



CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

June 9th, 2026

MEETING MINUTES

CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS

Brandon Brown, Chair
Kenneth Mountcastle, Vice President
Diana Cyganovich
Chenoa Miller
Glenn Parker III
Billy Sharp
Waverly Willis

LEGAL COUNSEL

Dalya Oprian, Asst. Director of Law

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

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

MEETING AGENDA

I. Call to Order Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 0:02:34 – 0:03:16

1. Chair Brown called June 9th, 2026 hearing to order at 9:20 am EST.
2. Roll Call
 - a. Board Members Daivd Gatian and Edwin Moore had an excused absence.
 - b. Member Billy Sharp arrived to meeting after roll call @ 9:39 am EST.
 - c. Member Chenoa Miller arrived to meeting after roll call @ 12:07 pm EST.
 - d. A quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes CPRB

YouTube Timestamp: 0:03:16 – 0:03:57

1. **May 12th Meeting Minutes – In- person| City Hall**

Motion: Approve May 12th, 2026 CPRB Meeting Minutes
Motion By: Willis
Second By: Parker III
Motion Status: Carried



III. Public Comment

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 0:03:57 – 0:04:22

- No individuals were present for Public Comment

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

Michael Hess
Interim Administrator

OPS2025-0052

Timestamp: 0:05:13 – 0:16:35

Complainant: Randall Krzystan (Present)

Presented by: Eisen

Det. Mark Bahrijczuk Jr., #486

P.O. Tiona Jones, #210

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation C: Other – Miranda Warning

Allegation B: Biased Policing

P.O. Anthony Jones, #88

Allegation C: Other – Miranda Warning

Summary of Case Presentation: Mr. Randall Krzystan was arrested on March 14, 2025, on a warrant for an alleged violation of a protection order. He reported that he was never contacted by a detective after the arrest and that the arresting officers did not Mirandize him. He also alleged that a detective assigned to the matter was biased and that an attorney had characterized that detective as racist. OPS reviewed investigative assignments, interviews, body-worn camera recordings, and applicable Division policy to determine whether the detective timely contacted the subject, whether any bias influenced investigative decisions, and whether the arresting officers provided required Miranda advisements when appropriate.

OPS recommends a finding of Sustained for the Lack of Service allegation against Det. Mark Bahrijczuk, #486, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence, including the detective's admission that he did not contact the arrestee, supports a finding that the alleged conduct did occur and was inconsistent with Detective Unit Manual Responsibility #6. OPS further recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Bias Policing allegation against Det. Mark Bahrijczuk, #486, as the evidence does not support a finding of discriminatory motivation and the detective's actions were consistent with GPO 1.07.08. OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for the Miranda Warning Violation allegations against P.O. Tiona Jones #210 and P.O. Anthony Jones #88, concluding that although the officers effected the arrest, they did not question the arrestee in custody, and their actions were consistent with GPO 2.02.03. The evidence supports these findings and that officer actions otherwise aligned with Division policy.



Randall Krzystan (Complainant) Statement: The complainant stated that he and the alleged victim were frequently together and that he regularly drove her to work and picked her up from social events; he said they were in a relationship and that he had evidence (texts, emails, photos) showing they were together prior to her incarceration. He reported that the woman was arrested on January 17 for a probation violation, and that while she was jailed, he contacted her to offer financial assistance because he believed a protection order had been removed.

He alleged that the investigating detective failed to conduct a proper inquiry, did not review the communications or photos that would corroborate his account, and did not perform basic detective work to verify the circumstances. The complainant also asserted that the detective had a personal connection to the woman's friend, which he believes influenced the decision to arrest him, and that the arresting officer was from a different district rather than the detective who handled the investigation.

Finally, the complainant expressed frustration that he was arrested at work on a Friday afternoon and detained over the weekend, which he described as unnecessary and punitive given the timing (noting St. Patrick's Day weekend concerns). He maintained that the allegations against him were untrue, emphasized his willingness to produce corroborating evidence, and asked that the investigative process be scrutinized for bias and lack of follow-up.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board began by reviewing the investigative record and questioned whether the warrant and its supporting affidavit had been examined in full. Members noted the warrant originated from a police report submitted by a third party who held power of attorney for the alleged victim while she was incarcerated; that report included screenshots from a messaging app and was forwarded to the detective bureau, which led to the warrant. Board members emphasized that, despite the warrant's existence, the detective still had an investigative obligation to contact Mr. Christian at some point during the inquiry.

Discussion distinguished two discrete strands of the matter: the underlying investigation that produced the warrant, and the subsequent arrest and custodial procedures (including whether Miranda warnings were read). The Board sought clarity about whether the protection order had been rescinded before the events in question; investigators reported they could not find documentation showing the order had been removed. Members stressed the importance of establishing the timeline and legal status of the protection order as part of assessing the reasonableness of the investigative steps taken.

Board members also explored why officers from a different precinct executed the arrest. Investigators explained that the arresting unit was determined by Mr. Christian's location at the time (he was at work in the First District), so First District officers executed the warrant rather than officers from the Third District who initiated the report. The Board asked whether any evidence of bias or an improper personal relationship between the detective and involved parties had been found; investigators reported no evidence of bias, and the record did not show the detective had a disqualifying personal connection.



Throughout the deliberation members repeatedly returned to the Board's core role: evaluating the adequacy of the police process rather than adjudicating the underlying interpersonal dispute. They concluded the record needed to show whether the detective fulfilled basic investigative duties, most notably contacting the subject and confirming the status of the protection order, and whether arrest procedures complied with policy. The Board's questions focused on those procedural gaps and on ensuring the investigation had addressed both the warrant's basis and the conduct of the arrest.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Mark Bahrijczuk Jr., #486	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in CDP Detective Responsibilities #6.</i> <i>Explanation: Officer did not contact the complaint throughout the investigation.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried Group Level: Group Level I- Unsatisfactory Performance Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Biased Policing

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Mark Bahrijczuk Jr., #486	<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 Opposed: Parker III

Allegation C: Other – Miranda Warning Violation

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Tiona Jones, #210 P.O. Anthony Jones, #88	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in General Police Order 2.02.03.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried



OPS2025-0007

Timestamp: 0:31:05 – 1:09:34

Complainant: Latorya Anthony (Present)

Presented by: Watson

Det. Michael Legg, #2198

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Det. Charles Schultz, #508

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On September 12, 2024, Ms. Latorya Anthony reported that homicide detectives assigned to the investigation of a murder-suicide involving her son, Phillip Wingfield Jr., did not provide sufficient service and were unprofessional in their interactions with her and her family. The detectives assigned to the case were Det. Michael Legg and Det. Charles Schultz. Ms. Anthony expressed concerns about the adequacy of investigative communication and the detectives' demeanor during the course of the investigation into the events of September 12, 2024.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera recordings, investigative case files, detective unit procedures, witness and complainant statements, and applicable Division policy governing detective responsibilities and officer conduct. The recorded materials document the detectives' investigative steps, victim family interactions, and adherence to detective unit guidelines. Investigators evaluated whether the detectives fulfilled their investigative duties, provided appropriate notifications and follow-up to the family, and conducted themselves in a professional and respectful manner consistent with Division rules.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for the Lack of Service allegation against Det. Michael Legg #2198, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the detective's investigative actions were consistent with Manual Rules 4.01 and 4.18. OPS further recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Unprofessional Behavior allegation against Det. Legg, as the evidence does not support a finding that the detective's conduct violated Manual Rules 5.08 or 5.09. OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for the Lack of Service allegation against Det. Charles Schultz #508, concluding that the detective acted in accordance with Manual Rules 4.01 and 4.18. OPS further recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Unprofessional Behavior allegation against Det. Schultz, as the preponderance of evidence shows the detective's interactions were professional and consistent with Manual Rules 5.08 and 5.09. The evidence supports that the detective's investigative actions and conduct aligned with Division policy.

Latorya Anthony (Complainant) Statement: Ms. Anthony said she and her family followed the detective's instructions but believe the investigation was mishandled. She described being told by the victim's mother, while her son was en-route to the hospital, that \$3,000 had been left in the house and that the mother knew who was coming and where they were coming from. The house was in the mother's name, and Ms. Anthony explained her son and his family were living



there temporarily; she asserted that the mother and her associates coordinated people and vehicles to the house and effectively “set up” her son.

She recounted prior threats and troubling communications that, in her view, pointed to a planned ambush rather than a spontaneous incident: late night calls, Instagram messages warning “watch your back,” and texts indicating plans to bring guns to the location. Ms. Anthony insisted her son did not own guns or belong to gangs and said the pattern of messages and behavior showed the incident was orchestrated. She emphasized that the mother knew what was happening and failed to stop it.

Ms. Anthony strongly criticized the police response, saying detectives did not adequately investigate, failed to interview key witnesses, and did not timely or clearly communicate with the prosecutor. She maintained she had provided texts, videos, and other evidence that corroborated her account but that investigators did not pursue those leads thoroughly. Frustrated by perceived one-sided treatment in the media and by authorities, she urged the Board to scrutinize the investigative process and not accept accusers’ statements without fuller verification.

Throughout her statement Ms. Anthony expressed deep grief and resolve: she thanked the Board for their time, affirmed she would protect her grandchildren, and said the family would pursue the matter properly rather than allow her grandson’s name to be maligned. She called for greater oversight and accountability so other families do not feel unheard or unsafe, acknowledged the Board’s limited authority, and welcomed any avenues, such as broader review by oversight bodies, that might address systemic concerns.

Phillip Wingfield (Witness) Statement: Mr. Wingfield told the Board he was en-route to pick up his children for a parent-teacher- conference. He said he called his Jr. son at 5:14 p.m. and called again shortly after; on the second call his younger son answered and told him that his son Jr. had killed the mother of his child. Expressing how traumatic and quickly the events happened.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board opened by expressing condolences to the family and acknowledged the emotional difficulty of the matter. Members reviewed the investigative record and the evidence the complainant provided, including text messages, videos, and social media content. The complainant and family members described prior threats, alleged coordination of an ambush, and other communications they believed the detectives should have pursued; they expressed frustration that the prosecutor did not communicate clearly and that the investigation felt incomplete.

Board members focused their questions on process rather than re-weighting the underlying facts. They asked whether detectives had reviewed the Instagram posts, videos, and other materials the family submitted, whether interviews were conducted with relevant witnesses, and whether the detective consulted the prosecutor with the full set of evidence. Investigators confirmed multiple interviews were conducted, that videos and messages were provided to the prosecutor, and that Detective Leg consulted with a prosecutor (identified in the record) who ultimately declined to



file charges. The Board noted a discrepancy in the family's account of the prosecutor's response and the prosecutor's reported reaction, which contributed to the family's frustration.

Several members emphasized the Board's limited remit: it evaluates officer conduct and investigative process, not prosecutorial decisions. While acknowledging gray areas in the evidence and investigative judgment, members asked whether any clear procedural failures occurred, such as failing to contact key witnesses or to document investigative steps. Investigators maintained that the detective turned over the available evidence to the prosecutor and conducted multiple interviews, but the Board observed that some procedural questions remained and that further inquiry could be warranted if new, material evidence surfaced.

The Board discussed possible next steps for the family, including referral to the Cleveland Police Commission for broader review, since the Commission has a wider scope than the Board. With those procedural clarifications and the record before them, the Board moved toward deliberation on whether the detectives met their investigative obligations under departmental policy, keeping the focus on process and documentation rather than the prosecutor's charging decision.

Additional Information to Note:

- *Chair Brown directed OPS staff to ensure the complainant receives information about the Cleveland Police Commission (CPC) and to help the family pursue that option if they wish. Specifically, he asked staff to provide CPC contact details and meeting information so the complainant can attend, follow up, or request a broader review.*
- *Board Member Sharp specify gratitude towards Chair Brown and the Board for allowing the grieving family space to speak in an emotionally charged case, noting this may be one of the last opportunities the family has to do so. He expressed appreciation for the Board's commitment to follow its established parameters and procedures when reviewing and adjudicating officer-related matters and affirmed that the Board had adhered to those responsibilities in this case.*

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Michael Legg, #2198 Det. Charles Schultz, #508	<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: Cyganovich Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried Opposed: Willis- prosecutor only received evidence after called detective



Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Michael Legg, #2198 Det. Charles Schultz, #508	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

Meeting Recess:

Chair Brown called for a 7- minute meeting recess starting at 10:28 am EST.

Meeting Resumed Promptly at 10:39 am EST.

V. Presentation of Investigations

Michael Hess

Interim Administrator

OPS2024-0134

Timestamp: 1:20:26 – 1:30:04

Complainant: A'Lexis Prettyman

Presented by: Eisen

Det. Bobby Sumlin, #2153

Allegation A: Biased Policing

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Citation

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Last Heard: May 12, 2026

Tabled: CPRB previously tabled for further investigation, specifically regarding the school-based interaction at Saint Martin de Porres High School to review the alleged comments Det. Sumlin made to complainant.

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by A'Lexis Prettyman, who alleged Bias Policing, Improper Procedure, and Unprofessional Conduct by Detective Bobby Sumlin during an encounter on June 11, 2024. Ms. Prettyman reported that while walking her dog, the animal defecated on Saint Martin de Porres High School property. She stated that Det. Sumlin yelled at her about failing to pick up the waste, followed her to her residence, and later followed her again when she drove past the school. She further alleged that he improperly issued citations by mail and that his conduct was biased and unprofessional.



OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage, court summonses, traffic and misdemeanor citations, and conducted interviews with the complainant, a school administrator, and Det. Sumlin. The evidence showed that Det. Sumlin, working as a school security officer, observed Ms. Prettyman commit multiple ordinance violations, including failing to dispose of dog waste and operating a vehicle with expired plates. Both parties acknowledged that he yelled from a significant distance, which OPS determined was consistent with attempting to communicate across space rather than unprofessional conduct. OPS found no evidence that his enforcement actions were motivated by bias; instead, they were based on observed violations. However, OPS determined that Det. Sumlin did not follow required CDP procedures for issuing citations. He mailed summonses instead of personally serving a Uniform Traffic Ticket, did not document a valid reason for issuing a summons in lieu of a UTT, and failed to include the required subsection for the Driving Under Suspension charge. These omissions were inconsistent with GPO 8.2.03, GPO 3.4.06, and GPO 3.4.14.

OPS recommended Exonerated for Allegation A, Bias Policing, concluding that the enforcement actions were based on observed conduct and consistent with GPO 1.07.08. OPS recommended Sustained for Allegation B, Improper Procedure, finding that the detective's citation process did not comply with CDP policy or Ohio law. OPS recommended Exonerated for Allegation C, Unprofessional Conduct, determining that his raised voice was due to distance and that his conduct remained within professional expectations.

Investigator Addendum (March 26, 2026): OPS noted that Det. Sumlin's WCS had been deleted under CDP's retention policy, but the footage had been reviewed and summarized in the original investigation. No new information altered the findings, and the original recommendations remain unchanged.

Investigator Addendum (May 28, 2026): The addendum notes that the May 12th, 2026 CPRB meeting the Board questioned whether Det. Sumlin was acting as a CDP officer or as a school security employee during the incident, and raised concerns about an additional alleged interaction at the high school, specifically the complainant's claim that he told her to "wait until I get off work", which had not been addressed in the original interview and was not captured on WCS. Because this missing information was central to understanding the complaint, the Board tabled the case for further investigation. OPS then conducted a follow-up interview with Det. Sumlin on May 27, 2026, during which he denied the allegations and stated he was working secondary employment, described seeing the complainant's dog defecate on school property, warning her about a citation, noting her expired plates, and the school dean speaking with her.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members focused first on the timeline and number of alleged officer-complainant interactions. They asked investigators to confirm each reported contact: an initial encounter while the complainant was walking a dog, a subsequent incident at a school, and a possible third face-to-face interaction. Investigators reported they found no evidence of a third in-person encounter at the school.



Members probed the officer's account and work status, noting the officer said he was performing secondary employment that day but considered himself an on-duty officer in both roles. The Board examined whether that status affected the officer's conduct or the department's responsibilities and asked investigators to verify the circumstances and any documentation supporting the officer's version of events.

The Board also reviewed procedural questions about how the matter was handled at the point of contact, specifically whether the officer issued a summons rather than handing a citation in person, and whether that choice complied with policy given the limited circumstances that permit summonses. Members sought clarity on whether any procedural missteps occurred and whether the investigative record documented the officer's decisions and actions.

With those process questions addressed, the Board concluded there were no immediate factual findings to overturn based on the record presented but emphasized the need for clear documentation. Members invited any final questions for the investigator, then prepared to move to formal deliberations and motions based on the confirmed investigative record.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Biased Policing

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Bobby Sumlin, #2153	<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 1.07.08.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Citation

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Bobby Sumlin, #2153	<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 Ohio Revised Code 2935.26 and Cleveland Division of Police GPOs 3.04.06, 3.04.14, and 8.02.03.</i> <i>Explanation: Det. Sumlin issued the citation via summons rather than personally serving the ticket to the complainant at the time of the incident. The Board noted that this procedure is only permitted under very limited circumstances, none of which were met in this specific</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried Group Level: Group Level I- Unsatisfactory Performance, Erroneous Reporting Motion by: Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried



	<i>case, making the action inconsistent with division standards.</i>	
--	--	--

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Bobby Sumlin, #2153	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, 5.09 and General Police Order 1.01.03.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0001

Timestamp: 1:30:16 – 1:35:37

Complainant: Shenee McCoy-Gibbons

Presented by: S.I. Bowker

P.O. David Smith, #2376

Sgt. Marcus Jones, #9284

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct - SUSTAINED

Allegation F: Improper Procedure - SUSTAINED

Allegation D: Improper Stop - SUSTAINED

Allegation G: WCS Violation SUSTAINED

Allegation E: Improper Citation - SUSTAINED

Allegation H: Improper Citation - SUSTAINED

Case Update: All sustained findings in this case were administratively dismissed because both involved CDP employees: P.O. David Smith, #2376, who separated on April 2, 2026, and Sgt. Marcus Jones, #9284, who separated on April 21, 2026; left the Division before discipline could be issued. Prior to dismissal, the Board had sustained multiple allegations: against P.O. Smith for Unprofessional Conduct, Improper Procedure: Stop, and Improper Procedure: Citation, all classified as Group Level II violations; and against Sgt. Jones for Improper Procedure, a WCS Violation, and Improper Procedure: Citation, with the first two classified as Group Level II violations and the citation-related allegation classified as Group Level I.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members discussed the status of the officers involved and whether they had retired or separated while disciplinary proceedings were pending. There was uncertainty in the record about the officers' exact employment status; some members believed the officers had retired, while others noted the file only showed a separation. The group agreed that the distinction matters because retirement during pending discipline could affect eligibility to return and might create a procedural loophole.



Members explored the potential ramifications if an officer retires while facing possible demotion or other discipline. Several members raised concerns that retirement could preserve pension benefits and rank in ways that would frustrate accountability, and they asked staff to research how retirement interacts with ongoing disciplinary proceedings and collective bargaining rules. Investigators and staff noted they would need to confirm whether a hearing had been held or a sustained finding issued, since those outcomes affect what disciplinary remedies remain available.

The Board identified this as a policy and oversight issue rather than a single-case evidentiary question and suggested it may warrant review by the Cleveland Police Commission (CPC). Members asked OPS to look into the mechanics—how retirement affects discipline, demotion, and rehire eligibility—and to report back so the Board could determine whether to refer the matter to the CPC for broader policy consideration. The Board emphasized the importance of closing any procedural gaps that would allow officers to avoid accountability by leaving the department before discipline is resolved.

Additional Information to Note:

- *With those questions assigned for follow-up, the Board asked OPS staff to return with clarified employment records and legal guidance on the intersection of resignation/retirement and disciplinary proceedings.*
-

OPS2024-0040

Timestamp: 1:35:47 – 1:44:13

Complainant: Anonymous

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Sierra Morris, #1258

Sgt. Randolph Murphy, #9286

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

P.O. Dimand Murphy, #1264

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves an anonymous complaint alleging that during a liquor inspection on February 24, 2024, a female officer told a bartender to “move the fuck out of the way.” The complainant also alleged Improper Procedure by Sgt. Randolph Murphy, though OPS had already investigated that allegation in OPS2024-0070, where the CPRB issued a finding of Exonerated. The two female officers on scene were identified as P.O. Dimand Murphy and P.O. Sierra Morris.



OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage, the CDP incident report, duty assignments, and the search warrant inventory. Officers had shut down a large party at 15901 St. Clair Avenue to conduct a liquor inspection after determining the location lacked a valid certificate of occupancy for alcohol service. The footage did not support the complainant's claim; as the report states, "WCS did not show her making any unprofessional comments, as alleged," and both officers "conducted themselves in a manner to command the respect of the public."

OPS recommended Unfounded for the Unprofessional Conduct allegation, finding no evidence that the alleged statement occurred. The Improper Procedure allegation against Sgt. Murphy was Administratively Dismissed, as it had already been fully investigated and adjudicated in a prior case.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members reviewed the case file and clarified that this matter originated from an anonymous complaint submitted shortly after the incident. The complaint raised issues similar to those in a separate, related case; staff explained the cases were considered for consolidation but ultimately handled separately because some allegations did not overlap.

Investigator Khabir confirmed they had reviewed available WCS footage and other materials from the related investigation. The anonymous complaint identified the same officer but added no new, substantive information beyond what had already been examined in the companion case. The Board noted the administrative practice of combining related complaints when appropriate, but also the need to keep distinct allegations separate when they concern different subjects or parties.

Members focused on Allegation B (improper procedure) and asked what specific procedure was alleged to be improper. Staff explained the allegation concerned confiscation of alcohol from an establishment and whether that action was appropriate given the contractual arrangements for alcohol service. Because the subject matter had been addressed in the other case and the anonymous submission added no new evidence, the Board treated Allegation B as administratively dismissed. The Chair confirmed the dismissal on the record, so the administrative disposition was clear.

The Board emphasized the importance of clear documentation when complaints are combined or administratively dismissed, and asked staff to ensure the rationale for dismissal and any links to the related case are recorded in the file. With those clarifications made, members had no further questions and moved to the next item on the docket.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

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



P.O. Sierra Morris, #1258 P.O. Dimand Murphy, #1264	<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
--	--	---

Sgt. Randolph Murphy, #9286

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

**OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED – Already Investigated**

**CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED – Already Investigated**

The allegation is administratively dismissed because OPS previously investigated the same issue in Case 2024-0070. During the August 12, 2025, CPRB meeting, the Board exonerated Sgt. Murphy, #9286 on the Improper Procedure allegation. As the matter has already been reviewed and resolved, it does not require further consideration in this case.

OPS2024-0059

Timestamp: 1:49:47 – 1:51:36

Complainant: Angela Ferguson

Presented by: Koenig

P.O. James Ortells, #104

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Sgt. Alexander Sinclair, #9313

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

P.O. Matthew Woznicki, #2508

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Angela Ferguson alleging Lack of Service by P.O. James Ortells #104 and P.O. Matthew Woznicki #2508, and Improper Procedure by Sgt. Alexander Sinclair #9313, stemming from two separate incidents on **12/04/2023** and **03/09/2024**. Ms. Ferguson stated that officers filed an incorrect report, did not fully hear her account, and that Sgt. Sinclair misled her about potential charges against the suspect. OPS reviewed extensive **WCS footage**, incident reports, and interviews documenting officers' responses to a school-related fight involving Ms. Ferguson's children and a later altercation in which the suspect allegedly brandished a firearm inside the complainant's home.

OPS found that officers on both dates listened to Ms. Ferguson, gathered statements from all involved parties, provided case numbers and victim paperwork, and attempted to contact the other involved parent. WCS showed officers explaining prosecutorial options, discussing retaliation concerns, and returning to the scene to speak with additional witnesses. During the March 2024 incident, officers detained the suspect due to a reported firearm threat, interviewed both sides, and consulted a supervisor regarding charging decisions. Sgt. Sinclair informed Ms.



Ferguson that any potential Aggravated Menacing charge or protection order would be handled by the prosecutor, and WCS did not support the allegation that he lied or provided false information.

After reviewing all evidence, OPS concluded that officers complied with GPO 5.12.01 (Interactions with Youth) and Manual of Rules 5.08 and 5.09, demonstrating courtesy and appropriate investigative steps. OPS recommended **Exonerated** for Allegation A against P.O. Ortells, finding his actions consistent with policy. Allegation A against P.O. Woznicki and Allegation B against Sgt. Sinclair were Administratively Dismissed, as both officers are no longer employed by CDP and OPS lacks jurisdiction to investigate non-CDP personnel. OPS advised that complaints involving inactive officers should be referred to the appropriate outside authority.

Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after the case presentation.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. James Ortells, #104	<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 4.18, 5.08, 5.09 and General Police Order 5.12.01.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

P.O. Matthew Woznicki, #2508

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Action: **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 11/21/2024

CPRB Recommendation: **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 11/21/2024

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 11/21/2024. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

Sgt. Alexander Sinclair, #9313

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

OPS Action: **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 04/11/2024

CPRB Recommendation: **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 04/11/2024



Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 04/11/2024 As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

OPS2024-0163

Timestamp: 1:51:43 – 1:55:33

Complainant: Emily Bond

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Kenneth Kirk, #572

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On July 16, 2024, OPS received a complaint from Ms. Emily Bond alleging that P.O. Ken Kirk sent her text messages after she visited the 4th District on July 15, 2024, which made her uncomfortable and crossed professional boundaries. Ms. Bond provided printed screenshots of the text exchange showing messages from an individual identifying himself as P.O. Kirk asking where she lived and whether she had a boyfriend. OPS opened an investigation to determine whether the officer's conduct violated CDP Manual Rules governing professionalism, respect, and conduct that could diminish public esteem.

OPS obtained and reviewed the complainant's written complaint, the printed screenshots of the text messages, a recorded interview of Ms. Bond, an audio interview with Victor Acosta of FCPO 205, and a video-recorded interview of P.O. Kirk. In his interview, P.O. Kirk admitted sending the texts, described personal issues affecting his judgment that day, and acknowledged that his messages were inappropriate and could be perceived as crossing professional boundaries. The text content and the officer's admission were the central evidentiary bases for OPS's assessment.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence; including P.O. Kirk's admission and the text message screenshots; OPS recommends a finding of SUSTAINED for Allegation A, Unprofessional Conduct, concluding that on July 15, 2024, P.O. Kirk's texts to Ms. Bond were inconsistent with CDP Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, and 5.09. This recommendation is grounded in the investigator's determination that the officer's conduct diminished the professional standards expected of Division personnel.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board asked why the officer sent the text messages. In his interview he said he was going through a rough period, saw the complainant as a friendly face, and intended to buy her a coffee to talk. The complainant, however, felt uncomfortable with that contact and that discomfort prompted her to file the complaint.

Case Findings:



Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Kenneth Kirk, #572	<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 Rule 5.01, 5.08, and 5.09.</i> <i>Explanation: Officer Kirk sent text messages to the complainant after she visited the 4th district to offer condolences. The Officer admitted asking where she lived and does she have a boyfriend.</i>	Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried Group Level: Group Level I – Unsatisfactory Performance, Violation of Training Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0166

Timestamp: 1:55:37 – 1:58:28

Complainant: Ashely Mostella

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Abner Deleon Giron, #1542

P.O. Gary Kane, #56

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On July 18, 2024, Ashley Mostella filed a phone complaint alleging Lack of Service and Improper Procedure by P.O. Deleon and P.O. Kane following an assault on July 16, 2024. Ms. Mostella reported that an adult male grabbed her by the neck and pushed her to the ground, and she alleged that one officer falsely accused her of jumping out of her vehicle with a knife and that neither officer provided names or badge numbers during the response. OPS opened an investigation to determine whether officers properly investigated the assault and complied with CDP duties to identify themselves and document the incident.

OPS reviewed the officers' WCS, the incident report, and a recorded OPS interview with Ms. Mostella. The WCS footage shows officers providing the complainant with the incident report number, their identifying information, a Know Your Rights form, and the prosecutor's office phone number. The WCS also documents a follow-up at the suspect's reported residence and visual identification of an individual matching the complainant's description, which was reflected in the incident report.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for the Lack of Service allegation, concluding that the officers acted within CDP Manual Rule 4.13, which requires officers to report and investigate complaints and document investigative steps. OPS further recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Improper Procedure allegation, as the WCS footage and incident report show the officers provided identifying information on the Know Your Rights form and documented the follow-up



at the suspect's residence. The evidence supports that the investigation and documentation were appropriate, and the officers' conduct aligned with Division policy.

Investigator Addendum (May 29, 2026): *This case was investigated previously by an investigator no longer with OPS. Based on a review of the complaint and the available evidence, there is no allegation of Improper Procedure; only an allegation of Lack of Service: Insufficient Service.*

Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after the case presentation.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Abner Deleon Giron, #1542 P.O. Gary Kane, #56	<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 4.13.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0187

Timestamp: 1:58:32 – 2:03:53

Complainant: Tamika Schaffer

Presented by: Eisen

Sgt. Eric newton, #9233

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

P.O. Justin Riolo, #2375

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Dr. Tameka Schaffer alleging Lack of Service and Unprofessional Conduct by Sgt. Eric Newton #9233 and P.O. Justin Riolo #2375 during their response to a large fight at a CMHA property. Dr. Schaffer stated that officers failed to arrest two adult women who assaulted her 15-year-old niece and that their handling of the incident was dismissive. Body-worn camera footage showed a chaotic scene with multiple individuals present, officers attempting to restore order, and no active fighting when officers arrived. The footage also showed officers speaking with witnesses, identifying involved parties, and gathering information.



OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage, officer interviews, witness statements, and the CDP incident report. The evidence showed that Sgt. Newton and P.O. Riolo identified the juvenile victim, reviewed video evidence provided by witnesses, offered EMS, and completed a named-suspect assault report. Officers advised the victim's family on how to pursue charges through the prosecutor's office and forwarded the case to the detective bureau for further review. OPS found that the officers' decisions not to make immediate arrests were based on the lack of visible injuries, conflicting accounts, and the absence of a warrant, all of which were consistent with CDP policy.

OPS recommended Exonerated for both officers on the allegations of Lack of Service and Unprofessional Conduct. The investigation concluded that the officers' actions aligned with CDP Manual Rules 4.14, 4.18, and 5.01, and that they acted appropriately by dispersing the crowd, documenting the incident, and providing guidance to the victim's family. No evidence supported the claim that officers acted dismissively or failed to provide service.

Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after the case presentation.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Eric Newton, #9233 P.O. Justin Riolo, #2375	<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 4.13.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Eric Newton, #9233 P.O. Justin Riolo, #2375	<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 5.01.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0215

Timestamp: 2:03:58 – 2:10:08



Complainant: Juanita Rucker

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Diovanni Smith, #285

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Biased Policing

P.O. Megan Hollenbeck, #187

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Allegation D: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

P.O. Drew Flagg, #152

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Arrest

P.O. Jared Volan, #549

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Summary of Case Presentation: On September 12, 2024, OPS received a complaint from Juanita Rucker alleging that on September 1, 2024, P.O. Diovanni Smith was rude and biased during the investigation of an altercation that led to Ms. Rucker's arrest. Ms. Rucker stated the arrest decision was based on a tenant's cell-phone video and alleged other officers on scene failed to assist or otherwise provide service. OPS opened an investigation to determine whether officers acted unprofessionally, engaged in biased policing, properly established probable cause for arrest, and provided required identifying and service information.

OPS reviewed multiple body-worn camera recordings: P.O. Megan Hollenbeck, P.O. Diovanni Smith, P.O. Jared Volan, and P.O. Drew Flag, along with the incident report. The WCS footage shows officers separating parties, obtaining witness statements, and P.O. Hollenbeck viewing the tenant's cellphone video that depicted the complainant striking the tenant. The footage documents that the tenant requested medical assistance, completed a misdemeanor complaint, and that officers escorted the tenant and his partner into the residence to retrieve belongings. Ms. Rucker told officers she had video showing the tenant as the aggressor but was unable to produce that evidence at the time of arrest.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for the Improper Arrest allegation, concluding that P.O. Hollenbeck acted within GPO 3.04.01 Probable Cause/Warrantless Arrest after reviewing the tenant's cell-phone video and witness statements. OPS further recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Unprofessional Conduct and Bias Policing allegations against P.O. Smith, as the WCS footage shows professional, unbiased interactions and no conduct inconsistent with GPO 1.07.08 Bias Free Policing or Manual Rules 5.01 and 5.08. The evidence supports that the arrest was lawful and the officers' conduct aligned with Division policy.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members reviewed Allegation C: Improper arrest and asked investigators to clarify whether the complainant had been given an opportunity to produce exculpatory video evidence. Investigators confirmed the complainant said a video existed showing the other party as the primary aggressor, and officers had asked her at the time of arrest to provide any such footage.

The complainant was unable to produce the video at the scene and, according to the record, did not provide it subsequently. Investigators noted they had requested the evidence and documented



the request, but no video or other corroborating material was ever submitted to support the claim that she was not the primary aggressor.

Given the absence of the purported video and the lack of additional corroboration, the Board observed that the allegation of an improper arrest was weakened. Members concluded the record did not substantiate that officers failed to follow arrest procedures based on the information available to them at the time, and they treated the improper arrest claim as unsupported by the evidence on file.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Diovanni Smith, #285	<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: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Biased Policing

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Diovanni Smith, #285	<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: Parkere III Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Arrest

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 alignment with the standards outlined in General Police Order 3.04.01.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

Allegation D: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Drew Flagg, #152 P.O. Megan Hollenbeck, #187 P.O. Jared Volan, #549	<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: Parker III Motion Status: Carried



OPS2024-0223

Timestamp: 2:36:42 – 2:50:35

Complainant: Kathleen Drummond

Presented by: Green

P.O. Stephen Pratt, #2556

Allegation A: Biased Policing

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On September 13, 2024, P.O. Stephen Pratt responded to a reported assault and ongoing neighbor dispute at 10413 Baltic Rd. Complainant Kathleen Drummond alleged that P.O. Pratt failed to properly investigate the incident and showed favoritism toward the neighbor and the neighbor's workers because he knew the neighbor. Upon arrival, P.O. Pratt separated the parties, reviewed a video provided by the witness, and notified dispatch that he knew the neighbor; he also requested additional units and a supervisor due to the prior relationship. A supervisor responded, determined there was no conflict requiring recusal, and arranged for another officer to complete the report.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage from the responding officers, recorded statements from the complainant and witnesses, the incident report, and applicable Division policy. The footage documents P.O. Pratt identifying himself by name and badge, viewing the video of the altercation, documenting statements from all parties, requesting additional units and supervisory oversight, and providing parties with prosecutor contact information and a police report number. Witness statements corroborated that both sides exchanged threats and that the complainant was the first to initiate threats.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Bias Policing allegation, concluding that the officer acted within GPO 01.07.08 Bias-Free Policing. OPS further recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Lack of Service allegation, as the WCS footage and incident documentation show P.O. Pratt viewed the complainant's video, gathered statements, requested additional units and supervisory oversight, and ensured parties received a report number and prosecutor contact information in accordance with Manual Rules 3.12, 4.11, 4.18, 5.09, and 7.01. The evidence supports that the investigation and documentation were appropriate, and the officer's conduct aligned with Division policy.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members reviewed the complaint alleging biased policing because the responding officer knew the homeowner (a realtor who had facilitated sales for the officer). The officer immediately gathered a statement from Mr. Drummond, observed recordings shown by Mr. Drummond, and radioed for additional units and a supervisor when the situation escalated.



The Board examined whether the officer's prior relationship with the homeowner amounted to actionable bias. Members distinguished between the mere existence of a relationship and actual biased conduct, noting the complaint alleged bias because of the relationship, not because of specific biased actions.

Members referenced policy considerations (including Manual Rule 7.01) and observed that officers do not choose response assignments; an existing relationship alone does not prove bias. The investigator confirmed the record showed the officer responded as assigned, intervened, and sought backup rather than showing overt favoritism.

The Board concluded the relationship was present but found no evidence in the record that the officer acted with bias. Members agreed the question was valid to raise, but with the available evidence they did not find a sustained bias violation and had no further questions.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Biased Policing

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Stephen Pratt, #2556	<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

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Stephen Pratt, #2556	<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

OPS2024-0256

Timestamp: 2:22:39 – 2:30:07

Complainant: Tamieka Stewart

Presented by: Green

P.O. Brian Brunner, #2083

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation C: Improper Procedure

Sgt. Michael Boyd, #9369

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation C: Improper Procedure



Summary of Case Presentation: Ms. Tameika Stewart alleged that on October 13, 2024, Sgt. Michael Boyd and P.O. Brian Brunner backed into the front of her vehicle while she was stopped at a stop sign, causing her to strike the vehicle behind her, and that the officers instructed her to wait at a nearby shelter and then delayed returning to investigate. OPS opened an investigation to determine whether the officers failed to provide timely service, acted unprofessionally, or violated traffic reporting procedures during their response.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage from the responding officers, the incident and traffic crash reports, and the complainant's statements. The footage documents the officers returning to the scene after responding to a nearby call, separating the parties, viewing the available video of the event, collecting license and insurance information, and completing an OH1 traffic crash report that identified the complainant as the at fault driver. The other driver on scene confirmed that the patrol vehicle did not strike the complainant's vehicle and corroborated the officers' account.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Lack of Service allegation, concluding that the officers acted within Manual Rule 4.18 by responding to the scene, documenting the incident, and completing the required crash report. OPS further recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Unprofessional Behavior allegation, as the body-worn camera footage shows the officers remained professional and conducted themselves in accordance with Manual Rule 5.01. OPS also recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Improper Procedure allegation, concluding that the officers complied with applicable traffic reporting procedures and properly completed the OH1 crash report in accordance with Division policy. The evidence supports that the investigation, documentation, and officer conduct aligned with Division policy.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members raised discrepancies in badge and batch numbers listed on the agenda versus the investigative report. Staff acknowledged the error and reviewed the entries aloud, noting different numbers for Officer Michael Boyd and Officer Brian Brunner across documents. Members asked whether the badge numbers reflected promotions or changes in rank, and staff confirmed the roster can change over time and that sergeant badge numbers typically begin with a nine.

The group agreed the correct, current badge numbers should be used for motions and the official record; staff said the board secretary normally verifies badge numbers with IAPRO when preparing the agenda and would correct the agenda to match the investigative report. Members asked staff to update the file and the agenda to reflect the accurate badge numbers and to note any rank changes that might explain prior inconsistencies.

The Board emphasized the importance of consistent identification in the record, so motions and dispositions unambiguously reference the right officers. With the corrections agreed, members had no further questions and asked staff to make the updates before finalizing the case materials.

Case Findings:



Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Michael Boyd, #9369 P.O. Brian Brunner, #2083	<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
Sgt. Michael Boyd, #9369 P.O. Brian Brunner, #2083	<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 C: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Michael Boyd, #9369 P.O. Brian Brunner, #2083	<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

OPS2024-0267

Timestamp: 2:51:54 – 2:57:24

Complainant: Megan Kilbane

Presented by: Green

P.O. Daniel McGinty, #850

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation C: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: Ms. Megan Kilbane alleges that on August 22, 2024, P.O. Daniel McGinty displayed favoritism during an investigation into the ownership of a property, failed to review evidence she provided, and that those actions led to her being improperly detained. OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage of the response, the Division detail report, court/civil filings related to the property dispute, and the complainant's statements. WCS shows the officer arriving at the address, speaking with the homeowner who claimed to have purchased the property, viewing information provided by the complainant, consulting with a supervisor, and following supervisory direction regarding the status of the residence and the appropriate law enforcement response.



WCS footage documents the officer gathering statements, verifying that the complainant told him she no longer lived at the residence and had entered through an open window, and coordinating with a supervisor who advised that eviction was a civil matter and that entry after locks were changed could support a breaking and entering detention. The recording shows the complainant and another male were detained, advised of next steps, and informed they could be released pending further detective follow-up. Attempts to contact the complainant for additional follow-up were unsuccessful.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for the Improper Procedure allegation, concluding that the officer acted within General Police Order 2.02.02 (Search and Seizure; Miranda Warning and Waiver) and GPO 3.04.01 (Probable Cause/Warrantless Arrest) when detaining the complainant after determining she had entered a vacant residence following a change of locks. OPS further recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Unprofessional Conduct allegation, as the body-worn camera footage shows the officer remained professional and conducted himself in accordance with Manual Rule 5.01. OPS also recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Lack of Service allegation, as the officer gathered statements, documented the incident, coordinated supervisory oversight, and provided information consistent with Manual Rule 4.18. The evidence supports that the detention and investigative actions were consistent with Division policy and procedure.

Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after the case presentation.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Daniel McGinty, #850	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur and was consistent with the General Police Orders 2.02.02 and 3.04.01.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Daniel McGinty, #850	<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: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded



Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Daniel McGinty, #850	<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: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0001

Timestamp: 2:35:50 – 2:46:57

Complainant: Tonya Papp

Presented by: Watson

Sgt. John Kosko, #9354

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Search

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Allegation D: Missing Property

Allegation E: Harassment

Det. Robert Jorgensen, #2312

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Det. Michael Ratti, #1698

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Det. Richard Rospierski, #2006

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Sgt. Michael Harper, #9230

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Det. Ryan McNamara, #949

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On January 3, 2025, Detective John Kosko executed a search warrant at the home of Tonya Papp in connection with a December 2024 shooting. The operation was led on scene by Sgt. Michael Harper and included multiple detectives and a patrol officer. The complainant alleged the search was illegal, that all officers on scene acted unprofessionally, that her sons' subsequent arrests were retaliatory or illegal, that property belonging to one son is missing, and that one son's Miranda rights were violated. Two suspects, Timothy Papp Jr. and Peter Papp, were arrested on January 17, 2025, in connection with the shooting; the complainant contends those arrests and related actions were improper.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera recordings, recorded interviews, the search warrant and supporting affidavits, arrest documentation, and court records. The warrant and related court approvals were examined alongside contemporaneous recordings of the search and arrests. Investigators assessed whether the search and arrests complied with statutory authority and Division policy, whether Miranda advisements were provided prior to custodial questioning, and whether property handling followed legal and procedural requirements.



OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct against Det. John Kosko, Sgt. Michael P. Harper, Det. Michael J. Fallon, Det. Robert K. Jorgensen, Det. Dylan J. Madej, Det. Ryan McNamara, Det. Michael Ratti, and P.O. Richard A. Rospierski, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence, including body-worn camera recordings, interviews, warrants, and court records, shows the alleged unprofessional conduct did not occur and that officers' actions were consistent with Manual Rules 5.08 and 5.09. OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Search against Det. John Kosko, concluding that while the search occurred, it was conducted in accordance with ORC 2933.23, GPO 2.2.04, and Manual Rule 4.17. OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Arrest against Det. John Kosko, concluding the arrests were lawful and consistent with GPO 2.02.03 and ORC 2935.08. OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation D: Property Missing against Det. John Kosko, concluding that property handling complied with ORC 2933.26 and ORC 2933.41 and that seized property remains under court custody. OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Allegation E: Harassment against Det. John Kosko, concluding the evidence does not support a finding of harassment and that officer conduct was consistent with GPO 1.07.07. The evidence supports that the search, arrests, advisements, and property procedures were lawful and that officer conduct aligned with Division policy. This will conclude OPS Investigation OPS #20250001.

Investigator Addendum (March 4, 2026): This case was completed on 7/1/2025. Since its completion, Det. Dylan Madej, #2078 departed the Cleveland Division of Police on 7/22/2025 and Det. Michael Fallon, #2529 departed on 8/5/2025. The allegations of Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct have been administratively dismissed against both detectives per 703(a) – Non-CDP Employee section of the OPS Manual.

Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after the case presentation.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Michael Harper, #9230 Det. Robert Jorgensen, #2312 Sgt. John Kosko, #9354 Det. Ryan McNamara, #949 Det. Michael Ratti, #1698 Det. Richard Rospierski, #2006	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Det. Michael Fallon, #2529

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct



**OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 08/05/2025**

**CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 08/05/2025**

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 08/05/2025. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

Det. Dylan Madej, #2078

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

**OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 07/22/2025**

**CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 07/22/2025**

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 07/22/2025. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Search

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. John Kosko, #9354	<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 4.17, ORC 2933.23, and General Police Order 2.02.04,</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Arrest

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. John Kosko, #9354	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in ORC 2935.08 and General Police Order 2.02.03</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation D: Property: Missing

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. John Kosko, #9354	<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: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried



alignment with the standards outlined in ORC 2933.26 and ORC 2933.41.

Allegation E: Harassment

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. John Kosko, #9354	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0023

Timestamp: 2:47:07 – 2:51:37

Complainant: Destiny Montanez

Presented by: Smith-Moore

P.O. Elijah Cintron, #1115

P.O. Valentino Vajusi, #532

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On October 18, 2024, Destiny Montanez and her nephew were legally crossing the street when they were struck by a vehicle making a left turn. Ms. Montanez alleges that P.O. Elijah Cintron #1115 and P.O. Valentino Vajusi #532 did not speak with her on scene, did not follow up at the hospital, and should have arrested the driver. The officers arrived on scene prior to a 911 call, requested EMS when Ms. Montanez reported pain, interviewed the driver and pedestrians, and coordinated the on-scene investigation.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera recordings, RTCC video, officer reports, traffic crash documentation, EMS notifications, and witness statements. The available video clearly depicts the collision and the officers' on-scene actions. Officers secured the scene, requested medical assistance, collected statements from all parties, provided report numbers, and cited the driver for misdemeanor offenses. EMS reported no visible serious injuries at the scene, and the driver identified herself and signed citations, negating the need for a warrantless arrest or hospital follow-up by officers.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service against P.O. Elijah Cintron #1115 and P.O. Valentino Vajusi #532, concluding that the officers acted within Manual of Rules 4.01 and 4.18. The evidence supports that the officers provided required life safety assistance, completed the on-scene investigation, documented injuries and statements, and issued appropriate citations in accordance with Division policy.



Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after the case presentation.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Elijah Cintron, #1115 P.O. Valentino Vajusi, #532	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Miller- arrived during case presentation

OPS2025-0073

Timestamp: 2:51:45 – 3:02:44

Complainant: TaJuana Harris

Presented by: Lampkin

P.O. Jonathan Barker, #985

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On April 8, 2025, Ms. TaJuana Harris reported her daughter missing. On April 9, 2025, P.O. Jonathan Barker responded to Castle High School for a returned missing juvenile. Ms. Harris alleges that P.O. Barker failed to follow required missing person procedures, did not take statements from the juvenile or school staff, did not notify the parent, did not return the juvenile to her home, and did not complete the required supplemental report or NCIC entry to clear the missing person record.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera recordings, CAD and RMS entries, the applicable General Police Order and Divisional Notice on missing juveniles, and statements from school staff and the reporting party. The recordings show P.O. Barker located the juvenile in a school office and visually confirmed her identity, but did not obtain a statement from the juvenile, did not notify the parent while on scene or afterward, did not return the juvenile to her home, and did not complete the supplemental RMS report or NCIC clearance as required by policy. The divisional notice requires prompt notification of the reporting person and documentation of attempts to contact them; the GPO requires personal identification of the juvenile upon return and completion of a supplement report.



OPS recommends a finding of SUSTAINED for the Lack of Service allegation against P.O. Jonathan Barker #985, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence supports a finding that the officer failed to follow Divisional Notice 22-321 and GPO 6.2.17 and Manual Rule 4.03 by not obtaining statements, not completing the required supplemental RMS and NCIC entries, and not making reasonable efforts to notify the reporting person. The evidence supports that the omissions constituted a departure from Division policy and procedure. This will conclude OPS Investigation OPS #2025-0073.

Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after the case presentation.

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Jonathan Barker, #985	<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 Rule 4.03 and General Police Order 6.02.17.</i> <i>Explanation: Officer Barker failed to take a statement from the missing girl, did not contact her mother or return the girl to her home, and omitted a supplemental report and NCIC entry to update her missing status.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Sharp- Stepped out the room during case presentation Group Level: Group Level I- Unsatisfactory Performance Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Sharp- Same reason

OPS2025-0105

Timestamp: 3:02:44 – 3:13:39

Complainant: Cal Kannenberg

Presented by: Lampkin

P.O. Trevor Smith, #1615

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Biased Policing

Summary of Case Presentation: On March 20, 2025, Mr. Kannenberg came to the 4th District station to file an OH1 crash report. He provided detailed information about the collision and the at fault driver to P.O. Trevor Smith. Mr. Kannenberg later discovered inaccuracies in the initial



crash report and spent approximately four months seeking corrections. He was informed on May 21, 2025, that the report had been updated and merged. Mr. Kannenberg alleged that P.O. Smith's initial inaccuracies reflected a lack of service and that the officer was biased because the at fault driver was African American.

OPS reviewed lobby WCS footage, the initial and amended OH-1 reports, duty records, officer interviews, and related documentation. The footage shows P.O. Smith taking the report in the lobby, reviewing information on the complainant's phone, and later being directed to correct the report. The investigation found that the initial report contained incomplete or inaccurate fields and that corrections were made following supervisory review. P.O. Smith explained he was new to lobby duty at the time and was instructed to re-submit the report to address the errors.

OPS recommends a finding of Sustained for the Lack of Service allegation, concluding that P.O. Smith failed to give full attention to the performance of his duties as required by Duty 4.03 and did not promptly ensure the OH-1 was complete and accurate in accordance with GPO 23-322. OPS further recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Biased Policing allegation, as the preponderance of the evidence shows the inaccuracies were attributable to inexperience and procedural error rather than discriminatory intent or selective enforcement under GPO 1.07.08. The evidence supports that the report required correction and that there is no basis to conclude the officer's conduct was motivated by bias.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members focused on two issues: the inaccurate Ohio One report completed by Officer Smith and the four-month delay before the report was corrected. Staff explained Mr. Kannenberg and his wife brought the error to the district, attempted to contact Officer Smith over several months, and ultimately reached Sergeant Cruz, who pulled Officer Smith from field duty to redo the report with the correct information.

Members agreed the sustained finding should address the officer's factual errors on the original report—Officer Smith's inexperience was offered as an explanation for the mistake—but they were reluctant to attribute the lengthy delay to Officer Smith personally since he was back in the field and there was no evidence he ignored messages. The Board noted the timeliness issue might reflect a service or district-level problem rather than individual misconduct.

The sustained recommendation therefore targets the inaccurate report itself, not the subsequent delay in correction. Members also discussed that any separate allegation about delayed service would more appropriately be directed at the district or supervisory processes, and no additional individual allegation was necessary in this case.

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

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



P.O. Trevor Smith, #1615	<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 Rule 4.03 and Divisional Notice 23-322.</i> <i>Explanation: Officer Smith completed an inaccurate and incomplete Ohio-1 traffic crash report. The investigation noted that the errors were due to officer's lack of experience with the lobby detail, and Officer Smith was subsequently required to complete a supplemental report to correct the inaccuracies.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried Group Level: Group Level I- Unsatisfactory Performance & Erroneous Reporting Motion by: Sharp Second by: Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried
--	---	---

Motion: Issue letter of reinstruction regarding reporting procedures for Patrol Officer Trevor Smith, #1615.

Motion By: Sharp

Seconded By: Mountcastle

Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Biased Policing

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Trevor Smith, #1615	<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: Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0158

Timestamp: 3:14:12 – 3:22:07

Complainant: Kenneth Carrington

Presented by: Lampkin

P.O. Joseph Danczak, #1828

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

P.O. Taylor Savarino, # 2152

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

P.O. Jonathan Anchez, #966

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

P.O. Wanda Wright, #2206

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

P.O. Countney Jagoe, #509



Allegation C: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On May 16, 2025, Mr. Kenneth Carrington reported that he was assaulted at his residence and that responding officers treated him as if he were trespassing, failed to properly investigate the assault, and did not obtain the suspect's identification. The responding officers for the May 16 incident were P.O. Joseph Danczak #1826 and P.O. Taylor Savarino #2424. Mr. Carrington later reported a second incident on May 23, 2025, alleging officers came to his residence late at night, ordered him outside, and arrested him improperly; the officers responding to the May 23 incident were identified as P.O. Jonnatan Sanchez #1176 and P.O. Wanda Wright #1856. Mr. Carrington provided additional statements and an advocate supplied supporting remarks and allegations concerning non-CDP individuals and a separate allegation that P.O. Courtney Jagoe failed to complete police reports.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera recordings, incident reports, CAD/RMS entries, complainant and witness interviews, and related documentation to determine whether officers properly investigated the May 16 assault, whether the May 23 arrest complied with legal authority and Division policy, and whether any CDP member failed to provide required service.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Allegation A: Lack of Service against P.O. Joseph Danczak #1826 and P.O. Taylor Savarino #2424, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged failure to investigate did not occur and that the officers' actions were consistent with Division policy. OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation B: Improper Arrest regarding the May 23, 2025 incident, concluding that the officers acted pursuant to a valid Cuyahoga County warrant and followed applicable General Police Orders. Allegations concerning non-CDP employees are administratively dismissed as outside OPS jurisdiction. OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Allegation C: Lack of Service against P.O. Courtney Jagoe #509, concluding that the available reports and documentation do not support a finding that the officer failed to complete required reports. This will conclude OPS Investigation OPS #20240158.

Investigator Addendum (June 5, 2026): Investigator Lampkin issued an addendum incorporated into the official record after a supplemental review of the completed report; the original findings remain unchanged except where noted. The addendum recommends Allegation A (Lack of Service) against P.O. Jonnatan Sanchez #1176 and P.O. Wanda Wright #1856 be unfounded, finding the preponderance of evidence (including WCS and the incident report) shows the alleged conduct did not occur. It also notes P.O. Courtney Jagoe #509 separated from the Cleveland Division of Police on April 23, 2026; under OPS Manual 703 this renders her a non-CDP employee and the allegations against her are administratively dismissed.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members opened by noting multiple badge and batch number discrepancies between the agenda and the investigative report. Staff and members read the differing numbers aloud for several officers, and staff explained the report had been prepared



by a previous investigator while the agenda numbers had been independently verified. The group agreed to rely on the agenda's current badge numbers for motions and asked staff to note any rank or number changes in the record, so identification remains clear.

Members requested that the report be corrected to match the agenda and that any reasons for historical differences (promotions, reassignments, or clerical errors) be documented. The Board emphasized using the current batch numbers to avoid ambiguity when making motions and asked staff to flag and explain any future discrepancies before cases are voted on.

The Board also confirmed receipt of an addendum to the OPS report, which clarified findings and recommended Allegation A (Lack of Service) be unfounded for Officers Sanchez and Wright based on WCS and incident reports, and noted Officer Jagoe had separated from the Division and therefore the allegations against her were administratively dismissed. Members observed the addendum contained material not previously in their packet and asked staff to ensure the corrected badge numbers and the addendum are included in the final case materials.

With those administrative clarifications assigned for follow-up, members had no further substantive questions about the case and directed staff to update the record so the Board can proceed to motions using the accurate identifiers and the addendum as part of the official file.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Joseph Danczak, #1828 P.O. Jonnatan Sanchez, #966 P.O. Taylor Savarino, #2152 P.O. Wanda Wright, #2206	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Joseph Danczak, #1828 P.O. Taylor Savarino, #2152	<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 Abstention: Mountcastle – was not present for motion

P.O. Courtney Jagoe, #509



Allegation B: Improper Procedure

**OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 04/23/2026**

**CPRB Decision: ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 04/23/2026**

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 04/23/2026. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

Chief Departures

Timestamp: 3:22:16 – 3:35:22

Departure Summary: On April 9, 2024, the Civilian Police Review Board sustained Lack of Service allegations against P.O. James Brooks , #1017, P.O. Antonio Muñoz , #440, and Sgt. Dustin Vowell, #9323, issuing Group Level I non-disciplinary letters of reinstruction after finding that on September 23, 2023 each officer failed to report a suspected child endangering incident to the 696 KIDS hotline following a call for a child left unattended in a vehicle in violation of ORC 2151.421. On March 27, 2026, the Chief reviewed the matter and issued dismissal letters for the same officers, concluding that neither Officer Brooks nor Officer Muñoz observed the child unattended upon arrival, that the child was already with the mother and reported by the parents to have been left alone for approximately five minutes (contrasting with witness statements of twenty minutes), and that Sergeant Vowell, who responded and had prior experience in the Sex Crimes and Child Abuse Unit, assessed the child's condition, found the child to be in good health, ensured the child was properly secured in a car seat, and reasonably determined there was insufficient evidence to pursue criminal charges or to require a mandatory report to the hotline.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members questioned long delays in processing and communicating the chief's decision, why the Board heard the case in April 2024, but the chief's decision only reached the Board much later. Staff explained several administrative gaps likely caused the lag: disposition letters weren't processed promptly during a period without a secretary, an investigator transition left email routing inconsistent, and personnel changes may have created a "perfect storm" that delayed notice. Members noted the delay likely put any disciplinary window under the collective bargaining agreement beyond remedy and agreed there was little the Board could now do on this specific case.

Substantively, members were concerned the chief's rationale did not address the Board's core concern about mandatory reporting in child-related cases. The Board had sustained based on a failure to meet mandatory reporting expectations, but the chief's decision tracked the department's original recommendation and did not engage the Board's reasoning. Members



worried this could reflect a broader misunderstanding across the department about mandatory reporting obligations and whether officers are being trained or instructed to comply.

The Board voted to seek formal clarification before escalating the matter: staff were asked to request a policy interpretation from the department (and to consult the academy and policy unit about training) about how the department interprets and applies the mandatory reporting statute in child abuse cases. The Board agreed to pursue the department's response first and, depending on that answer, consider referring the issue to the CPC rather than immediately involving the CPC.

***Additional Information to Note:** According to the collective bargaining agreement there is a 60-day discipline window for pre-disciplinary action. The Board noted the chief's decision, and the delayed notice put the matter well outside that 60day window, so discipline could not practically be pursued in this case.*

Motion: Ask for clarification from the police department regarding how they are interpreting ORC 2151.421, which is the mandatory reporting requirement under state law for suspected child abuse.

Motion By: Cyganovich

Seconded By: Mountcastle

Motion Status: Carried

Meeting Recess:

Chair Brown called for a 25-minute meeting recess starting at 12:55 pm EST.

Meeting Resumed Promptly at 1:20 pm EST.

VI. Executive Session

CPRB

YouTube Timestamp:

- **Motion:** To enter executive session for personnel, Employment and discipline Matters will be considered. Inviting in ADL Dayla Oprian, Law Department Guest (2 individuals), OPS Interim Hess, General Manager Watson, Labor Relations Manager Mark Shinon, Director of Human Resources Matt Cole, and CPRB Administrative Assistant.

Roll Call Vote: All Present Board Members said "Yes".

Board Members: Brown, Mountcastle, Cyganovich, Gatian, Miller, Parker III, Sharp, and Willis.

Motion: Chair Brown



Seconded By: Parker III

Motion Status: Carried

- Executive Session began at 1:20 p.m. EST
- Adjourn back into open session at 3:30 p.m. EST

VII. OPS Status Report

YouTube Timestamp: 5:48:37 – 5:49:30

Michael Hess

Interim Administrator

A. OPS Cases & Administrative Update

In May, OPS received a total of 13 new complaints. One OPS case was administratively dismissed, resulting in a net total of -4 cases for the month.

VIII. Old Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 5:49:30 – 5:49:42

A. OPS Staff Matters

- Board updated the public that a new OPS administrator has been hired; the name was withheld until acceptance and a start date confirmed. The administrator is expected to begin this month and will be on board by the Board's July meeting; no other old business was raised.

IX. New Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 5:49:42 – 5:50:24

A. NACOLE 2026

- For the confirmed Board Members who are going please feel out travel form. There is a total of 5 board members who plan to attend NACOLE 2026: Chair Brown, Miller, Parker III, Sharp, and Willis. Board Members who were not present for today's meeting will be contacted via email and will receive copy of the NACOLE Travel Form.

X. Public Comment

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 5:52:24 – 5:52:26

1. No individuals were present for Public Comment

XI. Adjournment

CPRB

YouTube Timestamp: 5:52:26 – 5:52:28

Motion: To Adjourn June 9th, 2026 CPRB Meeting

Motion By: Willis

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried



- The CPRB June 9th, 2026 meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm EST.
- The following CPRB Meeting will be held in-person at City Hall, Room 514 on July 14, 2026 at 9:15 a.m. EST.