



CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

March 10th, 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

Michael Hess, Interim Administrator
Jessyca Watson, Interim General Manager
Art Bowker, Interim Senior Investigator
Adam Eisen, Investigator
Hamza Khabir, Investigator
Tammi Lampkin, Investigator
Angela Schwark, Investigator
Alayne Koenig, Investigative Assistant
Katerina Metheney, Investigative Assistant

LEGAL COUNSEL

Dalya Oprian, Asst. Director of Law

MEETING AGENDA

- I. **Call to Order (00:01- 00:28)** **Brandon Brown, Chair**
- a. Chair Brown called March 10, 2026, hearing to order at 9:03 a.m. EST.
 - b. Roll Call
 - a. Member Glenn Parker III had an excused absence.
 - b. Member Chenoa Miller arrived to meeting after roll call @ 9:05 am EST
 - c. A quorum was present
- II. **Approval of Minutes (00:28 – 02:09)** **CPRB**
- a. **February 10th Meeting Minutes – Virtual**
Motion: Approve February 10th, 2026 CPRB Meeting Minutes.
Motion By: Sharp
Second By: Willis
Motion Status: Carried



b. February 25th Meeting Minutes – Virtual

Motion: Approve February 25th, 2026 CPRB Meeting Minutes.

Motion By: Sharp

Second By: Willis

Motion Status: Carried

III. **Public Comment (04:33 – 04:57)**

Brandon Brown, Chair

a. No individuals were present for Public Comment

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

Michael Hess

Interim Administrator

OPS2024-0160

Timestamp: 01:20:38 – 01:36:48

Complainant: Angela Davis (Present)

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Besjon Domnori, #233

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Tow

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: Ms. Angela Davis alleged that her vehicle was improperly towed and that the involved officer, later identified as P.O. Besjon Domnori #233, engaged in unprofessional conduct during the August 8, 2024 incident. She asserted that the 72-hour tow notice documented by CDP was falsified and that the tow was unjustified. OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage, tow records, and the complainant's statements. The investigation confirmed that Ms. Davis's vehicle was disabled, parked at a location where she did not reside, and still displayed the 72-hour tow notice that Officer Domnori had placed on it approximately two months earlier. OPS found no evidence of any interaction between Ms. Davis and the officer during the tow.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for the Improper Tow allegation, concluding that the officer acted within Cleveland Codified Ordinances §§405.02 and 451.25, which authorize the removal of abandoned or inoperable vehicles parked beyond 72 hours. OPS further recommends the finding of Unfounded for the Unprofessional Conduct allegation, as the complainant had no contact with the officer during the tow and the documentation completed by the officer was consistent with what was observed on WCS footage. The evidence supports that the tow was lawful and the officer's conduct aligned with Division policy.

Angela Davis (Complainant) Statement: Ms. Angela Davis addressed the Board to dispute the accuracy of the OPS investigation, stating that the information presented was false. She



explained that her vehicle was parked on CMHA property where she lives, yet the first police report she received claimed her car was involved in a hit-skip on private property during rush hour, was blocking traffic, and that she was incarcerated at the time. She said a second report, issued weeks later, listed the tow as an abandonment tow. By the time she contacted the tow company, her vehicle had already been destroyed. Ms. Davis stated she submitted both reports with her complaint and offered to provide them again.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members focused on the sequence of events that led to the tow and on the documentary evidence that tied the tow to the prior 72-hour notice. Several members asked detailed questions about the tow records and the timing of the notice placement, seeking to understand whether the notice had been placed contemporaneously with the tow or earlier. The board discussed the legal standard in the Cleveland ordinances that authorize removal of abandoned or inoperable vehicles and compared the observed facts on WCS footage to those statutory elements.

Members also spent time evaluating the complainant's assertion that documentation had been falsified. They reviewed what the WCS footage showed about the vehicle's condition and location and discussed whether the absence of direct interaction between the complainant and the officer during the tow affected the credibility of the allegation. Because the complainant later submitted additional police reports, the board emphasized the need to review those documents before completing deliberations and noted the potential for new information to change the factual context.

Additional Information to Note: Member Sharp recused himself as he knows the complainant.

Motion: Table the case until the April 14, 2026, meeting to allow time to review additional documents submitted by the complainant.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Willis

Motion Status: Carried

Abstention: Member Sharp personally knows complainant

V. **Presentation of Investigations**

Michael Hess

Interim Administrator

OPS2024-0278

Timestamp: 05:15 – 19:52

Complainant: Robert Bennett

Presented by: Lampkin

P.O. Colin Gill, #171

Det. Jerome Krakowski, #585

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service



Summary of Case Presentation: Robert Bennett alleged that responding officers failed to provide him an opportunity to give his side of the story during an October 3, 2024, call for service involving an altercation with his neighbor. He stated that officers only spoke with the neighbor, which he believed contributed to him later receiving three aggravated menacing citations by mail. The investigation showed that Detective Krakowski responded due to staffing shortages and his familiarity with the area. body-worn camera footage documented that the detective interviewed the reported victim, who stated that Mr. Bennett drove past her home, made threats, and gestured as if he had a weapon. The footage also captured Detective Krakowski taking a recorded statement from Mr. Bennett, contradicting the complainant's claim that he was not given an opportunity to speak.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Lack of Service/Insufficient Service allegation against Detective Krakowski and P.O. Gill. The evidence, including WCS footage and OPS interviews, shows that officers did in fact obtain Mr. Bennett's statement and conducted a complete investigation. The allegation that officers failed to hear his side of the incident is not supported by the documented interactions, and the investigation concludes that the alleged conduct did not occur.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board revisited OPS 20240284 after previously tabling the case to obtain missing WCS footage. Members clarified that no video existed showing the officer speaking with the complainant on scene because the complainant had already left prior to the officer's arrival. The only direct communication was a recorded follow-up phone call, which had since been added to the file. Member Cyganovich confirmed she had listened to the recording, while Chair Brown noted he had overlooked it while searching for body-worn footage.

Discussion centered on the complainant's allegation that the officer issued citations without first speaking to him. Members questioned whether departmental policy required the officer to locate and interview the complainant before issuing citations. Investigator Lampkin explained that the Detectives Manual is vague on this point and does not clearly mandate obtaining a subject's statement prior to issuing a citation. He also noted that during the recorded phone call, the complainant was given a full opportunity to provide his account and was informed of the violations and reasons for the citations.

Board members emphasized that the complainant was not present when the officer arrived, distinguishing this case from situations where an officer ignores an available witness. The officer relied on multiple consistent statements from individuals on scene, which members agreed could reasonably establish probable cause to issue citations. Chair Brown cautioned against imposing requirements on officers that are not articulated in policy, noting that the manual does not obligate officers to track down a complainant before taking enforcement action.

Member Sharp concurred with the Chair's assessment and added that the complainant retained the ability to contest the citations through the court process if he believed his account



would exonerate him. Overall, the Board focused on the absence of a policy requirement to locate the complainant, the reasonableness of relying on consistent witness statements, and the fact that the complainant was later given an opportunity to provide his version of events during the recorded phone call.

Additional Information to Note: Member Gatian recused himself during the case presentation due to knowing one of the officers.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Colin Gill, #171 P.O. Jerome Krakowski, #585	<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 Abstention: Member Gatian- Personally knows one of the officers

OPS2025-0046

Timestamp: 19:52 – 34:37

Complainant: Anonymous

Presented by: David Frantz
 Zashin & Rich Co. L.P.A.

P.O. John Smith, #493

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: An anonymous complaint submitted on March 14, 2025 alleged that officers working secondary employment at the Jack Cleveland Casino provided special treatment to a city leader, Karl Racine, and failed to fulfill their duties by covering up an incident on January 7, 2025. Security footage and interviews with casino staff and P.O. John Smith #943 showed that an individual attempted to enter the casino around 2:20 a.m. without providing identification as required by casino rules. When the individual refused to comply or leave, P.O. Smith engaged him for approximately 13–14 minutes, reiterated the requirement to show ID, provided his own name and badge number upon request, and eventually called for a patrol car. The individual left the premises before additional officers arrived.

OPS recommends findings of Unfounded for both the Lack of Service and Unprofessional Conduct allegations. The evidence shows that P.O. Smith acted appropriately,



followed casino procedures, and made reasonable efforts to gain compliance while working secondary employment. The allegation of special treatment is unsupported, as the officer denied the individual’s request to bypass identification requirements and handled the situation in the same manner he described using in similar incidents. Security staff also confirmed that the officer acted professionally and did not provide preferential treatment. The investigation found no evidence that the officer failed to perform his duties or attempted to conceal the incident.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board reviewed the investigation into an anonymous complaint alleging that Officer John Smith #493 provided special treatment to an individual at the Jack Cleveland Casino and attempted to cover up the incident. Early in deliberations, Chair Brown noted a discrepancy between the badge number listed on the agenda and the number in the investigative report; Investigator Frantz acknowledged a typographical error and confirmed that #493 was correct. Members then invited questions before proceeding to motions.

Member Sharp asked Investigator Frantz to restate the core allegations, given the anonymous nature of the complaint. Frantz explained that the complainant alleged favorable treatment and failure to perform duties, but the investigation found no evidence supporting those claims. Video footage—though without audio—showed the officer calmly engaging the individual, refusing entry due to lack of ID, and ultimately resolving the situation without conflict. Frantz noted that the officer’s approach was consistent with standard casino procedures for handling uncooperative patrons.

Board members discussed whether any force was used during the encounter. Frantz clarified that the only physical contact consisted of light taps on the individual’s shoulder, intended as gentle prompts to leave, and did not constitute force. Sharp observed that allowing the individual to enter without ID would have been the true example of special treatment, underscoring that the officer’s refusal aligned with policy and standard practice. Members agreed that the officer’s conduct appeared appropriate and professional.

Chair Brown concluded by noting that the case seemed to have drawn heightened attention primarily because of the identity of the civilian involved rather than any misconduct by the officer. With no further questions or concerns raised, the Board prepared to move forward with motions based on the investigative findings.

Additional Information to Note: The badge number for P.O. John Smith was incorrectly listed in the investigative report as #943, but the correct badge number is #493 as listed on the agenda.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

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



P.O. John Smith, #493	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried
------------------------------	--	---

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. John Smith, #493	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0284

Timestamp: 34:37 – 42:29

Complainant: Sharon Drummonds

Presented by: Lampkin

P.O. Christian Crane, #50

P.O. Tyrence James, #1208

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: Ms. Sharron Drummonds alleged Unprofessional Conduct and Lack of Service on November 19, 2024, stating that P.O. Christian Crane #50 and P.O. Tyrence James #1208 were rude, unethical, and failed to arrest her boyfriend after she reported that he kicked in her security screen door and stole her car battery. The investigation showed that officers gathered statements from both Ms. Drummonds and her boyfriend, Mr. Grays, who reported that he was attempting to fix her car and that the two shared access to each other’s residences. Officers determined that the situation involved a domestic dispute and advised Ms. Drummonds that eviction proceedings would be required to remove Mr. Grays from the home. When informed that Mr. Grays would be permitted to leave for the night to prevent further conflict, Ms. Drummonds became upset and requested the officers’ names, badge numbers, and a supervisor, which the officers provided.

OPS recommends Unfounded for the Unprofessional Conduct allegation, as body-worn camera footage shows that both officers remained professional and courteous throughout the encounter. OPS recommends Exonerated for the Lack of Service allegation, concluding that the officers’ actions were consistent with law, Division policy, and standard procedure for domestic--related- disputes involving cohabitating partners. The evidence supports that the officers appropriately assessed the situation, provided guidance, and took reasonable steps to prevent escalation.



Board Discussion Summary: After the case presentation, the board had no further questions, comments, or concerns.

Additional Information to Note: After the case presentation Member Miller recused herself for this case due to personally knowing one of the officers.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Christian Crane, #50 P.O. Tyrence James, #1208</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: Moore Motion Status: Carried Abstention- Member Miller due to personally knowing an officer</p>

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Christian Crane, #50 P.O. Tyrence James, #1208</p>	<p><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 4.18.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Abstention; Member Miller personally knowing one of the officers</p>

OPS2024-0167

Timestamp: 42:29 – 51:15

Complainant: Shelia Foster

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Carlos Robles, #2283

Allegation A: Improper Procedure



Summary of Case Presentation: Ms. Foster reported on July 16, 2024 that a Cleveland police officer had entered her mailbox without cause, stating she did not understand why an officer was at her home. The officer was identified as P.O. Carlos Robles #2283, who had been dispatched to notify Ms. Foster’s neighbor of a protection order. The investigation showed that the information card he left was related to that protection order and that he placed the notice on the outside of Ms. Foster’s mailbox, not inside it. Body-worn camera footage, Ms. Foster’s own video, and the officer’s interview all confirmed that no mail matter was deposited inside the mailbox.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Improper Procedure allegation. The evidence shows that P.O. Robles was at the residence for a lawful purpose, acted within the requirements of protection order enforcement procedures, and did not violate federal restrictions regarding- mailboxes. His actions were consistent with Division policy and applicable law, and the alleged conduct did not occur.

Board Discussion Summary: After the case presentation, the Board had no further questions, comments, or concerns.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Carlos Robles, #2283	<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: Willis Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0178

Timestamp: 46:53 – 51:15

Complainant: Antoinette Sesti-Stone

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Besjon Domnori, #233

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: Ms. Antoinette SestiStone filed a complaint on July 25, 2024 alleging unprofessional behavior by P.O. Domnori Besjon #233 after he approached her and requested that she cut her grass. She stated that the officer’s conduct was inappropriate. The investigation showed that the officer had been flagged down by a community member regarding overgrown grass at her property. body-worn camera footage confirmed that the officer’s interaction with Ms. Sesti-Stone was brief, professional, and limited to informing her of the city’s property maintenance requirements.



OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for the allegation. The evidence shows that the officer acted in good faith, within the scope of his authority, and consistent with Cleveland Codified Ordinance 209.01, which requires grass to be maintained at a height under eight inches. No citation was issued, and the officer did not escalate the interaction when Ms. Sesti-Stone- disagreed. The investigation concludes that the alleged conduct occurred but was fully consistent with law, policy, and procedure.

Board Discussion Summary: After the case presentation, the Board had no further questions, comments, or concerns.

Additional Information to Note: The officer's name is listed incorrectly on the agenda, but the correct order is P.O. Besjon Domnori, #233.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Besjon Domnori, #233	<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 Cleveland Codified Ordinance 209.01.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0074

Timestamp: 51:15 – 55:03

Complainant: Naliah Fanville-Hester

Presented by: Bowker

P.O. Elvert Jordan, #230

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Summary of Case Presentation: Ms. Nailah Fanville-Hester filed a complaint on April 9, 2024, alleging that P.O. Elvert Jordan #230 improperly disclosed her confidential information to her fiancé after she was asked to leave the Third District lobby. OPS attempted multiple times to contact the complainant for an interview but received no response. The investigation proceeded using available evidence, including body-worn camera footage and the complainant’s written statement. The footage shows P.O. Jordan advising both parties to leave separately to prevent further conflict and does not show him releasing any protected information to the fiancé.



OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Improper Procedure allegation. The evidence, including the officer’s WCS footage, supports that no disclosure of confidential information occurred and that the officer’s actions did not violate Manual Rule 5.01 or GPO 7.03.02. The investigation concludes that the alleged conduct did not occur.

Board Discussion Summary: After the case presentation, the Board had no further questions, comments, or concerns.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Elvert Jordan, #230	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

OPS2023-0164

Timestamp: 55:03 – 1:03:56

Complainant: Johnathan Simonski
Ana Tejada

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Darian Laska, #757

P.O. Timothy McKenzie, #1816

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: Ms. Ana Tejada, an Uber driver, reported that during the early morning hours of July 9, 2023, she flagged down a Cleveland police officer near the East Flats after her vehicle was struck by a phone battery charger during a nearby altercation. She alleged that the officer dismissed her concerns and told her to keep moving without assessing the situation. Her husband, Mr. Johnathon Simonski, also an Uber driver, reported a separate interaction earlier that night in which an unidentified officer allegedly made negative comments about rideshare drivers. OPS identified P.O. Darian Laska #757 and P.O. Timothy McKenzie #1816 as the officers assigned to the zone car in the area at the time, but both officers denied any interaction with the complainants, and no body-worn camera or documentary evidence linked them to the alleged encounters.

OPS recommends Insufficient Evidence for both the Lack of Service and Unprofessional Conduct allegations against P.O. Laska and P.O. McKenzie, as the investigation could not confirm that either officer interacted with the complainants or made the alleged statements.



Additionally, because the officer involved in Mr. Simonski’s allegation could not be identified, that portion of the complaint is recommended for Administrative Dismissal under OPS policy. The available evidence does not substantiate the allegations made.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board discussed the case as an insufficient evidence matter, with Chair Brown emphasizing the importance of ensuring that the Board truly lacks evidence to support or refute the allegation before reaching that finding. Members considered whether the complainant had provided enough detail to allow for a meaningful assessment of the officer’s response. Member Sharp asked whether the complainant had identified who threw the phone charger that allegedly struck her vehicle or provided any actionable information.

While reviewing the incident report, Investigator Eisen explained that the complainant described two women physically fighting in the Flats. During the altercation, one woman threw a phone charger at the other, and it struck the complainant’s vehicle. The complainant did not know the individuals involved and did not identify anyone by name. She later went to the Third District to file the report, meaning the parties involved were no longer on scene when officers were present.

Given that the complainant could not identify the individuals involved, and the officer had no subjects present to interview or detain, members agreed that the officer’s ability to investigate was inherently limited. Sharp noted that without identifiable suspects, the officer was “kind of tied,” as there was no actionable lead to pursue. With no further evidence available to clarify the officer’s conduct or expand the investigation, the Board acknowledged the case appropriately fell under insufficient evidence.

***Additional Information to Note:** Board members noted that this incident occurred in a high-traffic nightlife area where officers often manage multiple simultaneous issues. Chair Brown highlighted that the Board has previously recognized officers’ need to prioritize immediate safety concerns in such environments, and that feelings of “lack of service” often arise when officers must triage competing demands. Members reiterated that the Board does not override officer discretion unless there is clear evidence of abuse.*

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Darian Laska, #757 P.O. Timothy McKenzie, #1816</p>	<p><i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports the alleged conduct did not occur.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Opposed: Member Gatian- since there is was no WCS footage we do</p>



		not truly know what happened during encounter.
--	--	--

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence **CPRB Decision:** Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Darian Laska, #757 P.O. Timothy McKenzie, #1816	<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: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried

OPS Action: **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – Unidentifiable CDP Employee

CPRB Recommendation: **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – Unidentifiable CDP Employee

Pursuant to Section 703(b) of the OPS Operations Manual, these allegations were administratively dismissed because OPS was unable to identify a CDP employee involved. As a result, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Office of Professional Standards and the Civilian Police Review Board.

OPS2024-0093

Timestamp: 1:03:56 – 1:10:39

Complainant: Abdulkarim Kelley

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Anthony Longer, #2452

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Tow

P.O. Steven Obed, #2134

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Tow

P.O. Zachary Musarra, #2133

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Tow

Sgt. George Roberts, #9296

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Tow

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: The complainant alleged that on April 19, 2024, officers improperly towed his recovered stolen vehicle and provided insufficient service when they refused to release the vehicle to his friend who was on scene. He also stated that Sgt. George Roberts refused to take his complaint over the phone and would not provide the names and badge numbers of the officers involved. The investigation found that the vehicle had been reported stolen, and officers were unable to verify ownership or trustee authority at the scene. body-worn camera footage showed that the tow was ordered in accordance with Cleveland Codified Ordinance 405.02(c), which authorizes removal of stolen vehicles. Records also showed that the complainant did not request officer identification during the call, and that P.O. Longer was not on duty at the time of the incident.



OPS recommends Unfounded for the Improper Tow allegation against P.O. Anthony Longer, as he was not present. The Improper Tow allegations against P.O. Zachary Musarra, P.O. Steven Obed, and Sgt. George Roberts are recommended Exonerated, as the tow occurred and was consistent with law and policy. The Lack of Service allegation against Sgt. Roberts is recommended Unfounded, as evidence shows he complied with identification requirements and did not refuse a complaint. The investigation found no support for the complainant's claims and confirmed that officers acted within policy.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board briefly discussed the tow decision, with Chair Brown noting that the Codified Ordinances clearly outline when officers are permitted to tow a vehicle, and in this case the officers were unable to determine ownership at the time of the incident. He acknowledged that the complainant was upset both during the encounter and later during a phone call, which contributed to the tone of the interactions, but emphasized that the officers' actions appeared consistent with policy under the circumstances. Brown invited any final questions or concerns, but none were raised.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Tow

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Anthony Longer, #2452 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 carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in Cleveland Codified Ordinance 405.02.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Tow

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. George Roberts, #9296	<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 Cleveland Codified Ordinance 405.02.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

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



Sgt. George Roberts, #9296	<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: Willis Motion Status: Carried
-----------------------------------	--	---

OPS2023-0290

Timestamp: 01:10:39 – 1:20:38

Complainant: Taylor Hawkins

Presented by: IA Koenig

P.O. Chad Smith, #289

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: Ms. Taylor Hawkins filed a complaint on December 1, 2023 alleging Lack of Service after she went to the First District station to report an issue involving her downstairs neighbor. She stated she had been falsely accused of breaking and entering and believed the responding officer did not properly assist her. OPS made multiple attempts to contact Ms. Hawkins by phone, mail, and in person, but was unable to reach her for an interview. The investigation proceeded using available evidence, including body-worn camera footage from her interaction at the district.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Lack of Service allegation against P.O. Chad Smith #289. The evidence shows that the officer was professional, completed a report for Ms. Hawkins, and explained that without the name of the individual involved, further action would need to be pursued through the Prosecutor's Office. His actions fulfilled his duty to provide service, and the investigation found no support for the allegation that he failed to assist her.

IA Koenig Addendum (Dated: 2/20/2026): *The evidence reviewed included the WCS footage of P.O. Smith, #289, the complainant's written complaint dated December 11, 2023, and Field Case Report 2023-00361311 authored by P.O. Smith on December 1, 2023. The applicable Manual of Rules for the Conduct and Discipline of Employees was also considered. These materials collectively support the conclusion that the alleged failure to provide service did not occur.*

Board Discussion Summary: The Board discussed whether the officer should have taken additional steps when the complainant came to the district to report ongoing issues with an unidentified neighbor. Member Gatian questioned why the officer told the complainant that nothing could be done without a name, noting that she had video evidence and could at least describe where the neighbor lived. He expressed concern that the officer may have dismissed the matter too quickly rather than attempting to gather basic investigative details. Investigator Koenig clarified that no officer responded to the scene and that the complainant lived in an area with multiple possible neighbors, making identification difficult without more specific



information. She also noted that OPS attempted to follow up with the complainant for clarification but was unable to reach her.

Members Sharp and Willis agreed that while the officer completed a report and provided guidance on next steps, they too wished the officer had asked more probing questions—such as which unit or which adjacent home the neighbor occupied—before concluding that no further action could be taken. They acknowledged the limitations created by the complainant filing the report after the fact and without clear identifying information but still felt that a modest additional effort by the officer could have strengthened the response.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Chad Smith, #289	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0177

Timestamp: 1:20:38 – 1:41:09

Complainant: Arto Green

Presented by: Eisen

Interim Administrator Hess skipped this case due to technical difficulties related to video sharing.

OPS2023-0201

Timestamp: 1:41:09 – 1:55:14

Complainant: DeLorese Pearson

Presented by: Schwark

Sgt. Michael Boyd, #9369

Sgt. Steven Fedorko, #9334

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Ms. DeLorese Pearson regarding an incident that occurred on August 14, 2023, during which she alleged that an unidentified white male officer with dark hair refused to take a harassment report after she reported that neighbors across the street were filming and harassing her special needs children.



She reported concerns related to unprofessional behavior and lack of service, stating that the officer—later identified as P.O. Michael Boyd #2584—told her the conduct was not a crime, encouraged the neighbors to continue recording, and compared himself to her children by referencing his own ADHD. Ms. Pearson said she felt dismissed and believed the officer showed a lack of empathy. She further stated that when two officers returned approximately 45 minutes later, both P.O. Boyd and P.O. Steven Fedorko #1399 again declined to take a harassment report. OPS conducted a full investigation, including review of body-worn camera footage from both officers, officer interviews, and the CDP incident report.

OPS reached findings of exonerated for all listed allegations. These determinations were based on clear and corroborated body-worn camera evidence showing that both officers responded promptly, assessed the situation, and accurately explained that the neighbors' actions did not constitute a criminal offense under Ohio law. The footage showed that both officers remained calm, respectful, and informative, consistent with CDP Manual Rules 5.08 and 5.09 regarding professional and courteous conduct. Their explanation that no harassment report could be taken aligned with Manual Rule 4.18, which requires officers to investigate reports requiring police action; the officers fulfilled this obligation by responding, evaluating the circumstances, and providing legally accurate guidance. OPS concluded that the officers' conduct did not violate policy and that the alleged unprofessional behavior and lack of service did not occur.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board discussed whether the officer made specific statements alleged by the complainant, particularly the claim that he told a neighbor they could continue recording the complainant's special needs children. Member Sharp noted that while the officer did advise both parties to record their interactions, he did not hear anything on WCS suggesting the officer singled out the children or encouraged recording them specifically. Members Moore and Willis agreed, recalling only a general instruction to both sides to document future encounters. The Board also acknowledged that one of the complainant's allegations—the officer's comment about having ADHD—did occur, though members viewed it as an attempt at rapport building rather than an unprofessional remark.

A second part of the discussion focused on whether Allegation A (unprofessional behavior) should be classified as unfounded or exonerated. Member Cyganovich questioned why the investigative recommendation listed the allegation as exonerated rather than unfounded, given that the conduct described by the complainant did not occur. Chair Brown explained that he generally prefers "unfounded" for unprofessional conduct allegations when the alleged behavior did not happen at all, because "exonerated" can imply the officer behaved unprofessionally but within policy. However, after further discussion, members acknowledged that one of the specific statements—the ADHD comment—was made, even if it was not intended disrespectfully, which could justify an exonerated finding rather than unfounded.

Overall, the Board agreed that the officer's actions on scene did not match the complainant's characterization, and that the WCS footage supported the investigator's conclusion that the officer remained calm and attempted to de-escalate. Members appreciated the



nuance between the two possible findings and noted that the distinction would be addressed during the motion phase.

Additional Information to Note: During the investigation the original badge number for the CDP employees involved was P.O. Michael Boyd, # 2584 and P.O. Steven Fedorko, #1399. Both employees received a promotion. Their corresponding updated badge numbers are reflected on the agenda and meeting minutes.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Michael Boyd, #9369 Sgt. Steven Fedorko, #9334	<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 5.08 and 5.09.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Michael Boyd, #9369 Sgt. Steven Fedorko, #9334	<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 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

OPS2023-0208

Timestamp: 01:55:14 – 2:10:35

Complainant: Olivia Woods

Presented by: Schwark

P.O. Megan Hollenbeck, #187

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Citation

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation F: Improper Procedure: Transport

P.O. Tatiana Bartell, #584

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation D: Excessive Force

Allegation E: WCS Violation

Allegation F: Improper Procedure: Transport



Sgt. Carma Crosby, #9316

Allegation G: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Ms. Olivia Woods regarding an incident on August 5, 2023, during a late-night parking enforcement and tow operation near E. 78th Place and Superior Avenue. She alleged Improper Procedure related to citation, arrest, and transport; Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct; Excessive Force; a WCS violation; and Lack of Service by a responding supervisor. Ms. Woods stated she was handcuffed without cause, experienced wrist pain from tight cuffs, and that the involved officers—P.O. Megan Hollenbeck #187 and P.O. Tatiana Bartell #584—laughed at her and made jokes about her deceased friend. She further alleged unsafe transport, including speeding and not being seat-belted, and claimed that Sgt. Carma Crosby #9316 failed to respond to her concerns at the Cuyahoga County Sheriff’s Office. OPS reviewed extensive body-worn camera footage, radio communications, officer statements, and Detective Follow-Up documentation.

OPS reached findings of Exonerated for the allegations of Improper Procedure (citation, arrest, and transport), Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct, and the WCS allegation, and Unfounded for the Excessive Force allegation. The evidence showed officers were conducting lawful parking enforcement in a posted “No Parking Anytime” zone, provided repeated explanations and warnings, and attempted de-escalation before detaining Ms. Woods. WCS confirmed she was double-cuffed with visible clearance, repeatedly declined cuff adjustments, and at one point stated she was “trying to save [her] lawsuit.” No evidence supported claims of mocking or unsafe driving. Her resistance during transport—including kicking and refusing to be touched—created an articulable safety risk that fell within the seat-belt exception under GPO 3.01.01. The WCS review also confirmed that P.O. Bartell’s camera was active until its battery was depleted, which she immediately reported as required. The Lack of Service allegation against Sgt. Crosby was exonerated, as footage showed she responded promptly, assisted Ms. Woods, loosened her cuffs, and attempted to obtain identified information. OPS concluded that all involved officers acted within CDP policy and procedure.

Board Discussion Summary: After the case presentation, the Board did not have any further questions, comments, or concerns.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Citation

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Megan Hollenbeck, #187	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried



	<i>alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.01.</i>	
--	---	--

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Tatiana Bartell, #584 P.O. Megan Hollenbeck, #187	<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 4.01 and 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Tatiana Bartell, #584 P.O. Megan Hollenbeck, #187	<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 4.13 and 5.08.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation D: Excessive Force

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Tatiana Bartell, #584	<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 E: WCS Violation

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Tatiana Bartell, #584	<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 4.04.06.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation F: Improper Procedure: Transport



OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Tatiana Bartell, #584 P.O. Megan Hollenbeck, #187</p>	<p><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 6.0, 8.01 and General Police Order 3.01.01.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Sharp Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried</p>

Allegation G: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>Sgt. Carma Crosby, #9316</p>	<p><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 4.01, 4.06 and 4.11.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Sharp Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried</p>

OPS2024-0201

Timestamp: 02:10:44 – 02:20:11

Complainant: James Jackson

Presented by: Eisen

Sgt. Brandon Betley, #9363

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Citation

Allegation B: WCS Violation

Summary of Case Presentation: Mr. James Jackson filed a complaint with OPS regarding an incident that occurred at Opportunity Corridor, during which he alleged that P.O. Brandon Betley #1790 failed to properly cite the driver who struck his vehicle during a multivehicle crash. Mr. Jackson reported concerns related to improper procedure, asserting that the involved officer did not issue a citation for lack of insurance and failed to document all parties appropriately. OPS conducted a full investigation, including review of body-worn camera footage, the OH1 crash report, officer statements, and available documentation.

OPS reached findings of exonerated for the allegation of improper procedure and sustained for the allegation of a WCS violation. These determinations were based on evidence showing that P.O. Betley completed the OH1 report in accordance with CDP Manual Rules and General Police Orders, identified witnesses, and followed required procedures regarding proof of financial responsibility. However, OPS concluded that the officer failed to activate his body-



worn camera for a portion of the encounter, including his interaction with a listed passenger, which violated GPO 4.06.04. The case is presented to the CPRB for review and final recommendation.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board reviewed the traffic accident response and the complainant’s claim that a female witness walked away without speaking to Officer Betley. Chair Brown noted that the investigative record clearly showed the officer did speak with the woman—her name and information appear in the crash report—though he allowed her to leave shortly afterward. Investigator Eisen confirmed that the witness, Ms. King, was reluctant to remain on scene, initially resisted providing her information, and left as soon as she could after giving her name. Members acknowledged that while the officer did not obtain a full statement, he did secure identifying information before she departed.

Discussion then turned to the Wearable Camera System (WCS) violation. Officer Betley stated he believed he had activated his camera but apparently had not, despite the device emitting an audible tone when properly engaged. Member Sharp raised an additional concern: if the officer realized at the end of his shift that no WCS footage existed for the incident, he should have documented a malfunction or noted that he believed he had activated the device. Investigator Eisen confirmed that the officer never reported a malfunction and only offered speculative explanations—such as the activation bar “maybe not going all the way across”—after being notified of the violation. Members agreed that while mistakes happen, officers are responsible for ensuring their cameras are activated and for documenting any equipment issues at the time they occur.

With no further questions or concerns raised, the Board concluded that the officer had spoken with the witness as required but failed to activate his body-worn camera and did not document any malfunction, supporting the WCS violation finding.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Citation

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Brandon Betley, #9363	<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 4.18 and General Police Order 8.02.03- Section III.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: WCS Violation

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained



Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>Sgt. Brandon Betley, #9363</p>	<p><i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur and was inconsistent with the standards outlined in GPO 4.06.04.</i></p> <p><i>Group Level Explanation: The officer failed to activate WCS during investigation of a motor vehicle accident, which is inconsistent with the GPO 4.06.04 policies and procedures.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level I – Improper use of WCS Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p>

OPS2025-0026

Timestamp: 02:20:11 – 02:48:57

Complainant: Cameran Branford

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Kevin Nussbaum, #325

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Tow

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Mr. Cameran Branford regarding an incident in which he alleged that his vehicle was improperly towed. He stated that his vehicle had been towed to its location after an accident and that the individual who originally moved the vehicle measured the distance from the curb beforehand, implying it should not have been subject to tow. Mr. Branford’s phone number was disconnected, and he did not respond to multiple notices sent to several addresses associated with him, preventing OPS from verifying his account. OPS conducted a full investigation, including review of body-worn camera footage from the involved officer, P.O. Kevin Nussbaum #325.

OPS reached a finding of exonerated for the allegation of improper procedure related to the tow. This determination was based on clear video evidence showing the vehicle parked more than 12 inches from the curb, a violation of Cleveland Codified Ordinance 451.04(a). With no contradictory evidence available and the officer’s actions aligning with the ordinance, OPS concluded that the tow was lawful and consistent with policy. The case is presented to the CPRB for review and final recommendation.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board engaged in an extensive discussion regarding the officer’s decision to issue parking citation and tow the complainant’s vehicle for being more than twelve inches from the curb. Members Cyganovich and Gatian questioned the officer’s method of measurement, noting that the WCS footage showed him using his foot rather than a measuring



device. Cyganovich observed that the officer's written report stated the vehicle was more than twelve inches from the curb, yet the only visible measurement technique was placing his foot between the tire and the curb. Members expressed concern that the officer appeared to rely on the assumption that his shoe length equaled twelve inches, raising questions about the accuracy and reliability of the measurement.

Member Gatian expanded on these concerns, emphasizing that although the vehicle may have technically exceeded the twelve-inch limit, it was not obstructing traffic, creating a safety hazard, or generating complaints. He noted that the street was wide, traffic was minimal, and other vehicles appeared similarly positioned. Gatian argued that while the officer may have followed the letter of the law, the decision to tow the vehicle did not align with the spirit of the ordinance, which is generally intended to address nuisance or safety issues. He expressed concern that such enforcement actions can erode public trust, particularly when the vehicle owner was already dealing with frontend damage and the financial burden of repairs.

The Board then turned to the officer's compliance with GPO 6.03.01 regarding vehicle inventory procedures. Gatian pointed out that the officer spent less than two minutes conducting the inventory and failed to open several unlocked boxes and a tool case visible in the trunk. The GPO requires officers to open and document the contents of all unlocked containers, yet the officer listed "nothing of value" on the tow sheet without verifying the contents. Gatian stressed that this omission created risk for both the department and the vehicle owner, as disputes could arise if property were later reported missing. Member Sharp agreed that the inventory appeared incomplete but cautioned that adding a new allegation without first hearing from the officer could appear retaliatory instead that a reinstruction letter might be more appropriate.

Chair Brown then addressed the procedural limitations of the investigation. Because this was an abridged investigation, OPS had not interviewed the officer, leaving important context unknown—such as whether there had been prior neighborhood complaints, whether the officer believed the vehicle was disabled, or why the inventory was conducted so quickly. Brown noted that if the Board wished to consider an additional allegation regarding improper inventory procedure, it would be necessary to speak with the officer to obtain a full account. He also acknowledged that while the tow may have appeared overly strict, there may have been contextual factors not reflected in the file.

After further discussion, members agreed that the Board could not fairly evaluate either the propriety of the tow or the alleged inventory violation without first hearing from the officer. They concluded that additional information was necessary to determine whether the officer exercised appropriate discretion, followed required procedures, and adhered to departmental policy. The Board therefore moved to table the case so OPS could interview the officer and return with a complete investigative record before any findings or motions were made.

Additional Information to Note:



Motion: Table Case 2025-0026 to allow for further investigation, including interviewing P.O. Nussbaum #325 to clarify the tow and inventory-related questions.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Gatian

Motion Status. Carried

Motion: Add allegation of Improper Procedure based on GPO 6.03.01 Section II- Inventory Expectation.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Gatian

Motion Status. Carried

OPS2024-0068

Timestamp: 02:49:02 – 02:53:19

Complainant: Carl Hussing

Presented by: Eisen

Det. Ginger Strong, #427

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Mr. Carl Hussing regarding an incident that occurred on March 11, 2025, during which he alleged a lack of service by Det. Ginger Strong #427 after he was involved in a hit-skip accident. Mr. Hussing stated that Det. Strong did not thoroughly investigate the incident and believed additional steps should have been taken to identify the vehicle that struck him. OPS conducted a full investigation, including review of RTCC footage, RTA camera footage, officer documentation, and applicable CDP policies.

OPS reached a finding of exonerated for the allegation of lack of service. The evidence showed that Det. Strong reviewed all available RTCC and RTA footage from the area identified by Mr. Hussing and was able to determine the type of vehicle involved, but the license plate was not visible on any camera angle. With no additional leads available, the case was appropriately closed as unsolvable. OPS concluded that Det. Strong's actions were consistent with CDP Manual Rule 4.18, which requires officers to investigate all reports requiring police action; she fulfilled this obligation by conducting a thorough review of available evidence. The case is presented to the CPRB for review and final recommendation.

Board Discussion Summary: After the case presentation, The Board did not have any further questions, comments, or concerns.

Case Findings:



Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Ginger Strong, #427	<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: Willis Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0128

Timestamp: 02:53:19– 02:57:39

Complainant: Sandra Reyes

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Nathan Farrell, #1594

Sgt. Brandon Melbar, #9361

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

P.O. Sean Mandzak, #1235

Det. Colbert Stadden, #1226

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Ms. Sandra Reyes regarding an incident that occurred on June 3, 2024, during which she alleged a lack of service by multiple Cleveland Division of Police officers after she contacted police several times about loud music, open containers, fireworks, and general disturbances caused by her neighbors. She stated that officers did not investigate, did not speak to anyone on scene, and failed to address the ongoing nuisance behavior. The complaint was later revised on February 24, 2026, to include three additional officers. OPS conducted a full investigation, including review of body-worn camera footage from all responding officers and relevant documentation.

OPS reached findings of unfounded for all listed allegations of lack of service. The evidence showed that officers operated in accordance with General Orders and were not required by policy to exit their vehicles during the response. Contrary to the complainant’s statements, WCS confirmed that both responding patrols engaged with the neighbors and assessed the situation. No loud music or fireworks were occurring when officers arrived, and the decision to issue a warning rather than a citation was within officer discretion under GPO 4.04.07, which supports community-oriented problem solving. OPS concluded that the alleged lack of service did not occur and that the actions of P.O. Sean Mandzak #1235, P.O. Nathan Farrell #1549, Det. Colbert Stadden #1226, and Sgt. Brandon Melbar #9361 were consistent with CDP policy.

Board Discussion Summary: After the case presentation, The Board did not have any further questions, comments, or concerns.

Case Findings:



Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Nathan Farrell, #1594 P.O. Sean Mandzak, #1235 Sgt. Brandon Melbar, #9361 Det. Colbert Stadden, #1226	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0147

Timestamp: 02:57:47 – 03:07:10

Complainant: Lawrence Wilson

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Renee Perez, #2268

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Mr. Lawrence Wilson regarding an incident that occurred on July 7, 2024, during which he alleged that he observed a Cleveland Division of Police officer using a vape pen while on duty near the City Hall “Free Stamp” area. Mr. Wilson stated he recognized the officer as P.O. Renee Perez #2268 and believed the vape contained marijuana. OPS conducted an investigation that included an interview with P.O. Perez, who stated she does not smoke or vape and does not leave the building during her work hours. OPS also reviewed the applicable smoking policy, GPO 1.02.07, which outlines restrictions on smoking and vaping while on duty.

OPS reached a finding of insufficient evidence for the allegation of unprofessional behavior/conduct. The determination was based on the absence of any corroborating evidence to validate Mr. Wilson’s claim and the conflicting statements between the complainant and the officer. Additionally, the alleged conduct—even if it had occurred as described—would not have violated the smoking policy, as vaping outdoors near the Free Stamp would not fall under the prohibited conditions outlined in GPO 1.02.07. OPS concluded that the available information did not establish whether the alleged conduct occurred. The case is presented to the CPRB for review and final recommendation.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board discussed the complainant’s allegation that the officer was smoking marijuana from a vape pen near the Free Stamp. Investigator Khabir explained that the complainant offered no concrete evidence beyond personal speculation and an asserted “prior knowledge” of the officer’s alleged substance use. During the interview, the complainant admitted he was standing across the street and could not confirm what substance—if any—was in the vape. OPS attempted to explore the complainant’s claim of prior familiarity with the



officer, but the union representative prohibited questioning on that topic because no independent evidence supported it. Due to the six-month delay between the incident and the complaint, OPS was also unable to corroborate with the officer’s statement that she does not leave the building during duty hours, and no additional officers were interviewed.

Board members noted that even if cameras or witnesses had been available, they would not have been able to determine whether the vape contained marijuana. Members Sharp, Gatian, and Cyganovich emphasized that the complainant’s distance, lack of specificity, and inability to identify the substance made the allegation inherently unprovable. They also observed that the complainant’s claim that he “knew” it was marijuana was not credible given his vantage point. Members agreed that the evidence did not support an exonerated finding, because exoneration would imply the conduct occurred but was permissible. Instead, they concluded that the allegation lacked factual support altogether.

The Board ultimately agreed that the appropriate classification was unfounded, as the complainant’s account could not be substantiated and no evidence indicated the officer engaged in the alleged conduct. With no further questions, Member Sharp prepared to make a motion.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Renee Perez, #2268	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, documents, and written reports supports the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Gatian Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0304

Timestamp: 03:07:10 – 03:11:09

Complainant: Suzanne Magro

Presented by: Lampkin

Traffic Controller Robert Maloney, #7170

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Ms. Suzanne Magro regarding an incident that occurred on December 15, 2024, during which she alleged that Traffic Control Officer (TCO) Robert Maloney #7170 yelled at her, ordered her to hurry up, and used inappropriate verbal language as she crossed St. Clair and E. 9th Street on her way to a Cleveland Browns game. She stated she later reported the encounter to another officer and a supervisor but could not provide their names, badge numbers, or the identity of a witness. OPS



conducted a full investigation, including a recorded phone interview with TCO Maloney and review of available traffic and mobile support footage, though no video was available due to the 30-day retention limit.

OPS reached a finding of insufficient evidence for the allegation of unprofessional behavior. The determination was based on the lack of corroborating evidence, conflicting accounts between Ms. Magro and TCO Maloney, and the absence of any available video or witness information to validate the complaint. TCO Maloney stated he remembered the interaction but denied using inappropriate language and noted he is not issued a body-worn camera as a parttime civilian traffic officer. OPS also reviewed applicable policies, including Manual Rules 5.01 and 5.09, and found no evidence establishing whether the alleged conduct occurred. The case is presented to the CPRB for review and final recommendation.

Board Discussion Summary: After the case presentation, the Board had no further questions, comments, or concerns.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence **CPRB Decision:** Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
Traffic Controller Robert Maloney, #7170	<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: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0005

Timestamp: 03:11:19 – 03:30:02

Complainant: Branko Prodanovic

Presented by: Lampkin

P.O. Phillip Burkhardt, #69

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Mr. Branko Prodanovic regarding an incident on January 8, 2025, during which he alleged that P.O. Phillip Burkhardt #69 and an unidentified second officer were unprofessional toward him while he was attempting to retrieve his firearm from the CDP Property Unit. He stated he was treated poorly and believed the unit should have cameras to document interactions. OPS conducted an investigation that included an interview with P.O. Burkhardt, review of duty assignments, and attempts to verify the complainant’s account, though no video footage, time-specific details, or officer identification were available.



OPS reached a finding of insufficient evidence for the allegation of unprofessional behavior/conduct. The determination was based on the absence of any video, the complainant's inability to identify the second officer, and the lack of corroborating information. P.O. Burkhardt stated he informed Mr. Prodanovic multiple times that his firearm could not be released without proper judicial paperwork, and that no cameras or WCS are assigned to the property/forfeiture detail. With conflicting accounts and no objective evidence to support or refute the allegation, OPS concluded that it could not determine whether the alleged conduct occurred. The case is presented to the CPRB for review and final recommendation.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board held an extensive discussion regarding the officer's failure to activate his Wearable Camera System (WCS) during an interaction in the property room. Member Sharp began by questioning when the officer was issued his WCS and why he possessed one if the unit did not routinely use cameras. Investigator Lampkin confirmed that the officer was issued a WCS on the day he was assigned to the detail, but that the property unit historically does not activate cameras, and the policy language is vague regarding whether the unit is exempt. Members expressed concern that the officer initially stated he had never been issued a WCS, only for the investigation to later confirm that he had one on his person during the incident.

Members Cyganovich and Mountcastle raised broader questions about the lack of clarity surrounding WCS usage in the property room. Cyganovich noted that the investigative file did not contain documentation confirming the officer's WCS assignment and questioned why the property room—where officers frequently interact with the public and handle sensitive exchanges—would not require cameras. Investigator Lampkin explained that all officers are issued WCS devices as part of their standard uniform, but the property unit has historically been treated as exempt. Senior Investigator Bowker added that the policy unit had verbally stated that the property room is considered an administrative environment similar to a justice center, where WCS activation is not required. However, this interpretation was not provided in writing, prompting Chair Brown to request written confirmation before the Board relies on it.

The discussion then shifted to the officer's statements during his OPS interview. Member Sharp expressed serious concern that the officer may have lied under oath when he claimed he had never been issued a WCS. Sharp argued that if the officer knowingly made a false statement, this would constitute a separate violation for dishonesty. Bowker cautioned that before concluding the officer lied, the Board should review the WCS recording of the interview to determine the exact wording of the question and the officer's response. Members agreed that the distinction between "I was never issued one" and "I don't have to wear one" could be significant, and that clarity was essential before adding an allegation of dishonesty.

Members also discussed the underlying policy interpretation. Gatian pointed to the GPO section on prohibited recording, which exempts administrative duties, court functions, and non-investigative interactions from WCS activation requirements. He suggested that the department may be relying on this language to treat the property room as an administrative setting. Sharp countered that property room interactions can easily become adversarial, especially when



citizens dispute property returns, and argued that the absence of cameras in such a setting is problematic. Members agreed that the policy itself may require review by the Cleveland Division of Police or the Community Police Commission, as the current ambiguity creates inconsistent expectations for both officers and the public.

Given the unresolved questions—particularly regarding the officer’s interview statements and the lack of written confirmation about WCS requirements in the property unit—Chair Brown recommended tabling the case. He emphasized that the Board should not make findings without reviewing the interview footage and obtaining a written policy interpretation. Members agreed that additional investigation was necessary to determine whether the officer violated WCS policy, whether the unit is exempt, and whether the officer made false statements under oath. The Board then moved to table the case pending further inquiry by OPS.

Additional Information to Note:

Motion: Table Case 2025-0005 for further investigation, add allegations of a WCS violation and dishonesty under oath, and request written clarification regarding the policy exception stating that WCS is not required inside property rooms.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status. Carried

VI. **Executive Session 3:30:10 – 5:55:31)**

CPRB

- **Motion:** To enter executive session for personnel, Employment and discipline Matters will be considered. Inviting in OPS Interim Administrator Hess, General Manger Watson, Legal Counsel and CPRB Administrative Assistant Fair-Johnson.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Mountcastle

Motion Status: Carried

- Executive Session began at 12:35 p.m. EST.
- Adjourn back into open session at 2:59 p.m. EST.

VII. **OPS Status Report (5:55:34 – 5:56:35)**

Michael Hess

Interim Administrator

A. OPS Cases & Administrative Update

In January, OPS received a total of 18 new complaints. No OPS cases were administratively dismissed, resulting in a net total of +18 cases for the month. Interim



Admin Hess disclosed the CPRB has 130 cases remaining for review and noted that the Board is making strong progress in reducing the case backlog.

VIII. **Old Business** (5:56:35 – 6:01:57)

Brandon Brown, Chair

A. Hire OPS Investigator

- i. Hire Applicant 1971152 for the OPS Investigator.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

- ii. Hire Applicant 2112145 for OPS Investigator.

Motion By: Chair brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

B. NACOLE 2026

- i. Tabled discussion for Special Virtual Meeting on March 23rd, 2026 at 11:00 a.m. EST.

C. **Motion:** Based on the LR3 pre-disciplinary hearing the Board finds Employee 2014996 is guilty of violating civil service rule 1.10, which covers conduct on becoming of an employee in public service

- i. Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

D. **Motion:** Impose a Two-day suspension for Employee 2014996 for violating civil service rule 1.10.

- i. Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

IX. **New Business** (6:01:57 – 6:05:57)

Brandon Brown, Chair

A. Community Engagement Strategy

- i. Chair Brown emphasized the importance of continuing the Board's community engagement efforts. He noted that the CPRB and OPS play a critical role in the



broader picture of police accountability under Charter 115, and he encouraged members to make the Board's presence known in everyday interactions with the public. With community interest heightened due to the consent decree, he stressed that CPRB's voice should remain visible and active. He added that this will be an ongoing discussion but kept his remarks brief given the meeting's time.

B. March 23rd @ 11 a.m. EST for two hours virtual

- i. Chair Brown announced that the Board will hold a special virtual meeting on Monday, March 23 at 11:00 a.m. He noted the meeting will be scheduled for two hours, though he expects it may conclude within one. He added that the meeting is necessary to address personnel matters that must be handled before April and confirmed that he will coordinate with staff to ensure all logistical details are in place.

C. Administrator Search Update

- i. Chair Brown provided an update on the OPS Administrator search, noting that the applicant pool has been narrowed from the original 176 submissions to approximately six finalists. The Board is now reaching out to this final group to schedule interviews and will continue moving the process forward. He emphasized that OPS is simultaneously developing standard operating procedures and training to ensure consistency as new staff join the office. Chair Brown expressed appreciation for the ongoing work of OPS staff and highlighted the Board's commitment to strengthening the agency through both accountability and recognition. He closed by reaffirming his pride in the progress made by both OPS and the CPRB and his optimism about their continued growth and collaboration.

X. **Adjournment** (6:05:57 – 6:07:01)

CPRB

Motion: To Adorn March 10th CPRB Meeting

Motion By: Sharp

Seconded By: Miller

Motion Status: Carried

- The CPRB March 10, 2026 Meeting was adjourned at 3:09 p.m. EST.
- Upcoming CPRB Meetings
 - The next public CPRB Meeting will be a special meeting held virtually on March 23, 2026 at 11:00 a.m. EST.
 - The next in-person CPRB Meeting will be at Cleveland City Hall, Room 514 on April 14, 2026 at 9:15 a.m. EST.