



CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

April 14th, 2026

MEETING MINUTES

CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

MEMBERS

Brandon Brown, Chair
Diana Cyganovich
David Gatian
Chenoa Miller
Glenn Parker III
Billy Sharp
Waverly Willis

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

Michael Hess, Interim Administrator
Jessyca Watson, Interim General Manager
Art Bowker, Senior Investigator
Adam Eisen, Investigator
Allison Davis, Investigator
LJ Green, Investigator
Hamza Khabir, Investigator
Tammi Lampkin, Investigator
Alayne Koenig, Investigative Assistant

LEGAL COUNSEL

Dalya Oprian, Asst. Director of Law

MEETING AGENDA

- I. **Call to Order** **Brandon Brown, Chair**
Timestamp: 00:00 -00:50
1. Chair Brown called April 14, 2026 hearing to order at 9:15 am EST.
 2. Roll Call
 - a. Vice Chair Kenneth Mountcastle and Member Edwin Moore had an excused absence
 - b. Member Sharp arrived to meeting after roll call @ 9:28 am EST.
- II. **Approval of Minutes** **CPRB**
Timestamp: 00:51 -02:50
1. **March 10th Meeting Minutes – Virtual**
Motion: Approve March 10th, 2026 CPRB Meeting Minutes
Motion By: Miller
Second By: Willis
Motion Status: Carried
 2. **March 23rd Meeting Minutes – Virtual**
Motion: Approve March 23rd, 2026 CPRB Meeting Minutes



Motion By: Willis
Second By: Cyganovich
Motion Status: Carried

III. Public Comment

Brandon Brown, Chair

Timestamp: 02:51 – 09:30

1. Chair Brown closed the initial public comment period but raised a request from a member of the public to add a second public-comment opportunity later in the meeting, specifically after New Business, so attendees could respond contemporaneously to items discussed rather than waiting a month. Board members supported the idea, noting it would help people who cannot arrive early and would allow comments tied to specific agenda items; several members observed the manual lists public comment after New Business and that a later slot could be scheduled around expected executive-session timing.

Chair Brown moved to add a second public-comment period after New Business for future meetings; the motion was carried. The Board agreed the additional comment period would be implemented going forward.

Motion: Add an additional public comment after new business.

Motion By: Chair Brown
Second By: Gatian
Motion Status: Carried

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

Michael Hess
Interim Administrator

OPS2022-0284

Timestamp: 09:31 – 44:20

Complainant: Bridget McGrevey (Present)

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Tammy Mays, #368

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

P.O. Deonte Gibson, #2244

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

P.O. Wesley Farra, #1182

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

P.O. Raul Rodriquez, #2573

Allegation C: WCS Violation

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Bridget McGrevey, who reported a long history of negative interactions with the Cleveland Division of Police and



alleged discrimination, harassment, improper procedure, and failures in service across several unrelated incidents. She stated that officers dismissed her concerns, mislabeled her as a “mental caller,” and failed to protect her from threats. Her complaint referenced multiple prior police contacts from 2012 through 2021, including a 2021 harassment report and a 2020 incident at West Town Plaza, which she believed were connected.

OPS reviewed WCS footage, officer interviews, and incident reports. The evidence showed that officers responding to the 2021 harassment call listened to her concerns, reviewed threatening text messages, and completed a harassment report naming the suspect she identified. WCS from the 2020 West Town Plaza incident showed she had already been detained by U.S. Marshals when CDP arrived, and officers provided medical evaluation, documented statements, and followed supervisory direction. OPS found no evidence of disrespectful or improper conduct by the officers involved. OPS also confirmed that P.O. Raul Rodriguez mislabeled WCS files but acknowledged the error during his interview.

OPS recommended Insufficient Evidence for Allegation A, Unprofessional Conduct against P.O. Tammy Mays; Unfounded for Allegation B, Improper Procedure against P.O. Deonte Gibson; Sustained for Allegation C, WCS Violation against P.O. Raul Rodriguez; and Exonerated for Allegation D, Improper Procedure against P.O. Wesley Farra.

Investigator Addendum (3/12/2026): This case was completed on February 2, 2023. The case involved Improper Procedure allegations against P.O. Delonte Gibson, #2244 and P.O. Adam Farra, #1182. Those allegations have been adjusted to Lack of Service: Insufficient Service to more accurately reflect Ms. McGervey’s complaint.

After the case was completed, Ms. McGervey returned to OPS multiple times with new allegations involving Cleveland Fire, EMS, Cuyahoga County personnel, military members, neighbors, hackers, and private attorneys. These matters fell outside OPS jurisdiction and were administratively dismissed. OPS also reviewed her renewed claims regarding a 2001 incident but determined she could not identify any officer or provide a date or specific allegation; the matter was dismissed under §703(b) for unidentifiable officer. The addendum corrected Allegation C to Administratively Dismissed because P.O. Rodriguez had separated from CDP on 6/22/2023.

Bridget McGervey Statement: The complainant described being repeatedly targeted and harassed by neighbors and others over an extended period, reporting break-ins, threatening notes left on her vehicle, and surveillance directed at her home and workplace. She told the Board she repeatedly reported these incidents to police but felt her concerns were not properly investigated or documented.

She disputed the allegation that she was combative, saying she was calmly speaking with a manager when approached. The complainant explained that a security guard (identified in her materials as Demetrius) spat in her face and that she reacted in anger, including using a racial slur in the moment; she characterized that outburst as provoked by repeated harassment and



assault. She also raised family-safety concerns involving her autistic brother and said she has recordings and other materials she believes demonstrate ongoing targeting and monitoring.

The complainant told the Board that surveillance video and security-guard contact information were not obtained during the original investigation, and she questioned why police did not secure available camera footage or take fuller statements from employees and witnesses. Board members asked clarifying questions about the security guard's employment and the investigative record; the investigator confirmed gaps in the file and agreed to review the materials further.

The complainant asked the Board to pursue additional review and investigation; she indicated she will submit further evidence. Board members acknowledged her concerns and requested the investigator reexamine the file for missing evidence and follow up where appropriate.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members reviewed three discrete incidents alleged by the complainant, spanning multiple years, and sought clarification about dates and locations. They confirmed the record includes incidents from 2012, 2020 (or 2022, as noted in the file), and November 9, 2022, and agreed the file requires careful untangling because the allegations and supporting materials cover different events and timeframes. Members noted the complexity of the complaints' account and the volume of issues she raised but agreed the Board could address the three incidents currently before them while recognizing other matters might warrant separate complaints or further inquiry.

The Board identified significant gaps in the investigative record that limit the ability to fully evaluate some allegations. In particular, members observed that the security-guard identity and contact information were not obtained for the May incident and that portions of WCS footage were missing for one event. Several members questioned why available surveillance video and witness contact information were not secured during the original investigation, and they agreed those omissions weaken the file's completeness and the strength of any administrative finding based on the current record.

Despite those evidentiary gaps, members discussed a practical approach to adjudication: they agreed they were not barred from ruling on the incidents that have been investigated and that the Board should proceed to make determinations on the three discrete occurrences in front of them. Several members indicated one allegation may properly be resolved as Insufficient Evidence given the record but emphasized that issuing rulings on the investigated incidents is appropriate rather than deferring entirely. The Board also acknowledged that additional allegations or continuing conduct could be pursued through new complaints and further investigation.

Board members discussed procedural limits and remedies, noting the six-month window for imposing discipline and that older incidents may fall outside the period in which discipline can be ordered. They emphasized that even when discipline is not available, the Board can still



investigate and issue findings, and they encouraged the complainant to submit any additional recordings or documentation. The Board requested the investigator reexamine the file for missing camera footage and witness information and agreed to proceed with motions to adjudicate the three incidents on the record while remaining open to reopening or expanding the inquiry if new material evidence is provided.

Additional Information to Note: *The Board discussed the six-month window for imposing discipline and noted older incidents may fall outside the period in which discipline can be ordered. They emphasized that even when discipline is unavailable for sustained findings, the Board can still investigate, issue findings, and advise the complainant on other avenues for redress.*

After the motions concluded, Chair Brown urged the complainant to continue filing complaints promptly if incidents recur. He acknowledged delays happen and said she should not be discouraged by current outcomes. He explained the Board's limited purview to specific incidents and recommended the Community Police Commission for broader, systemic concerns. He asked OPS to provide the Cleveland Police Commission's contact and meeting times so the complainant can raise district-level issues. He noted the Board reviewed WCS footage, interviews, and a full packet of materials before deciding, and that OPS will follow up with next steps. He reiterated that the complainant should file additional complaints and use the information OPS provides to pursue other avenues for review.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Tammy Mays, #368</p>	<p><i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Sharp- was not present for case presentation nor the complainant's statement</p>

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Wesley Farra, #1182</p>	<p><i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried</p>



	<i>occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rules 3.01 and 4.18.</i>	Abstention: Member Sharp- was not present for case presentation nor the complainant's statement
P.O. Deonte Gibson, #2244	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rules 3.01 and 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Sharp- was not present for case presentation nor the complainant's statement.

P.O. Raul Rodriquez, #2573

Allegation C: WCS Violation [Manual Rule 4.03, GPO 4.06.04(E)5]

OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY

CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY

DISMISSED – CDP Separated 06/22/2023

DISMISSED – CDP Separated 06/22/2023

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 06/22/2023. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

V. Presentation of Investigations

Michael Hess

Interim Administrator

OPS2024-0160

Timestamp: 44:21 – 56:04

Complainant: Angela Davis

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.

***Investigator Addendum (3/12/2026):** This matter was previously tabled by the CRRB to allow time to review additional documents provided by the complainant. The document Ms. Davis believed to be a police report was a standard fee schedule form automatically sent to anyone whose vehicle is impounded by the Cleveland Division of Police; the line reading 'Hit Skip/Arrest' is part of the template and not specific to her situation.*

Board Discussion Summary: Board members asked clarifying questions about dates, locations, and documents, confirming the file includes multiple incidents from different years and noting some inconsistencies in the paperwork. They observed the vehicle-impound and fee notices had confusing dates and that the tow/impound process may fall under the Parking Violations Bureau rather than the Division's misconduct purview.

Members emphasized missing or incomplete evidence—particularly absent WCS footage and the security guard's contact information—which limits the Board's ability to fully evaluate certain allegations. Several members said the file needs untangling and additional follow-up before definitive conclusions can be reached on some claims.

Despite those gaps, the Board agreed there are three discrete allegations before them that can be adjudicated now, while remaining open to further complaints or supplemental evidence. They noted procedural limits (the six-month discipline window) but stressed the Board can still investigate, issue findings, and advise the complainant on other avenues.

The Board invited the investigator to reexamine the file for missing footage and witness information and encouraged the complainant to submit any additional recordings or documentation. Members then moved to proceed with motions on the matters currently in the record.

***Additional Information to Note:** Member Sharp recused himself due to knowing the complainant.*



Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Tow

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Besjon Domnori, #233</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 Cleveland Codified Ordinance 405.02 and 451.25.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Sharp knows the complainant</p>

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Besjon Domnori, #233</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: Cyganovich Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Sharp knows the complainant</p>

OPS2024-0177

Timestamp: 56:05 – 1:08:28

Complainant: Arto Green

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Adrian Calhoun, #218

Allegation A: Harassment

P.O. Malcolm Sutton-Nicholson, #2161

Allegation A: Harassment

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Citation

Sgt. Roger Jones, #9348

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Citation

Allegation C: WCS Violation

Allegation C: WCS Violation



Summary of Case Presentation: Mr. Arto Green filed a complaint alleging that on July 24, 2024, Sgt. Roger Jones #9348 and P.O. Malcolm Sutton-Nicholson #2161 harassed him and improperly issued a citation. His daughter, Artonia Green, submitted a witness complaint alleging harassment as well. He also alleged that a week earlier, on July 17, 2024, P.O. Adrian Calhoun #218 harassed him during an unrelated interaction involving the towing of two commercial vehicles not connected to him. The investigation found that during the July 17 incident, P.O. Calhoun discussed property maintenance issues with Mr. Green, including the need for a dumpster, and body-worn camera footage did not support the allegation of harassment. For the July 24 incident, neither Sgt. Jones nor P.O. Sutton-Nicholson were wearing WCS, but Sgt. Jones provided a photograph showing Mr. Green's truck parked on the lawn, which supported the citation issued under CCO 451.23.

OPS recommends Insufficient Evidence for the harassment allegations against Sgt. Jones and P.O. Sutton-Nicholson, as the available evidence does not establish that their conduct violated Manual Rule 5.01. The Improper Citation allegation is recommended Exonerated, as the citation for parking on the lawn was supported by evidence and consistent with city ordinance. The WCS Violation allegation is recommended Sustained for both Sgt. Jones and P.O. Sutton-Nicholson, as neither officer activated their cameras during the encounter in violation of GPO 4.06.04. The harassment allegation against P.O. Calhoun is recommended Unfounded, as body-worn camera footage shows no conduct that violated Manual Rule 5.01.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members clarified that CPOP refers to Community and Problem Oriented Policing, noting some confusion about the acronym. They asked why CPOP officers believed they were exempt from activating or wearing WCS and confirmed two different explanations were given: one officer said they didn't have to turn it on, while Sergeant Jones said they didn't have to wear one at all.

Members observed no written policy was produced to support the officers' claims and that OPS's requests to the district commander and policy unit went unanswered. Several members expressed skepticism that an unwritten administrative rationale could override the Division's WCS requirements and noted the sergeant involved had since been promoted.

The Board concluded the matter points to a policy and training gap rather than a clear, documented exemption. They recommended OPS follow up with the policy unit for any written guidance, consider retraining on WCS requirements for CPOP roles, and address the inconsistency in officers' explanations.

Additional Information to Note: This matter was previously tabled by the Admin Hess due to technical difficulties related to video sharing with the CPRB Members.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Harassment



Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Adrian Calhoun, 218	<i>Unfounded - 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: Miller Motion Status: Carried
P.O. Malcolm Sutton-Nicholson, #2161 Sgt. Roger Jones, #9248	<i>Insufficient Evidence - 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: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Citation

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Malcolm Sutton-Nicholson, #2161. Sgt. Roger Jones, #9248	<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 451.23.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Miller Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: WCS Violation

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Malcolm Sutton-Nicholson, #2161	<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-Section II(A).</i> <i>Explanation: Officer Sutton-Nicholson failed to activate his WCS. He is not exempt from doing so.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried Group Level: Group Level I- WCS Violation Explanation: Motion by: Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried
Sgt. Roger Jones, #9248	<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-Section II(A).</i>	Motion by: Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried



	<p><i>Explanation: Sergeant Jones failed to turn on his WCS due to not having one on him which violates the GPO 4.06.04. With suggestion of a letter of reinstruction in discipline.</i></p>	<p>Group Level: Group Level I Explanation: Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p>
--	--	--

OPS2025-0005

Timestamp: 1:08:33 – 1:29:43

Complainant: Branko Prodanovic

Presented by: Lampkin

P.O. Phillip Burkhardt, #69

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct – Untruthfulness

Allegation C: WCS Violation

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: Board members began by clarifying terminology and the scope of the issue, noting that CPOP refers to Community and Problem Oriented Policing and expressing confusion about why some officers believed that status exempted them from WCS requirements. The discussion traced two different explanations from officers: one said CPOP officers need not activate their WCS, while a sergeant asserted they need not wear WCS at all. Members emphasized that property-unit duties had been characterized by the policy unit as administrative rather than policing, but they questioned whether that administrative label should excuse officers who nonetheless interact with the public from wearing body cameras.



The Board focused heavily on the absence of a clear, written policy to justify the officers' claims. OPS reported it had not received a written policy from the district or policy unit and that initial outreach went unanswered, leaving the Board to rely on an informal interpretation that property work is administrative. Several members pushed back on that interpretation, arguing that any uniformed officer who comes into contact with the public can be placed in an adversarial situation and therefore should reasonably be expected to wear WCS as part of the uniform. One member framed the practical concern succinctly: "we tabled it because we wanted some more clarity about whether or not these officers are required to wear WCS."

Deliberations turned into policy remedies rather than individual discipline. The Board agreed that the case revealed a policy and training gap: contradictory guidance about whether certain units must wear or activate WCS is not reflected consistently in the written WCS policy, and that inconsistency has produced repeated issues across cases. Members recommended referring the matter to the Community Police Commission for a formal review and possible revision of the WCS policy, and they urged OPS to seek any written GPOs or unit directives that might clarify the intended practice. As one member put it, "I think we should send it over to the CPC because I can see these are officers... they are in a situation where they do come in contact with citizens."

On the underlying misconduct allegation against Officer Philip Bluett, the Board moved to a practical adjudication based on the available record. Because no WCS footage or other objective evidence existed to establish what occurred during the interaction, a motion was made and supported to find Insufficient Evidence for Allegation A; members noted that without camera footage or corroborating documentation the preponderance standard could not be met. The Board closed by instructing OPS to reexamine the file for any overlooked evidence, to obtain any written policy guidance from the district or policy unit, and to forward the policy contradictions to the CPC so the systemic issue can be addressed through training and formal policy revision rather than case-by-case adjudication.

***Additional Information to Note:** This matter was previously tabled by the CPRB for further investigation, to add 2 allegations, and a written WCS Policy exception of property rooms.*

Motion: The CPRB authorizes joining OPS to draft and send a joint letter to the Community Police Commission requesting a comprehensive review and clarification of the Division's WCS policy to resolve recurring contradictions and gray areas identified in OPS investigations. The Board directs OPS to collaborate on the letter and forward it to the CPC for policy review and recommended revisions.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Second By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

Abstention: Member Parker III – was not present for discussion or motion.



Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/ Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Phillip Burkhardt, #69	<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: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct- Untruthfulness

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Phillip Burkhardt, #69	<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: WCS Violation

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Phillip Burkhardt, #69	<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

OPS2025-0026

Timestamp: 1:28:54 - 1:38:03

Complainant: Cameran Branford

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Kevin Nussbaum, #325

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Tow

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Search -Inventory

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.

Investigator Addendum (March 25, 2026): The investigator completed an addendum dated March 25, 2026, to pursue further investigation of Allegation B against Officer Kevin Nussbaum, # 325. After reviewing Officer Nussbaum's WCS and interview, OPS recommends a Sustained finding for Allegation B. OPS's factual basis is that the WCS and interview support a finding that P.O. Nussbaum failed to open locked/closed containers during a vehicle inventory search, violating CDP GPO 6.03.01. OPS included the officer's WCS and interview in the addendum to substantiate that procedural failure.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members began by clarifying the addendum timing and confirming the interview date was March 25, 2026, not 2025, to ensure the record was current. They noted this matter began as a bridge report and that OPS later added an allegation for an improper inventory search based on new review.

Members questioned whether Officer Nussbaum was dispatched to the vehicle or arrived on his own and asked OPS to check dispatch records. One member summarized the uncertainty: "he said he couldn't remember if he was instructed by his supervisor or if it was a dispatch call."

The Board compared the officer's account to video evidence and found factual inconsistencies about the scene. OPS pointed out that the officer described parts in the street and the vehicle's location inaccurately; the video shows the car had been towed to the lot rather than being at the crash site.

Deliberation focused on the inventory search allegation: the officer told investigators he looked at the containers and "didn't see anything that jumped out at him," but OPS concluded he did not open all containers. Members asked follow-up questions about whether dispatch logs exist, urged OPS to reconcile the WCS and video with the interview, and signaled that the added allegation (failure to inventory containers) warranted further review before final findings.

Additional Information to Note: This matter was previously tabled by the CPRB for further investigation and to add an allegation.

Investigative Addendum correction: OPS interview date was conducted on March 25, 2026, not March 25, 2025, as originally listed.



Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Tow

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Kevin Nussbaum, #325	<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 451.04(a).</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Gatian Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Search- Inventory

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Kevin Nussbaum, #325	<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 GPO 6.03.01(2)c.</i></p> <p><i>Explanation: Officer admitted in his interview that he did not look inside the unlocked containers because “nothing jumped out to him”, even though the policy requires that unlocked closed containers should be opened and inventory. Also, he listed on his tow inventory report that there was nothing of value, even though he did not do a thorough check of all unlocked containers in the vehicle.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Sharp Second by: Gatian Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level I – Unsatisfactory Performance Motion by: Sharp Second by: Gatian Motion Status: Carried</p>

OPS2023-0274

Timestamp: 1:38:13 – 1:50:23

Complainant: Qyaira Frary

Presented by: Lampkin

P.O. Peter Sains, #497

Allegation A: Excessive Force

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Tow

P.O. Christian Crane, #1067

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

P.O. Vickie Phillips, #1766

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct



Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Qyaira Frary following an incident on November 21, 2023, in which she alleged excessive force, improper tow procedure, and unprofessional conduct by several Cleveland Division of Police officers. Officers Peter Sains and Christian Crane had responded to a silent 911 call and found a female reclined in the passenger seat of Ms. Frary's vehicle, which was parked partially on the sidewalk. After the passenger gave verbal consent for officers to open the door, Ms. Frary exited her residence and confronted them, disputing their authority to open her vehicle and later objecting to their decision to tow it. She alleged that P.O. Sains grabbed and twisted her wrist in a painful and inappropriate manner, held her hand against his genital area, and detained her without cause. She also claimed that officers smelled of alcohol and that P.O. Vickie Phillips made rude or provocative comments during the encounter.

A review of body-worn camera footage, Internal Affairs documentation, and witness statements showed that the events differed from Ms. Frary's account. The footage confirmed that the passenger granted permission to open the vehicle door and that the vehicle was parked with its tires on the sidewalk and displayed expired registration tags, conditions permitting a tow under CCO 435.09. When a bystander attempted to hand Ms. Frary her keys, she reached toward the officer and grabbed P.O. Sains's hand, after which he held her wrist while repeatedly instructing her to exit the vehicle. The footage did not support claims of twisting, pain compliance, or sexualized contact, nor did it corroborate allegations that officers smelled of alcohol. The evidence showed that P.O. Sains used minimal, non-escalating force while attempting to affect a lawful tow, and that P.O. Crane's conduct remained within professional expectations. In contrast, WCS footage documented repeated laughing, inappropriate remarks, and unprofessional interactions by P.O. Phillips during the incident.

OPS reached findings consistent with the evidence. The allegation of excessive force against P.O. Sains, related to GPO 2.01.03, was not sustained because the force used was de minimis and occurred only after Ms. Frary grabbed his hand. The allegation of improper procedure regarding the tow, related to GPO 6.03.01 and CCO 435.09, was exonerated because the tow was lawful and consistent with policy. Allegations of unprofessional conduct against P.O. Sains and P.O. Crane, related to Manual Rules 5.01, 5.02, 5.06, 5.08, and 5.09, were not sustained due to lack of evidence. The allegation of unprofessional conduct against P.O. Phillips was sustained based on clear video evidence of inappropriate comments and demeanor. The case is presented to the Civilian Police Review Board for review and final recommendation.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members focused on whether Officer Phillips used profane or abusive language captured on WCS after Ms. Patterson's arrest, noting the recording showed swearing and a heated back-and-forth; they discussed context and acknowledged the complainant and others helped escalate the exchange but emphasized that provocation does not excuse unprofessional conduct by an officer, and they agreed the WCS and surrounding evidence must be weighed to determine whether the language met the threshold for misconduct.

Case Findings:



Allegation A: Excessive Force

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Peter Sains, #497	<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: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Christian Crane, #1067 P.O. Peter Sains, #497	Unfounded - <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
P.O. Vickie Phillips, #1766	Sustained - <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 CDP Manual Rules 5.01, 5.02, 5.08, and 5.09.</i> <i>Explanation: P.O. Phillips got into a verbal altercation with complainant, specially stating “All these motherfuckers look like it, damn”, “I don’t care about you.”, and “One Down” while Ms. Patterson was being escorted to the Zone Car. The language is unprofessional while on duty.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Gatian- was not in the room for motion Group Level: Group Level I- Discourteous & Rudeness Explanation: Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Gatian- was not in the room for motion

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Tow

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Peter Sains, #97	<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 Orders 6.03.01.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Gatian- was not in the room for motion



OPS2022-0195

Timestamp: 1:50:23 – 2:03:18

Complainant: Eboni Keyes

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Justin Longstreet, #2061

P.O. Tamiaka Stewart, #2110

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: This case involves a complaint filed by Eboni Keyes, who alleged that Cleveland Division of Police officers failed to provide proper service and behaved unprofessionally during their response to a dispute involving Ms. Keyes, her relatives, and neighbor Shyra Anderson on August 1, 2022. Ms. Keyes stated that the officers refused to hear her side of the story, focused only on Ms. Anderson and her family, and did not complete a police report. She further alleged that the officers were dismissive and unprofessional in their interactions. According to the investigative report, multiple witnesses at the scene alleged that Ms. Keyes attempted to strike them with her vehicle, and she was later arrested for felonious assault based on those statements. OPS reviewed WCS footage, officer interviews, incident reports, and court records to evaluate her claims.

The evidence showed that officers engaged with Ms. Keyes, her mother, and her grandfather, documented the incident, and followed supervisory directions regarding the arrest decision. WCS footage captured officers interviewing witnesses, explaining the process to Ms. Keyes, and accommodating her request to remove handcuffs after she stated she was pregnant. The footage did not support her claim that officers refused to listen to her or acted dismissively; instead, it showed officers communicating with her in accordance with CDP policy. OPS also noted that one involved officer, P.O. Tshaka Brown, had separated from the Division and therefore fell outside OPS jurisdiction for administrative review.

OPS found no evidence to substantiate the allegations. For Allegation A, Lack of Service, OPS concluded that officers completed the required documentation, spoke with all involved parties, and acted consistently with Manual Rule 4.01 and GPO 3.04.01. For Allegation B, Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct, OPS found no evidence of disrespectful language or conduct, and WCS footage showed officers acting within the expectations of Manual Rules 5.08 and 5.09. As a result, OPS recommended findings of Unfounded for both allegations against P.O. Tamiaka Stewart and P.O. Justin Longstreet, and Administrative Dismissal for allegations involving P.O. Tshaka Brown due to his separation from CDP.

Board Discussion Summary: The board did not deliberate on this case. There were no further questions, comments, or concerns.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service



OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Justin Longstreet, #2061 P.O. Tamiaka Stewart, #2110</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: Willis Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Sharp- was not in the room for motion</p>

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Justin Longstreet, #2061 P.O. Tamiaka Stewart, #2110</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: Willis Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Sharp- was not in the room for motion</p>

P.O. Tshaka Brown, #2103

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED – CDP Separated 07/11/2024

CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED – CDP Separated 07/11/2024

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 07/11/2024. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

OPS2023-0118

Timestamp: 2:03:18 - 2:04:14

Complainant: Toni Farmer

Presented by: Green

P.O. Anthony Bolivar, #55

P.O. Colin McNeeley, #287

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: This case involves a complaint filed by Toni Farmer, who alleged Lack of Service and Unprofessional Conduct by P.O. Anthony Bolivar and P.O. Colin McNeeley during their response to her 911 call on May 25, 2023. Ms. Farmer reported that



several women came to her home, banged on her door, threatened her, and poured syrup on her vehicle. She stated that when officers arrived, they were rude, told her there was nothing they could do, and advised her that the incident was recorded on their body-worn cameras. She reported feeling unsafe and believed the officers failed to take appropriate action.

OPS reviewed the available evidence, including the incident report and officer interviews. All WCS footage related to the incident had been deleted due to retention limits, leaving no video recording for review. The investigation confirmed that officers responded to the scene, spoke with Ms. Farmer, and completed CDP Incident Report 2023-00151281 documenting her account of the threats and property damage. Both officers were interviewed and stated they did not recall the interaction, but neither acknowledged any rude or unprofessional behavior. With no WCS available and no corroborating evidence beyond the complainant's statement, OPS found insufficient evidence to determine whether the alleged unprofessional conduct occurred.

OPS recommended Exonerated for Allegation A, Lack of Service, concluding that officers did respond, investigate, and complete the requested report. OPS recommended Insufficient Evidence for Allegation B, Unprofessional Conduct, as the preponderance of the evidence did not establish whether the alleged behavior occurred.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members reviewed the case's timeline and evidence gaps, noting the complaint was received the day after the incident but no WCS footage was available despite investigators' efforts; they discussed that the file passed through multiple hands and that turnover and an investigator's extended leave likely contributed to missing footage. Members examined the available paperwork and confirmed an incident report documented officers' response, but they questioned whether a more detailed field case report was completed. The Board emphasized the practical difference between those reports, an incident report records that officers responded, while a field case report lists offenses, victims, suspects, and provides a full investigative narrative—and noted the record here shows a response but lacks clarity on whether the complainant's request for a formal field case report was captured. Members asked OPS to confirm whether a field case report was ever created, to recheck WCS retention and network requests for footage, and then to proceed with motions once any outstanding documentary or video evidence is reconciled.

***Additional Information to Note:** Investigator Bowker explained that an **incident report** is the basic record created whenever officers respond to a call or service request; it documents that officers went to the scene but does not contain the detailed elements of a formal criminal report. By contrast, a **field case report** (also described as a formal police report) is prepared when a person requests to file a formal complaint or when the situation warrants documenting an offense: it lists the offense, victim, suspects, and provides a full narrative and investigative details. Booker emphasized that the field case report is more detailed and substantive than an incident report and is the document relied on when a complainant seeks formal charging or further investigative action.*



Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Anthony Bolivar, #55 P.O. Colin McNeeley, #287	<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: Willis Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Anthony Bolivar, #55 P.O. Colin McNeeley, #287	<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: Willis Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0002

Timestamp: 2:04:14 - 2:31:06

Complainant: Taunzia Livest

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Nathan Dawson, #940

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

P.O. Shannon Scaggs, #636

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation C: WCS Violation

P.O. Mason Swires, #2383

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Taunzia Livest, who alleged that several Cleveland Division of Police officers behaved unprofessionally and failed to provide sufficient service during their response to her incident. She reported that officers were dismissive, rude, and did not handle her concerns appropriately. Her complaint included allegations of unprofessional conduct against P.O. Nathan Dawson, P.O. Shannon Scaggs, and P.O. Mason Swires, as well as an allegation of insufficient service involving the same officers. She also named P.O. Jason Rees, who had separated from CDP prior to the investigation

OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage, officer statements, and incident documentation. The evidence showed that the involved officers made inappropriate comments, displayed unprofessional demeanor, and failed to meet expected standards of courtesy and



conduct during their interactions with the complainant. OPS found that the officers' behavior violated Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, and 5.09. The investigation also determined that the officers did not provide adequate service during the encounter, failing to fully address the complainant's concerns or follow expected procedures. P.O. Rees's involvement was administratively dismissed due to his separation from the Division.

OPS recommended Sustained findings for Allegation A, Unprofessional Conduct, against P.O. Dawson, P.O. Scaggs, and P.O. Swires. OPS also recommended Sustained findings for Allegation B, Lack of Service: Insufficient Service, against the same officers. Allegation C, a WCS Violation against P.O. Scaggs, was also Sustained. Allegations involving P.O. Rees were administratively dismissed under §703(a) because he was no longer employed by CDP.

Board Discussion Summary: Chair Brown a comment, "We have some officers who seem to be pretty cavalier here to kind of put it lightly, in the way they dealt with this situation." Member Cyganovich also stated, "They also failed to do anything about what their normal standard is on investigating a domestic violence situation. They had to marry couple and allegations of some kind of physical harm physical action, and they didn't really do anything about evaluating that." Chair Brown added "It was also weird to me that there were, I mean there were this many officers that were involved and none of them were decided to act unprofessionally here. It's concerning. You would expect that if there were, was it four officers who showed up that at least one of them would think to actually do their job."

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Nathan Dawson, #940</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 Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, and 5.09.</i></p> <p><i>Explanation: The officer was laughing at the complainant and used the words "fuck it" during the incident.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level II- Conduct Unbecoming Motion by: Sharp Second by: Miller Motion Status: Carried</p>
<p>P.O. Shannon Scaggs, #636</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 Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, and 5.09.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried</p>



	<p><i>Explanation: P.O. Scaggs directed the following unprofessional language towards her fellow officers in front of complainant: “calm the fuck down”, “Well fuck ‘em”, while dealing with the incident and in the presence of a minor.</i></p> <p><i>Note: The complainant mentioned she was very pleased with the service provided by P.O. Scaggs. Additionally, the complainant mentioned P.O. Scaggs made her feel better, she did the right thing, and she really appreciates P.O. Scaggs. The officer apologized to family for her language.</i></p>	<p>Group Level: Group Level II- Conduct Unbecoming Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried Opposed: Parker III, Cyganovich, Brown</p>
<p>P.O. Mason Swires, #2383</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 Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, and 5.09.</i></p> <p><i>Explanation: P.O Swires raised his voice at the complainant, making multiple statements. “You’re not listening to anybody”, “Jesus Christ, your daughter’s right here”, “Don’t you ever approach a police officer like that again”, “You’re married to her?”. Continuously yelling, using a mocking tone to mimic complainant’s vocals, tone, and speech. P.O. Swires also made references to Muppet characters Miss Piggy and Kermet, which contributed to the laughter.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level II- Conduct Unbecoming Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried</p>

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Nathan Dawson, #940</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 General Police Order 5.05.01, CDP Manual Rules 4.01, 4.18, and 9.05.</i></p> <p><i>Explanation: WCS showed multiple issues with the investigation conducted, including the officers did not immediately separate the involved parties; did not initiate any sort of assault or domestic violence investigation when complainant expressed she wanted the male removed due to feeling unsafe and showed physical evidence of injury.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level II – Diminishing the esteem of the Division, Conduct Unbecoming & Failure to Respond or Investigate Motion by: Chair Brown</p>



	<p><i>Additionally, Officers did not offer any sort of victim rights or safety planning forms. The male aggressor was removed then allowed to come back in. The Officers were clearly laughing, not taking the situation seriously, and ultimately escalating the violence.</i></p>	<p>Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p>
<p>P.O. Shannon Scaggs, #636</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 General Police Order 5.05.01, CDP Manual Rules 4.01, 4.18, and 9.05.</i></p> <p><i>Explanation: WCS showed multiple issues with the investigation conducted, including the officers did not immediately separate the involved parties; did not initiate any sort of assault or domestic violence investigation when complainant expressed she wanted the male removed due to feeling unsafe and showed physical evidence of injury. Additionally, Officers did not offer any sort of victim rights or safety planning forms. The male aggressor was removed then allowed to come back in. The Officers were clearly laughing, not taking the situation seriously, and ultimately escalating the violence.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level II – Diminishing the esteem of the Division, Conduct Unbecoming & Failure to Respond or Investigate Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p>
<p>P.O. Mason Swires, #2383</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 General Police Order 5.05.01, CDP Manual Rules 4.01, 4.18, and 9.05.</i></p> <p><i>Explanation: WCS showed multiple issues with the investigation conducted, including the officers did not immediately separate the involved parties; did not initiate any sort of assault or domestic violence investigation when complainant expressed she wanted the male removed due to feeling unsafe and showed physical evidence of injury. Additionally, Officers did not offer any sort of victim rights or safety planning forms. The male aggressor was removed then allowed to come back in. The Officers were clearly laughing, not taking the situation seriously, and ultimately escalating the violence.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level II – Diminishing the esteem of the Division, Conduct Unbecoming & Failure to Respond or Investigate Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p>



Allegation C: WCS Violation

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>P.O. Shannon Scaggs, #636</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 General Police Order 4.06.04 – Section I(A).</i></p> <p><i>Explanation: P.O. Scaggs did not notify her supervisor that her WCS was on then turned off under the incident. She did not follow proper protocol.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level I – WCS Violation Motion by: Sharp Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried</p>

P.O. Jason Rees, #193

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED – CDP Separated 06/04/2024

CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED – CDP Separated 06/04/2024

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 06/04/2024. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board’s Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

OPS2024-0011

Timestamp: 2:31:42 - 2:35:25

Complainant: Cierra Scott

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. William Salupo. #1969

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Cierra Scott regarding two separate motor vehicle accidents, one occurring on December 31, 2021, and the other on January 11, 2024. For the 2021 incident, OPS identified P.O. Niccolo Angelino as the responding officer; however, he had resigned from the Division, placing him outside OPS jurisdiction. Ms. Scott’s complaint focused primarily on the 2024 incident, during which she alleged Lack of Service by P.O. William Salupo. She stated that the officer failed to conduct sobriety testing on the other driver, failed to issue a citation or make an arrest, and told her mother that the other driver had been drinking despite the report indicating otherwise.



OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage, the OH-1 crash report, and scene documentation. The WCS showed that P.O. Salupo arrived promptly, assessed the scene, rendered assistance to Ms. Scott and her daughter, and gathered information from all involved parties. The footage documented that the male driver who struck Ms. Scott’s vehicle was experiencing a medical emergency due to critically low blood sugar, which EMS confirmed on scene. WCS also showed that P.O. Salupo completed the required tow paperwork, OH-1 crash report, and incident documentation, and coordinated with EMS and dispatch for follow-up. OPS found no evidence supporting Ms. Scott’s claim that the officer stated the driver had been drinking, and the OH-1 report accurately reflected the medical emergency as the cause of the collision.

OPS recommended Exonerated for Allegation A, Lack of Service, concluding that P.O. Salupo’s actions were consistent with CDP policy, training, and Manual Rules 4.03, 4.14, and 9.05. The allegation involving P.O. Angelino was Administratively Dismissed under §703(a) because he had separated from CDP and was no longer within OPS jurisdiction.

Investigator Addendum (March 26, 2026): OPS noted that the WCS originally reviewed for this case had since been deleted due to CDP’s retention policy. However, the footage had been reviewed and summarized in the original investigative report before deletion. No new information was presented, and the original recommendation of Exonerated for P.O. Salupo remains unchanged.

Board Discussion Summary: The board did not deliberate on this case. There were no further questions, comments, or concerns.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. William Salupo, #1969	<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, 4.14, and 9.05.</i>	Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried

P.O. Niccolo Angelino, #720

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Action: **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 09/26/2025

CPRB Recommendation: **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 09/26/2025

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 09/26/2025. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board’s Office of Professional Standards (OPS).



OPS2024-0190

Timestamp: 2:35:30 - 3:17:58

Complainant: Chris Hoffman

Presented by: Bowker

Det. Donald Kopchak, #2139

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/ Conduct

Allegation B: Biased Policing

Allegation C: Other: Criminal Conviction

Summary of Case Presentation: This case concerns a complaint filed by Chris Hoffman alleging Biased Policing, Unprofessional Conduct, and conduct resulting in Criminal Conviction by Det. Donald Kopchak #2139. The complaint arose after Hoffman viewed a YouTube video showing an April 26, 2024, incident in which Det. Kopchak and an off-duty Lake County Deputy confronted and detained Yonas Aberham Bokreedingil, a U.S. citizen of African descent, inside and outside a bar. The officers questioned his citizenship based on his accent and ethnicity, took his phone and valid Texas driver's license, forcibly removed him from the bar, and restrained him on the ground. Brunswick Police later determined Bokreedingil had caused no disturbance and that the officers lacked reasonable suspicion or probable cause for their actions.

OPS reviewed Brunswick Police reports, dispatch audio, video footage, and court records, confirming that the officers' conduct was not supported by any lawful basis and was motivated by assumptions tied to Bokreedingil's ethnicity and accent. Evidence showed that Det. Kopchak participated directly in the physical detention and removal of Bokreedingil and continued to restrain him until ordered to stop by responding Brunswick officers. Bokreedingil reported he had lived in the United States for fourteen years and was a naturalized citizen, contradicting the officers' claims that he was "illegal" or on a terror watch list. OPS concluded that the conduct violated Manual Rules 5.01 and 5.11, as well as GPO 1.07.08 and GPO 2.02.02.

OPS further confirmed that Det. Kopchak was criminally charged and later convicted in Medina County Common Pleas Court (Case 2025CR0520) of Abduction (two counts), Ethnic Intimidation, and Assault. Trial testimony and confirmation from the Medina County Prosecutor's Office established that Kopchak acted on Deputy LaJack's direction but nonetheless engaged in conduct that constituted criminal violations and serious policy breaches. The jury returned guilty verdicts on all counts on March 26, 2026. OPS recommended **Sustained** findings for all allegations.

***Investigative Notes:** Noting that these are Group III violations for which termination is the expected disciplinary outcome under City Charter Section 115.*



Board Discussion Summary: Board members reviewed a high-profile incident captured on video in which off-duty Cleveland officers detained and restrained a man at a bar after concluding based on his accent and appearance that he was an undocumented immigrant and possibly a security threat. Members described the conduct as racially biased and cavalier, noted that responding officers from the regional agency immediately questioned the detention, and observed that the subsequent criminal prosecution resulted in a jury conviction. The Board repeatedly emphasized that the officers’ stated justifications—claims they were acting on task-force authority or checking watch lists—were unsupported by the evidence and that the conduct amounted to unlawful detention, biased policing, and unprofessional, potentially violent behavior.

Deliberation focused on the strength of the documentary and video record. Members noted the case is unusually clear because the Brunswick police WCS footage and the criminal conviction provide objective corroboration; one member summarized the factual arc for the public: “there is a YouTube video... there were two enforcement officers... they believed that he is an undocumented immigrant and they therefore taken upon themselves to, harass and... basically arrest this person.” The Board discussed the officers’ defenses at trial, the guilty verdict, and the fact that one co-defendant pled guilty and testified, and they agreed the criminal findings closely mirror the administrative violations alleged here.

Members also debated the appropriate procedural path and the Board’s authority to act promptly. Several members stressed the need to proceed expeditiously given the conviction and public interest, while others raised procedural cautions about overlapping investigations and the consequences of recommending termination. The Board signaled it would rely on the criminal record, the WCS/video exhibits, and the OPS investigation to frame administrative findings and discipline recommendations rather than re-litigating facts already resolved in court.

Overall, the Board expressed consensus that the conduct was serious, that the available evidence supports sustained administrative findings for biased policing and unlawful detention, and that the case should move forward for formal disposition and discipline consistent with the gravity of the convictions and the Division’s policies.

Additional Information to Note:

Process of How OPS and Internal Affairs relate in this case:

- ***Parallel but coordinated investigations:*** OPS received a citizen complaint and opened an independent administrative review while Internal Affairs (IA) also opened a separate case after criminal charges were filed. As the investigator explained, “Charges were filed against him. Internal affairs opened their own case. We got a complaint separate from IA’s investigation.”
- ***Timing and sequencing:*** IA typically proceeds with its investigation and OPS often waits to review IA’s report to avoid duplicative work, but OPS may move more quickly when the criminal case and evidence are clear. OPS staff explained that in this instance they



did not delay because the criminal conviction and available video made the administrative review relatively straightforward.

- **Mutual constraints on discipline:** IA cannot present disciplinary recommendations while OPS has an open case on the same matter because the Board’s adjudicative role affects the timing of administrative discipline. As the investigator put it, “The reason why the IA cannot take a case forward is because the board has some authority over discipline and if they preempt us, then that... usurps the authority of the board.”
- **Practical coordination:** In practice OPS and IA aim to avoid duplicative investigations for efficiency; when IA conducts a full criminal or administrative probe, OPS will often review IA’s work and incorporate it into the Board package. When the criminal matter is already resolved and the administrative facts are clear, OPS may complete its review concurrently so both agencies can proceed to discipline and any hearing without unnecessary delay.
- Investigator Bowker requested to add Allegation D: Excessive Force referring GPO 2.01.03 subsection C (1). The Board adopted this Allegation D.

Motion: Add an Allegation D: Excessive Force

Motion By: Chair Brown

Second By: Gatian

Motion Status: Carried

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>Det. Donald Kopchak, #2139</p>	<p><i>The preponderance of the evidence, including WCS footage, written reports, and indictments & convictions from the Medina County Court; supports that the alleged conduct did occur and was inconsistent with the standards outlined in Manual Rules 5.01 and 5.11.</i></p> <p><i>Explanation: While off duty at a bar, Detective Kopchak behaved absolutely in a reprehensible fashion and was completely unprofessional in making his determination to detain a lawful U.S. citizen and identifying him as an illegal alien/undocumented immigrant and a potential terrorist. Group Level 3 with the action of Discipline is termination.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level III- Unnecessary Excessive Force, Discrimination & Biased Policing, & Felony Convictions</p> <p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p>



Allegation B: Biased Policing

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>Det. Donald Kopchak, #2139</p>	<p><i>The preponderance of the evidence, including WCS footage, written reports, and indictments & convictions from the Medina County Court; supports that the alleged conduct did occur and was inconsistent with the standards outlined in General Police Orders 1.07.08 and 2.02.02.</i></p> <p><i>Explanation: In addition to the reasoning previously stated, Det. Kopchak used both racist and nationalist views in carrying out his alleged police duties. Group Level 3 with act of discipline be termination of employment. Especially, stated in the City of Cleveland, Code of Ordinances, "Termination will be the presumed discipline for racist, sexist, anti-LGBTQ+, anti-immigrant, national-origin-based, or otherwise bigoted conduct, slurs, or language used in the course and scope of employment."</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level III- Discrimination & Biased Policing</p> <p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Miller Motion Status: Carried</p>

Allegation C: Other: Criminal Conviction

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
<p>Det. Donald Kopchak, #2139</p>	<p><i>The preponderance of the evidence, including WCS footage, written reports, and indictments & convictions from the Medina County Court, supports that the alleged conduct did occur and was inconsistent with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 2.01 and Criminal Convictions: Abduction 2905.02A(1)c, Abduction 2905A(2)c, Ethnic Intimidation 2927.12A(B), Assault 2903.13A(C).</i></p> <p><i>Explanation: Detective Kopchak, #2139 was convicted of all the above convictions, especially felonious convictions based on his discriminatory conduct.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level III- Felonies & Serious Misdemeanor offenses</p> <p>Motion by: Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p>

Allegation D: Excessive Force

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

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



<p>Det. Donald Kopchak, #2139</p>	<p><i>The preponderance of the evidence and the Brunswick Police WCS footage supports that the alleged conduct did occur and was inconsistent with the standards outlined in General Police Order 2.01.03(C)1.</i></p> <p><i>Explanation: Brunswick WCS footage shows Detective Kopchak holding down Mr. Bokredingil which resulted in an assault conviction.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level III- Excessive Force, Physical Force not within Policy</p> <p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p>
--	---	--

VI. Executive Session

CPRB

- **Motion:** To enter executive session for personnel, Employment and discipline Matters will be considered. Inviting in CPRB Legal Counsel, OPS Interim Admin Hess, OPS General Manager Watson, and the CPRB Administrative Assistant.
Motion By: Chair Brown
Seconded by: Sharp
Motion Status: Carried
- Executive Session began at 12:34 pm EST
- Adjourn back into open session at 2:56 pm EST.

VII. OPS Status Report

Michael Hess
Interim Administrator

Due to time Admin Hess was unable to give nor OPS Status Report.

VIII. Old Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

Timestamp: 3:19:27 – 3:20:38

A. OPS Administrator Search

Chair Brown provided an update on the search for an OPS Administrator and indicated that the Board had successfully narrowed down the list of candidates and are currently entering the final phase of interviews. The Board anticipates completing this phase within the next one or two weeks, after which a hiring



decision will be made. Chair Brown expressed the enthusiasm the Board has regarding the quality of the current candidate pool.

B. NACOLE 2026 Updates

Chair Brown confirmed the City of Cleveland Civilian Police Review Board is moving forward with a proposal to host a panel. The Panel Presenters are Chair Brown, Member Miller, Member Sharp, and Member Willis volunteered to be a moderator.

IX. **New Business**

Brandon Brown, Chair

Timestamp: 3:20:39 – 3:24:06

A. Accepting Resignations

- i. **Motion:** Accept resignation of Investigator James Ouk effective March 20th, 2026.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Miller

Motion Status: Carried

- ii. **Motion:** Accept resignation of Investigator Angela Schwark effective March 27th, 2026.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Miller

Motion Status: Carried

- iii. **Motion:** Accept resignation of Data Analyst Austin Kelleher effective March 20th, 2026.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Miller

Motion Status: Carried

B. Hiring New Investigators

- i. **Motion:** Hire Applicant ID: 56162472 for the position of OPS Investigator.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Miller

Motion Status: Carried

- ii. **Motion:** Hire Applicant ID: 64864186 for the position of OPS Investigator.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

Motion: Hire Applicant ID: 66696007 for the position of Data Analyst.



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

C. OPS2025-0264 Case Update

- i. **Motion:** OPS Seek outside Legal Counsel to conduct the investigation for case OPS2025-0264, with a budget of \$10,000.

Motion By: Chair Brown
Seconded By: Sharp
Motion Status: Carried

X. **Adjournment**

CPRB

Timestamp: 3:24:07 – 3:26:28

Motion: To Adorn April 14th, 2026 CPRB Meeting

Motion By: Miller
Seconded By: Cyganovich
Motion Status: Carried

- The CPRB April 14th, 2026 meeting was adjourned at 3:06 pm EST.
- The next CPRB Meeting is a special virtual on Monday, April 20, 2026 at 12:30 p.m. EST.
- The following CPRB Meeting will be held in-person at City Hall, Room 514 on Tuesday, May 12, 2026 at 9:15 a.m. EST.