasons for not activating WCS when they reasonably anticipate adversarial engagement. Members also asked OPS to develop guidance for clearer narrative documentation in incident reports so that, when recordings are missing, the written record better captures the sequence of commands, responses, and officer decision-making that led to the contact outcome.

Case Findings:



Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Zachary Musarra, #2133	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Gatian Motion Status: Carried

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Steven Obed, #2134	<p><i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports the alleged conduct did occur and was inconsistent with CDP Manual Rules 5.08 and 5.09. The Board reviewed the investigative record, officer interviews, and witness accounts. While some documentary evidence was inconclusive, the Board found persuasive the officers' own admissions during OPS interviews that they recognized the encounter was heightened when they re-approached the complainant. In that context, the officer's remark, "That wasn't so hard," was judged to be inappropriate and to have exacerbated the interaction. The Board concluded the comment, made while the complainant was visibly upset, constituted unprofessional conduct under Manual Rule 5.08.</i></p> <p>Group Level Explanation: P.O. Obed making the comment "That wasn't so hard". Officers admit in OPS interview that they knew the climate was heightened when they made the statement.</p>	<p>Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Gatian Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level I- Discourteous Conduct Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Gatian Motion Status: Carried</p>

Allegation B: WCS Violation

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Zachary Musarra, #2133 P.O. Steven Obed, #2134	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in General Police Order 4.06.04.</i>	Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried



<p>P.O. Zachary Musarra, #2133 P.O. Steven Obed, #2134</p>	<p>Group Level Explanation: <i>The officers acknowledged in their OPS interviews that the encounter had become heightened prior to the second contact, yet they did not activate their WCS as required. This omission constitutes a failure to follow a clear, mandatory recording policy and undermines transparency and accountability in officer-citizen interactions. Given the officers' awareness of the escalating climate, the Board determined a sustained finding is appropriate and recommends remedial measures, including targeted WCS activation training and a requirement that officers document contemporaneous reasons whenever they elect not to record an interaction that reasonably could become adversarial.</i></p>	<p>Group Level: Group Level II- Policy Compliance Failure Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p>
--	--	---

VI. Executive Session (01:42:28 – 02:53:26)

CPRB

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

Motion by: Chair Brown
Seconded by: Cyganovich
Motion Status: Carried

Executive Session began at 11:42 pm EST
Adjourn back into open session at 12:51 pm EST

VII. Old Business (02:53:26 – 02:55:45)

Brandon Brown, Chair

- A. Chair Brown instructed the CPRB Administrative Assistant to create an agenda for Friday, January 30, 2026 @ 2 pm for a special virtual meeting for the Board to officially appoint Michael Hess as the Ops Interim Administrator as it has been approved by Director of Law, Mark Griffin.
- B. This also serves as a Notice to the Public there will be a special virtual meeting Friday, January 30th, 2026 at 2:00 pm EST.

VIII. New Business (02:55:46- 02:56:53)

Brandon Brown, Chair



Motion: Table new business until the February 10th, 2026 CPRB Meeting.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

IX. **Adjournment** (02:56:54 – 02:57:19)

CPRB

Motion: To Adorn January 27th CPRB Meeting

Motion By: Gatian

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

- The CPRB January 27, 2026 meeting was adjourned at 12:54 pm EST.
- Upcoming CPRB Meetings
 - The next CPRB Meeting will be held virtually January 30th at 2:00 pm EST.
 - The February 10th, 2026 CPRB Meeting will be held virtually at 9:00 am EST.
 - The February 25th, 2026 CPRB Meeting will be held virtually at 9:00 am EST.