



CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

July 14th, 2026

MEETING MINUTES

CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS

Brandon Brown, Chair
Kenneth Mountcastle, Vice Chair
Diana Cyganovich
David Gatian
Chenoa Miller
Edwin Moore
Billy Sharp
Waverly Willis

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

Jeff Wenninger, OPS Administrator
Jessyca Watson, General Manager
Art Bowker, Senior Investigator
Allison Davis, Investigator
Adam Eisen, Investigator
LJ Green, Investigator
Hamza Khabir, Investigator
Tammi Lampkin, Investigator
Mary Smith-Moore, Investigative Assistant

LEGAL COUNSEL

Dalya Oprian, Asst. Director of Law

MEETING AGENDA

I. Call to Order

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 0:021:21 – 0:023:34

- **Chair Brown called July 14th, 2026, hearing to order at 9:16 am EST.**
- **Roll Call**
 - Board Members Parker III had an excused absence.
 - Member Edwin Moore arrived to meeting after roll call @ 9:20 am EST.
 - Member Chenoa Miller arrived to meeting after roll call @ 9:24 am EST.
 - A quorum was present.
- **Chair Brown Announcements & Agenda Changes**
 - a. Agenda Changes: The chair and vicechair nominations listed under new business will not take place at this meeting. Instead, they will be moved to the August meeting. The Board had previously believed nominations had to take place at one meeting before elections, but they now understand that nominations and selections may occur on the same day, making an August vote appropriate.



Chair Brown added that there are additional procedural details to work out and that members should have time to consider the roles before nominating anyone.

- b. Announcements: Chair Brown reminded members that after completing their case reviews, they must sign the SharePoint acknowledgement, so OPS and the Board have an accurate record of who reviewed each case before the meeting. Without those signatures, there is no formal verification of case review completion. The chair emphasized the importance of keeping that record up to date and asked members to ensure they sign it for each cycle.

II. Approval of Minutes

CPRB

YouTube Timestamp: 0:023:34 – 0:25:03

- **June 5th Meeting Minutes – Special Virtual**

Motion: Approve June 5th, 2026, CPRB Meeting Minutes

Motion By: Sharp

Second By: Cyganovich

Motion Status: Carried

- **June 9th Meeting Minutes – In- person| City Hall**

Motion: Approve June 9th, 2026, CPRB Meeting Minutes

Motion By: Sharp

Second By: Willis

Abstention: Gatian- was not present for June 9th CPRB meeting

Motion Status: Carried

III. Public Comment

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 0:25:03 – 0:26:05

- No individuals were present for public comment
- Officer Commendations
 - No Additional discussion was had by the board. To be addressed later.

IV. CPRB Training

Jeff Wenninger

YouTube Timestamp: 0:026:05 – 1:46:06

OPS Administrator

Introduction of OPS Administrator Jeff Wenninger

Brandon Brown, Chair

Summary: Jeff Wenninger was introduced as the new OPS Administrator, bringing over 30 years of law enforcement experience, primarily with the LAPD, where he led use of force



investigations and commanded investigative units like OPS. He has overseen more than 700 cases, earned multiple commendations, and written on police reform. His background includes sociology, psychology, and criminal justice, and he has recently worked as a consultant focused on data-driven accountability and community trust. The Board welcomed him, expressing confidence in his leadership and vision.

A Shared Philosophy of Accountability Presentation

By: OPS Administrator, Jeff Wenninger

Key Topics	Summary	Questions & Answers
Shared Philosophy of Accountability (Community, OPS, CPRB)	Admin Wenninger outlined a shared accountability framework involving the community, OPS, and CPRB. The community contributes voice and perspective; OPS provides objective, thorough investigations; and CPRB ensures independent oversight. Accountability requires balancing consistency, fairness, and clear expectations. Consistency means all employees are held to the same standards regardless of rank. Fairness requires acknowledging unique circumstances in each case. Clear expectations build trust and legitimacy for both the public and officers.	None
Consistency, Fairness, and Expectations	Admin Wenninger emphasized that misconduct must be evaluated consistently across all ranks, but fairness requires understanding the specific circumstances that led to the behavior. Expectations must be clearly communicated to citizens, officers, and leadership. When expectations are clear and decisions are applied consistently, trust and legitimacy grow. OPS aims to ensure investigations are principled, not arbitrary, and that outcomes reflect both standards and context.	None



Current OPS Workflow vs. Proposed Workflow	Admin Wenninger described the current OPS workflow (Intake → GM → Senior Investigator → Investigator → Senior Review → Administrator) and proposed a new multitiered system with three senior investigators overseeing distinct phases: initial review, preliminary investigation, primary investigation, adjudication, and final administrative approval. Proposed Workflow: Intake → GM → Senior Review → Preliminary Investigator → Primary Investigator → Adjudicator → Administrator. This structure increases efficiency, adds multiple supervisory checkpoints, separates fact-finding from adjudication, and improves report quality. It also allows investigators to rotate roles, strengthening skill development and reducing bottlenecks.	Q: How will the adjudicator role work, and will OPS begin recommending penalties? A: Wenninger clarified OPS will <i>not</i> recommend penalties. OPS will only determine whether misconduct occurred and provide clear rationale. Penalty decisions remain solely with CPRB. Q: Will investigators rotate through roles? A: Yes. Rotation builds mastery, improves efficiency, and ensures multiple supervisory reviews. Q: Will OPS provide disciplinary history during findings? A: OPS will not provide history during misconduct determination but may provide relevant history <i>after</i> CPRB sustains an allegation, for penalty consideration.
Framing Allegations Clearly and Specifically	Admin Wenninger proposed framing allegations in the complainant’s own words to avoid ambiguity and ensure clarity. Instead of broad categories like “Unprofessional Conduct,” OPS would list each specific allegation (e.g., “Officer told complainant ‘Talk to the hand’”). This helps investigators stay focused, ensures complainants feel heard, and prevents officers from being unfairly associated with allegations that were not sustained. Multiple statements can still fall under one allegation if appropriate.	Q: Will CPRB need to sustain each statement separately? A: No. Multiple statements can fall under one allegation; adjudication can group them. Q: Could this create too many allegations? A: Not necessarily. OPS will frame allegations logically; adjudication can consolidate. Q: Does this change penalty assignment? A: No. Penalties remain based on the overall misconduct, not each individual statement.
Accountability Beyond Discipline & Penalty Assessment	Admin Wenninger stressed that accountability includes training, coaching, corrective action, and recognition—not just discipline.	Q: Should OPS ask officers why misconduct occurred? A: Yes. Context is essential for CPRB’s penalty phase.



	Penalty assessment should consider motive, intent, scope, and intangible damage such as diminished public trust. Mifeasance (mistake of the mind) differs from malfeasance (intentional wrongdoing). OPS will provide context to help CPRB determine appropriate penalties, but OPS will not recommend specific group levels.	Q: Should CPRB consider prior violations? A: Only during penalty determination, not during misconduct determination. Q: How should CPRB access disciplinary history? A: After sustaining an allegation, CPRB may request relevant history for penalty evaluation.
Alternative Complaint Resolution (ACR)	Admin Wenninger introduced ACR as a mediation-based process for resolving complaints rooted in misunderstanding. A neutral mediator facilitates a conversation between the officer and complainant. Benefits include reconciliation, understanding, learning, satisfaction, and empowerment. ACR humanizes both parties and strengthens community trust. Statements made during mediation are confidential and cannot be used in disciplinary hearings. Wenninger plans to meet with stakeholders (union, chief, safety director, accountability partners) to collaboratively design the program, likely beginning with a pilot district.	Q: Are mediation statements admissible later? A: No. Mediation is confidential. Q: How will you get buy-in from unions, leadership, and stakeholders? A: Wenninger is meeting individually with all stakeholders to gather input and ensure collaborative design. Q: Has ACR reduced complaints elsewhere? A: Yes—empirical evidence shows improved relationships and reduced misunderstandings. Q: Should OPS send minor administrative violations (e.g., failure to rename WCS files) back to CDP instead of CPRB? A: Possibly. Wenninger suggests exploring a cooperative process where CDP handles minor administrative issues within 45 days and reports back.
Priorities for OPS Moving Forward	Admin Wenninger identified efficiency, quality, employee development, and training as top priorities. He aims to ensure investigations are thorough, contextual, and complete before reaching CPRB. He noted that many cases currently require additional investigation and	Q: What are your top priorities after 15 days in the role? A: Efficiency, quality, training, and developing investigators to think deeply and exhaust all investigative avenues. Q: How will OPS reduce delays in obtaining evidence?



	emphasized the need to avoid “stopping short.” He also highlighted the importance of building strong relationships with CDP to improve evidence access and reduce delays.	A: By limiting points of contact and building stronger relationships with CDP to streamline evidence retrieval.
--	---	--

Meeting Recess:
Chair Brown called for a 10-minute meeting recess.

Note: Member Sharp left during the meeting recess.

V. Presentation of Investigations with Citizen Or CDP Subject Employee Present **Art Bowker**
OPS Senior Investigator

- There were no individuals present for their case presentation.

VI. Presentation of Investigations **Art Bowker**
OPS Senior Investigator

Note: *Investigator Bowker elected to present the cases by investigator rather than in the order listed on the agenda. As a result, the case presentation did not strictly follow the agenda sequence.*

OPS2023-0118 **Timestamp: 1:46:06 – 1:57:46**

Complainant: Fernando Gonzalez **Presented by: Eisen**

P.O. Ericka Davis, #758
Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Det. Jearod Woods, #2170
Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service
Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Det. Anthony Lee, #255
Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Last Heard: 9/24/2025



Tabled: CPRB previously tabled to allow further investigation into whether repeated noise-related complaints and officers' prior knowledge of the location may have influenced their actions and are necessary for a fair evaluation of the case.

Summary of Case Presentation: On March 27, 2023, Mr. Fernando Gonzalez reported that responding officers from the First District failed to properly enforce noise and related complaints, alleging discretionary nonenforcement of noise ordinance violations and that officers misrepresented conditions upon arrival; the complaint identified P.O. Jearod Woods #2170, P.O. Anthony Lee #255, and P.O. Ericka Davis #758 as involved in separate responses on March 27, 2023, and May 5–6, 2023. The complainant also raised broader, unspecified concerns about “First District” officers refusing to enforce noise complaints and referenced an unrelated parking/parking violator concern. On March 27, 2023, P.O. Jearod Woods #2170 and P.O. Anthony Lee #255 responded to a noise complaint reported by Mr. Fernando Gonzalez.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera recordings (WCS), CDP incident reports, Axon evidence searches, CAD/RMS entries, the complainant interview, and related documentation to determine whether officers properly investigated and whether enforcement discretion complied with law and Division policy. The WCS shows officers located Mr. Matthew Morgan in a vehicle with music playing, engaged with the parties, and ultimately issued a verbal warning rather than a citation; OPS also reviewed incident reports documenting that Mr. Morgan was “advised to quiet the music.”

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service against P.O. Jearod Woods #2170, P.O. Anthony Lee #255, and P.O. Ericka Davis #758, concluding the preponderance of the evidence shows the officers acted within their lawful discretion and Division policy when they investigated, engaged the involved parties, and issued warnings rather than citations. OPS further recommends the finding of Unfounded for Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct against P.O. Jearod Woods #2170, concluding the evidence does not support the complainant's assertions of discourtesy or false reporting. Allegations against unidentified “First District” officers are Administratively Dismissed under OPS Manual 703b for lack of specific identification.

Investigator Addendum (June 11, 2026): *The addendum provides supplemental analysis of calls for service and patterns of response, noting there were 88 total calls for service with 56 noise complaints between July 2021 and June 2025, that 41 calls (73%) were quiet on arrival, and that Mr. Morgan was advised to turn down his music on five occasions and complied each time; the addendum found no pattern of repeated, short-interval enforcement by the same officer that would indicate improper discretionary targeting. The addendum states, “There were 88 total calls for service. Of those, 56 calls were received between July 2021 and June 2025, which were for noise complaints.”*

Board Discussion Summary: The Board discussed the complainant's long-standing concerns regarding repeated noise complaints and the desire for officers to issue a citation. Members noted that the complainant had contacted police numerous times over several years, but the responding



officers varied from call to call. The Board acknowledged the complainant's frustration but emphasized that their responsibility is to adjudicate only the conduct of the officers involved in the specific incident under review.

Board members agreed that the officers did respond appropriately to the complainant's call by arriving on scene and instructing the individual to lower the music. They discussed the limits of their authority regarding officer discretion, noting that discretion becomes a concern only when it appears to be abused. In this case, the Board did not find evidence of abuse of discretion, nor did they find grounds to hold the responding officers responsible for the broader pattern of complaints over several years.

The Board also reflected on the high number of calls made by the complainant, acknowledging the citizen's frustration while reiterating that their adjudication must remain focused on the facts of the specific case. Members agreed that the officers' actions during the incident did not rise to the level of misconduct and that the Board could not impose discipline based on the complainant's broader dissatisfaction with the ongoing situation.

Finally, the Board discussed potential non-disciplinary avenues to support the complainant. They agreed that referring the complainant to the district commander may help ensure the ongoing issue is formally documented and reviewed at the supervisory level. This referral was considered a constructive step to provide the complainant with an additional path for recourse outside of the Board's adjudicatory role.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Ericka Davis, #758 Det. Anthony Lee, #255 Det. Jearod Woods, #2170	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rules 4.01, 4.18, ORC §4510.12, Cleveland Codified Ordinance, General Police Order 4.04.07.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Cyganovich -was not present at previous case presentation on 9/24/2025.

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

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



Det. Jearod Woods, #2170	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Cyganovich -was not present at previous case presentation on 9/24/2025.
---------------------------------	--	--

Motion: The Office of Professional Standards will refer the complainant to the First District Commander so the ongoing pattern of noise-related calls can be formally documented and reviewed at the supervisory level, providing the complainant with an additional avenue for recourse outside of the Board's adjudication process.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Second By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

Abstention: Cyganovich – was not present for 9/24/2025 CPRB Meeting

OPS2023-0284

Timestamp: 01:58:11 – 2:02:37

Complainant: Tanea Brown

Presented by: Eisen

Det. Michael Dunn, #269

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On October 4, 2023, Ms. Tanea Brown reported that Detective Michael Dunn, #269, failed to provide adequate investigative follow-up on her felonious assault case (2023329450), stating she had not heard from Detective Dunn since early November 2023 and alleging a lack of service. The intake notes that Ms. Brown visited the Third District on December 4, 2023, to file the complaint and that the underlying incident involved a shooting of Ms. Brown's father by her boyfriend, Danny Isom. On October 4, 2023, Detective Dunn was assigned to the matter, and the case was later forwarded to the Prosecutor's Office.

OPS reviewed Detective Dunn's WCS interview, CDP reports and supplements, the Detective Unit Manual and applicable General Police Orders, voicemail recordings and case documentation, and other related evidence to determine whether Detective Dunn failed to perform required investigative duties. The investigator examined Detective Dunn's recorded statements and supporting documentation showing investigative activity and referral to the Prosecutor's Office on December 7, 2023. The report documents that Detective Dunn provided dates and evidence demonstrating efforts on the case and that he notified the Prosecutor's Office on November 16, 2023.



OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service against Detective Michael Dunn, #269, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged failure to investigate occurred, but Detective Dunn's actions were consistent with law, Division policy, training, and the Detective Unit Manual.

Investigator Addendum (June 26, 2026): *The addendum clarifies and supplements the original report for accuracy and completeness while leaving the original findings unchanged unless noted; it affirms the Unfounded recommendation for Allegation A and incorporates the relevant Detective Unit Manual rules (including rules 1, 2, 4, 7, and 9) as part of the rationale.*

Board Discussion Summary: Chair Brown made note that the agenda and OPS Investigative Report. Investigator Eisen acknowledged this and stated the Board should follow the recommendation of the original OPS investigative Report.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Michael Dunn, #269	<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: Miller Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0026

Timestamp: 2:02:45 – 2:17:54

Complainant: Jefferson Battle

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Ryan McCarthy, #1009

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Stop

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Citation

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Search

Allegation D: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation E: Improper Procedure: Failure to Return Driver's License

Summary of Case Presentation: On February 10, 2024, Mr. Jefferson Battle reported that P.O. Ryan McCarthy #1009 conducted an improper traffic stop, issued an altered citation, searched his vehicle without legal justification, behaved discourteously during the encounter, and failed to return his driver's license after the stop. The complaint described a traffic stop for a stop sign violation and alleged illegal front window tint and stated that Mr. Battle disclosed a firearm in the vehicle and was detained for officer safety before ultimately being cited and released.



OPS reviewed body-worn camera recordings (WCS) from P.O. Ryan McCarthy #1009 and assisting officers, CDP incident reports and stop forms, the Uniform Traffic Ticket (UTT), LEADS/CCH/LERMS checks, the complainant interview, and related documentation to determine whether the stop, citation edits, vehicle search, officer conduct, and return of the driver's license complied with law and Division policy. The WCS shows the firearm in plain view on the rear passenger floorboard, the officer securing and clearing the weapon, consultation with a sergeant, checks of criminal history and records, prefilling and later editing the citation, and the officer explaining the basis for detention and the citation to Mr. Battle. The file includes the issued citation (UTT #160112) and incident report 2024037871.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Improper Stop; Exonerated for Allegation B: Improper Citation; Exonerated for Allegation C: Improper Search; Exonerated for Allegation D: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct; and Insufficient Evidence for Allegation E: Improper Procedure — Failure to Return Driver's License, all against P.O. Ryan McCarthy #1009. The preponderance of the evidence shows the stop was supported by articulable facts for a stop sign violation and suspected illegal tint, the citation edits reflected the officer's contemporaneous decision-making and were not intended to mislead, and the limited seizure and securing of the firearm were lawful under the plain-view and officer-safety doctrines after the weapon was observed. WCS demonstrates that P.O. McCarthy communicated the reasons for detention, consulted a supervisor, conducted records checks, and took steps to secure the scene and the firearm, which supports the Exonerated findings and shows he attempted to de-escalate and keep the complainant informed. Regarding the driver's license, WCS does not show the license being returned and the officer believes he returned it consistent with his practice; because the evidence is inconclusive and a small item could have been handed back outside camera view, OPS finds Insufficient Evidence for the failure-to-return allegation.

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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Stop

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Ryan McCarthy, #1009	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in General Police Orders 2.02.01, 2.02.05, and Cleveland Codified Ordinance 437.28, 431.19.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Citation

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated



Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Ryan McCarthy, #1009	<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 4.03.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Search

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Ryan McCarthy, #1009	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in General Police Orders 2.02.02, and ORC §2931.16 (B), (C), (E-1).</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation D: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Ryan McCarthy, #1009	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.01, 5.09, and General Police Orders 1.02.01, 1.03.01.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Miller-stepped out during motion

Allegation E: Improper Procedure: Failure to Return's Driver License

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Ryan McCarthy, #1009	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Note (After Motions): The Board's discussion centered on the recurring issue of WCS footage becoming unavailable due to retention-policy expiration. Member Gatian expressed concern that investigators had previously viewed and transcribed WCS footage without downloading it, resulting in the loss of critical evidence once the retention window closed. The Board noted that this gap directly affected their ability to determine whether the officer returned the complainant's license, leaving them with insufficient evidence.



Members sought clarification on OPS's current procedures for downloading and preserving WCS footage. OPS staff explained that beginning this year, investigators are required to link WCS footage in IARO immediately upon access and download it to SharePoint to ensure long-term preservation. The Board acknowledged that the case under review predated the updated procedure and that the loss of footage resulted from prior practices no longer in use. Board members discussed whether the updated process fully resolves the issue and whether additional safeguards may be needed to prevent future losses. They noted that while the new procedure should prevent similar problems, the Board may continue to encounter older cases where footage is no longer available. The Board accepted OPS's explanation and recognized that the current case must be adjudicated based on the remaining limited evidence.

OPS2024-0180

Timestamp: 02:17:59 – 2:23:41

Complainant: Mary Robinson

Presented by: Wynne

Det. Ethan Burrell, #1398

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On July 30, 2024, Ms. Mary Robinson reported that members of the Cleveland Division of Police failed to provide adequate service in response to ongoing harassment complaints dating back to 2020 and specifically alleged that P.O. Ethan Burrell #1398 did not properly address a harassment report when he responded to her residence. Ms. Robinson told OPS she had experienced repeated incidents and sought documentation and follow-up; she visited the Fourth District on July 30, 2024, to report the most recent occurrence and later filed a complaint alleging lack of service by responding to officers.

OPS reviewed P.O. Burrell's body-worn camera recording of the July 30, 2024, response, the CDP incident report (202400220531), the CIT referral, Axon Evidence WCS search results, and OPS contact attempts and correspondence with the complainant to determine whether the officer investigated and documented the reported incident. The WCS shows P.O. Burrell reviewed the video Ms. Robinson provided, advised that it appeared to show a delivery driver dropping off food, and provided her with an incident number. The file also documents that a CIT referral was completed for follow-up and that OPS made multiple documented attempts to contact Ms. Robinson for a recorded statement.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service against P.O. Ethan Burrell #1398, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged failure to investigate did not occur because the officer reviewed the available video, provided an incident report number, documented the response in an incident report, and referred the matter to the Crisis Intervention Team for follow-up. OPS further recommends that



Allegation B: Lack of Service be Administratively Dismissed because the complainant raised concerns dating back to 2020 without providing specific officer names, badge numbers, dates, or locations, rendering those allegations unidentifiable and not investigable under OPS Manual Section 703(b).

Case Note: Officer Rank updated from Patrol Officer Ethan Burrell, #1398 to Detective Ethan Burrell, #1398.

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
Det. Ethan Burrell, #1398	<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.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Gatian-stepped out during motion

Unknown CDP Personnel

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

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

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

Administratively dismissed due to the inability to identify a CDP Employee given the information/ Evidence. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

OPS2023-0233

Timestamp: 2:23:42– 2:28:54

Complainant: Michael Smith

Presented by: Green

Det. Dymphna Oneill, #1503

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Det. Dan Zola, #2565

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service



Summary of Case Presentation: On September 21, 2023, Mr. Michael Smith reported that Detective Dan Zola #2565 refused to enforce a warrant against the mother of his child on September 20, 2023, despite having knowledge of her location. The complaint identified Det. Dan Zola #2565 and Det. Dymphna O'Neill #1503 as the subject officers and raised concerns that a known person had failed to appear for a court date and that the detective declined to execute the related capias.

OPS reviewed the WCS recording of Detective Dan Zola dated September 20, 2023, CDP incident reports (including Report 2023-90060), applicable General Police Orders and the Detective Unit Manual, and related documentation to determine whether detectives properly investigated and whether any required enforcement action was withheld. The investigation shows Det. Zola and Det. O'Neill located the mother with assistance from Middleburg Heights officers, spoke with her and her family, notified Children and Family Services, and coordinated follow-up.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service against Det. Dan Zola #2565 and Det. Dymphna O'Neill #1503, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged conduct occurred, but the officers' actions were consistent with law, Cleveland Division of Police General Police Orders, training, and procedures.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board's discussion of this case was brief. A member asked whether the detective had failed to take any required investigative steps based on the circumstances presented. OPS confirmed that, based on the facts available, the detective followed all applicable procedures and did not omit any required actions.

Board members acknowledged that the interpersonal history between the complainant and the involved party complicated the situation, including the fact that paternity had not yet been legally established and the involved individual was considered a victim at the time of the incident. The Board accepted OPS's explanation that the detective acted in accordance with CDP's General Police Orders and investigative manuals.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Dan Zola, #2565	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in General Police Orders 2.02.03, 4.03.01, and page 5 of the Detective Manual.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Det. Dymphna Oneill, #1503



Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Action: **ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 11/02/2023

CPRB Recommendation: **ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 11/02/2023

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 11/02/2023. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

OPS2024-0194

Timestamp: 2:28:57 – 239:52

Complainant: Elizabeth Vargas

Presented by: Green

P.O. Matthew Payne, #1397

P.O. Stephen Pratt, #2556

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On August 3, 2024, Ms. Elizabeth Vargas reported that Patrol Officers Stephen Pratt, badge 2556, and Matthew Payne, badge 1397, failed to provide adequate service after she called 911 to check on the wellbeing of her neighbor's baby and dogs. Ms. Vargas alleged the officers knocked on the wrong door of a duplex, did not contact the neighbor who was the subject of the call, and left the scene after a single unsuccessful callback rather than continuing the investigation.

OPS reviewed the officers' body-worn camera recordings (WCS) for Patrol Officer Matthew Payne and Patrol Officer Stephen Pratt, the dispatch chronology and event remarks (CAD/RMS), the complainant interviews, officer interviews, and related incident documentation to determine whether the officers investigated the reported unknown trouble call consistent with Division policy. The WCS shows Officer Pratt knocked on the wrong door and the Spanish-speaking male who answered indicated the baby was next door; dispatch attempted a callback that went to voicemail and the officers closed the event with an event remark noting the call back went to voicemail. The report states that the officers "only attempted one contact, at the wrong unit for Ms. Vargas, then proceeded to leave the scene," and documents the event remark: 2160 goa, no odor of marijuana, Spanish -speaking male stated no children at address, radio attempted call for further went to voicemail.

OPS recommends a finding of Sustained for Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service against Patrol Officer Stephen Pratt #2556 and Sustained for Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service against Patrol Officer Matthew Payne #1397, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the officers failed to fully investigate the unknown trouble call. The investigation found the officers did not follow up after being advised where the child was located, knocked on the incorrect unit, relied on a single contact attempt that went to voicemail, and left without using available information to continue the inquiry; these omissions are inconsistent with CDP Manual Rule 4.18 requiring officers to investigate reports that come to their attention.



Board Discussion Summary: The Board’s deliberation focused on whether the responding officers adequately investigated a report involving potential child endangerment. Members questioned whether the officers had arrived at the correct address and whether they made sufficient efforts to locate and check on the child. The Board noted that the residence was a duplex and that the officers appeared unable to determine which door corresponded to the reported unit. Members expressed concern that the officers made only minimal attempts to establish contact, particularly given the sensitive nature of the allegation.

Board members also discussed inconsistencies between the officers’ statements and the dispatch records. The officers maintained that dispatch had not relayed any information suggesting a child might be in danger, yet the dispatch log clearly reflected that such information had been communicated. The Board noted that the investigation materials did not include any reconciliation of this discrepancy, and members found the officers’ explanation unpersuasive.

The Board further observed that the officers did not utilize available tools, such as a language translator, to overcome communication barriers with the individual they encountered. Members also noted that the officers failed to knock on a second door, despite being directed toward it by the person they spoke with. The Board expressed concern that the officers’ actions, as shown in the WCS footage, reflected a lack of initiative and did not align with expectations for investigating a potentially serious allegation involving a child.

Overall, the Board concluded that the officers’ limited efforts, combined with the inconsistencies between their statements and dispatch records, raised significant concerns about the adequacy of their response. Members agreed that the officers should have taken additional steps to verify the child’s safety and fully investigate the complaint.

Additional Information to Note:

- *OPS clarified that marijuana possession was legal at the time of the incident, and therefore not a criminal element of the complaint.*
- *OPS noted that the officers were expected under CDP policy to investigate all complaints of potential criminal activity, including verifying signs of life when a child may be involved.*
- *OPS indicated that a language barrier contributed to the officers’ difficulty making contact, but this did not negate their responsibility to use available resources such as translation services.*

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: **Sustained**

CPRB Decision: **Sustained**

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



P.O. Matthew Payne, #1397	<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 4.18.</i> <u>Explanation:</u> <i>Officer Payne failed to conduct an adequate investigation after responding to a duplex residence where only the building number was provided. Although the individual at the first door indicated that the issue may have been occurring at the neighboring unit, the officer did not attempt to knock on the second door or make any further effort to verify the welfare of the child or animal referenced in the complaint. The Board found that the officer left the scene without performing the necessary follow-up steps required to investigate a potential child-in-danger situation, an animal-in-danger concern, or a noise complaint. This lack of action constituted insufficient service under Manual Rule 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Group Level: Group Level II – Failure to properly investigate Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried
---	--	---

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: **Sustained**

CPRB Decision: **Sustained**

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 occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.18.</i> <u>Explanation:</u> <i>Officer Pratt, like his partner, failed to conduct an adequate investigation after responding to a duplex residence where only the building number was provided. Although the individual at the first door indicated that the issue may have been occurring at the neighboring unit, PO Pratt did not attempt to knock on the second door or make any further effort to verify the welfare of the child or animal referenced in the complaint. The Board found that he left the scene without performing the necessary follow-up steps required to investigate a potential child-in-danger situation, an animal-in-danger concern, or a noise complaint. This lack of action constituted insufficient service under Manual Rule 4.18</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried Group Level: Group Level II – Failure to properly investigate Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried



Note: Board Member Miller left the meeting @ 11:35 a.m.

OPS2024-0206

Timestamp: 02:39:55 – 2:43:58

Complainant: John Traver

Presented by: Green

P.O. Sean Mandzak, #1235

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

Summary of Case Presentation: On August 3, 2024, Mr. John Tarver reported that Patrol Officer Sean T. Mandzak, badge 1235, engaged in misconduct during and after a traffic collision on August 2, 2024. Mr. Tarver alleged that Officer Mandzak acted abusively when speaking with him at the hospital, refused to take his statement, threatened to arrest him for refusing to sign a citation, and otherwise committed procedural errors when issuing the citation.

OPS reviewed P.O. Mandzak's body-worn camera recordings from the scene and hospital, the store surveillance footage shown to officers, the traffic crash report, the Uniform Traffic Ticket (UTT), and related documentation; OPS also attempted to interview the complainant but was unsuccessful. The WCS and scene footage show the officer reviewed corroborating video evidence of the collision, explained the basis for the stop and the potential Improper Handling of Firearms charge, informed the complainant that refusal to sign a citation could result in arrest consistent with policy, and issued a citation after consulting available evidence. The WCS captures the officer's explanations and the officer's reliance on corroborating video and investigative checks in completing the enforcement action.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct against P.O. Sean Mandzak #1235, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged abusive conduct did not occur because WCS demonstrates the officer remained professional, explained the basis for detention and citation, and did not refuse to accept information from the complainant. OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation B: Improper Procedure against P.O. Sean Mandzak #1235, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the cited actions did occur but were consistent with law, Cleveland Division of Police General Police Orders (including GPO 3.04.01), and Division procedures; the officer relied on corroborating video, conducted the required investigation, and lawfully issued the citation.

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

Case Findings:



Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

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

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Sean Mandzak, #1235	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.18, and General Police Orders 3.04.01.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0210

Timestamp: 02:44:01 – 2:47:29

Complainant: Oneida Cedenó

Presented by: Green

Det. Marie Clark, #1335

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On July 19, 2024, Ms. Oneida Cedenó reported that Detective Marie Clark #1355 executed a search warrant at her residence as part of a child abuse investigation and alleged the warrant was improper, that items seized exceeded the warrant, and that Detective Clark behaved unprofessionally.

OPS reviewed the complainant interview, Detective Clark's body-worn camera recording, the search warrant and inventory, WCS from another detective who executed a related warrant, and case documentation. WCS shows Detective Clark presented and explained the search warrant to occupants, identified the items to be seized, conducted an interview with the child's mother including Miranda advisement where appropriate, and the inventory corresponds to the warrant's authorized items; a separate warrant for the child's father's devices was also executed and documented.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Allegation A: Improper Procedure against Detective Marie Clark #1355 and Unfounded for Allegation B: Unprofessional



Behavior/Conduct against Detective Marie Clark #1355, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged misconduct did not occur because WCS and warrant documentation demonstrate the detective complied with GPO 2.2.04 for warrant service, provided the required warrant copy and explanations, seized only items authorized by the warrant, and conducted herself in a manner consistent with Division rules and procedures; matters concerning child removal and CPS decisions are outside OPS jurisdiction.

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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Marie Clark, #1355	<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: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Marie Clark, #1355	<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: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0224

Timestamp: 2:47:32 – 2:50:42

Complainant: Tonnetta Burney

Presented by: Green

P.O. David Morrison, #1017

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

P.O. Michael Kane Jr., #997

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On September 17, 2024, Ms. Tonnetta Burney reported that Patrol Officers Michael Kane Jr., # 997, and David Morrison, #1017, failed to provide adequate service after responding to a Trouble Unknown call at approximately 3:15 a.m.; she alleged the officers did not retrieve her property or complete a proper report when she asked them to enter



the residence to retrieve her keys and firearm. On September 17th, 2024, at approximately 3:15 a.m. CDP Patrol Officers Michael Kane Jr. #997 and David Morrison #1017 responded to a call for Trouble Unknown. The complaint arose after officers encountered an intoxicated Ms. Burney and a homeowner disputing possession of property and a firearm.

OPS reviewed P.O. Kane's and P.O. Morrison's body-worn camera recordings, the CDP incident report (202400274486), dispatch and CAD event remarks, and OPS contact attempts with the complainant to determine whether officers complied with Division policy and properly investigated the call. The WCS shows the officers arrived, observed the homeowner on the balcony asking that Ms. Burney be removed, spoke with Ms. Burney in the driveway, explained they could not enter the home without a warrant, asked the homeowner to gather Ms. Burney's belongings, and transported Ms. Burney to her residence because she was too intoxicated to drive. Patrol Officer Michael Kane #997 and Patrol Officer David Morrison completed an incident report.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service against Patrol Officer Michael Kane Jr. #997 and Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service against Patrol Officer David Morrison #1017, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the officers acted consistently with law, General Police Orders, and Division procedures. During the investigation it was discovered the officers declined to enter the residence because they lacked a warrant, they explained that civil property disputes are not resolved by warrantless entry, they asked the homeowner to retrieve the complainant's belongings when available, and they completed an incident report and transported Ms. Burney to her residence for safety due to intoxication; these actions demonstrate the officers followed CDP policy (including GPO 2.02.02 and Manual Rules 2.01, 3.02, and 4.03) and attempted to address the situation without exceeding their lawful authority.

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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Michael Kane Jr., #997	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rules 3.01 and 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

P.O. David Morrison, #1017

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service



**OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 09/02/2025**

**CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED – CDP Separated 09/02/2025**

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 09/02/2025.. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

OPS2024-0292

Timestamp: 2:50:50 – 02:56:28

Complainant: Gabrielle Grizzell

Presented by: Green

P.O. Bryce Carmichael, #1525

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On December 2, 2024, Ms. Gabrielle Grizzell reported Lack of Service and Unprofessional Conduct/Behavior against Patrol Officer Bryce Carmichael #1525, stating that the officer was rude and failed to thoroughly investigate a breaking-and-entering incident at the apartment complex she manages at 10506 Shaker Boulevard. She told OPS that officers did not enter rental units to document theft or damage and did not remove individuals she believed were unlawfully on the property. Her complaint centered on concerns about investigative thoroughness and officer demeanor during the response.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera recordings from P.O. Carmichael, the CDP Detail Report 2024350402, the complainant interview, and witness information gathered on scene to determine whether officers acted in accordance with Division policy and whether the alleged conduct occurred. The review focused on whether officers investigated the reported breaking and-entering, assessed the broken-down vehicle and its occupants, attempted to locate witnesses, and maintained professionalism while deescalating a verbal dispute. The WCS shows officers locating the vehicle, interviewing occupants, coordinating Cleveland Fire for a possible gas-valve hazard, obtaining witness statements including from a child eyewitness, and conducting premise checks with Fire personnel.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Allegation A: Lack of Service and Unfounded for Allegation B: Unprofessional Conduct/Behavior against P.O. Bryce Carmichael #1525, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged failures and discourtesy did not occur. The WCS demonstrates that P.O. Carmichael conducted an active investigation, coordinated with Fire when informed of a possible gas-valve leak, entered and exited rental units with Fire personnel to assess possible damage, and intervened to de-escalate a heated exchange between individuals on the property. His decision not to arrest the vehicle occupants or tow the vehicle was justified because there was no probable cause for criminal activity and the vehicle was on private property, where the property manager, not CDP, has authority to initiate a tow.



These actions show that the officer provided service consistent with Manual of Rules 4.18 and maintained professionalism consistent with Rules 5.01, 5.08, and 5.09.

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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Bryce Carmichael, #1525	<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: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Bryce Carmichael, #1525	<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: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Note: Senior Investigator Bowker publicly acknowledged Investigator Green’s exceptional effort during the meeting. He noted that she had just completed presenting six cases, including four that were not originally assigned to her, and commended her for stepping in to ensure the Board received complete and accurate presentations. He emphasized that she took the time to thoroughly review all the cases before presenting them, demonstrating professionalism and commitment to maintaining the expected standard of preparedness. The Board expressed appreciation for her work and acknowledged the challenging conditions in the meeting room at the time.

OPS2024-0306

Timestamp: 02:56:31 – 3:02:41

Complainant: Vera Brewer

Presented by: Davis

P.O. Khristian Vaden, #1380

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct



Summary of Case Presentation: On December 21, 2024, Ms. Vera Brewer reported Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct against Patrol Officer Khristian Vaden #1380, stating that the officer acted aggressively, elevated her tone, and spoke disrespectfully to community members during a toy giveaway event at the Church of God in Christ on Kinsman Avenue. Ms. Brewer explained that her son, Jordan Brewer, was registered to receive items for his children, who were present at the event with relatives, and that Officer Vaden wrongly denied him a bag and ordered him to leave. She further stated that when she attempted to clarify the situation, Officer Vaden became confrontational, refused to listen, and continued escalating the interaction in front of attendees.

OPS reviewed complainant and witness interviews, including statements from Ms. Brewer, Mr. Jordan Brewer, and Patrol Officer Anthony Jones, as well as the officer interview and event-related documentation. Because the incident occurred while Officer Vaden was working off-duty, no body-worn camera footage was available, and the church did not have video recordings of the event. OPS therefore relied on witness testimony to determine whether the alleged conduct occurred. Witness accounts consistently described Officer Vaden as confrontational, elevated in tone, unwilling to de-escalate, and dismissive toward both community members and Officer Jones. Witnesses also reported that her behavior caused attendees to leave the event early and created an environment of discomfort and tension inconsistent with CDP expectations for community engagement.

OPS recommends a finding of Sustained for Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct against Patrol Officer Khristian Vaden #1380, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged conduct occurred and violated CDP Manual of Rules 5.08 and 5.09. OPS determined that Officer Vaden's tone, confrontational demeanor, refusal to declare, and dismissive responses toward both civilians and a fellow officer were inconsistent with professional standards and contributed to disruption of a community event. Multiple independent witness statements corroborated with each other, and no evidence contradicted their accounts. OPS found that Officer Vaden's actions failed to reflect professionalism, courtesy, and community-focused conduct required by policy.

Board Discussion Summary: Chair Brown noted that although no body-worn camera footage was available for this incident, three independent witnesses provided consistent accounts of the officer's conduct. Members discussed that the officer did not fully deny that a verbal dispute occurred; rather, she stated that she did not believe her behavior was unprofessional. The Board observed that her acknowledgment of a verbal disagreement, combined with the alignment among witness statements, provided a sufficient basis to evaluate the allegation despite the absence of video evidence. With no conflicting accounts presented, the Board relied on the consistency of witness testimony and the officer's own statements in reaching its conclusion.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained



Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Khristian Vaden, #1380	<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 Manual Rule 5.08 and 5.09.</i> <i>Explanation:</i> <i>Officer Vaden despite the absence of body-worn camera footage, the available evidence showed that he continued to act in a confrontational manner during the incident. Another officer on scene attempted to de-escalate the situation, but PO Vaden did not adjust his behavior and instead escalated the interaction. The Board determined that his conduct failed to meet departmental expectations for professionalism and de-escalation, and that his actions contributed to an unnecessary escalation of the encounter.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Group Level: Group Level I – Discourteous & Rudeness Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0247

Timestamp: 03:02:43 – 3:08:05

Complainant: Mercedita Oliveras

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Besjon Domnori, #233

Allegation A: Harassment

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

P.O. Zachary Tomasic, #939

Allegation A: Harassment

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

Summary of Case Presentation: On September 30, 2024, Ms. Mercedita Oliveras reported that Patrol Officers Zachary Tomasic #939 and Besjon Domnori #233 engaged in harassment and improper procedure when they responded to a neighbor's call concerning a potential protection order violation and asked her to move her vehicle; Ms. Oliveras alleged the officers improperly pressured her and exceeded their authority during the encounter at her residence.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera recordings (WCS) from P.O. Besjon Domnori and P.O. Zachary Tomasic, the complainant interview, officer interviews, CAD/RMS event remarks and dispatch chronology, and related case documentation to determine whether the officers' actions complied with Division policy and General Police Orders. The WCS shows officers contacted the neighbors, then spoke with Ms. Oliveras, explained the protection order status, determined Ms. Oliveras had not been notified of the order, and asked her to move her vehicle temporarily while the parties resolved the civil dispute; the officers documented the contact and notified a supervisor when appropriate.



OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Allegation A: Harassment against P.O. Zachary Tomasic #939 and P.O. Besjon Domnori #233, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged harassing conduct did not occur because the encounter was consensual, the officers did not use harassing or coercive language, and their conduct was consistent with Division rules. OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation B: Improper Procedure against P.O. Zachary Tomasic #939 and P.O. Besjon Domnori #233, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the officers did act as alleged (they asked Ms. Oliveras to move her vehicle and discussed the protection order) but those actions were consistent with law, GPO 5.05.02 and GPO 4.04.07, and Division training and procedures; the request to move the vehicle was a problem-oriented policing step and Ms. Oliveras was under no legal obligation to comply.

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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Harassment

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Besjon Domnori, #233 P.O. Zachary Tomasic, #939	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Besjon Domnori, #233 P.O. Zachary Tomasic, #939	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in General Police Order 4.04.07.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0260

Timestamp: 3:08:07 – 3:12:54

Complainant: Sonya Sanders

Presented by: Khabir

Sgt. Daniel David, # 9140

P.O. Cecila Kochevar, #864

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Sgt. Quinton Harrison, #9370



Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Summary of Case Presentation: On October 17, 2024, Ms. Sonya Sanders reported that Cleveland Division of Police personnel failed to provide adequate service after officers responded to a possible robbery and allowed a third party to remove belongings from her garage; the complainant named Sgt. Daniel David #9140, P.O. Cecelia Kochevar #864, and P.O. Quinton Harrison #941 and alleged the officers did not protect her property or properly investigate the incident.

OPS reviewed multiple body-worn camera recordings from Sgt. Daniel David, P.O. Cecelia Kochevar, and P.O. Quinton Harrison, the police report (202400305786), the 911 dispatch recording and CAD event chronology, complainant interviews and follow-up interviews, officer interviews, and photos and video provided by the complainant to determine whether officers failed to provide service. The WCS shows officers arriving, interviewing the parties, assessing the scene, remaining on site to ensure safety while items were removed, and documenting the incident; the file also includes a robbery report prepared for the other party and dispatch notes reflecting the call's initial unknown trouble classification.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service / No Service against Sgt. Daniel David #9140, P.O. Cecelia Kochevar #864, and P.O. Quinton Harrison #941, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the officers acted consistently with law, General Police Orders, and Division procedures. During the investigation OPS found the officers reasonably determined the dispute to be civil in nature, requested proof of ownership when conflicting claims arose, advised the parties of appropriate civil remedies, remained on scene to ensure safety while property was removed, and completed an official report for the party who requested one; the officers' actions therefore constituted an appropriate law-enforcement response rather than a failure to provide service.

Case Note: *Officer Rank updated due to promotion. Changed from Patrol Officer Quinton Harrison, #941 to Sergeant Quinton Harrison, #9370.*

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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Daniel David, #9140 Sgt. Quinton Harrison, #9370 P.O. Cecelia Kochevar, #864	<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</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried



	<i>outlined in CDP Manual Rules 3.02, 4.01, and General Police Order 1.01.03.</i>	
--	---	--

OPS2024-0261

Timestamp: 3:12:57– 3:48:06

**Complainant: Qiana Banks
Timothy Davis**

Presented by: Khabir

Sgt. David Harris, #9146

Allegation A: Harassment

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

Summary of Case Presentation: On October 19, 2024, Mr. Timothy Davis and Ms. Qiana Banks reported that Sergeant David Harris #9146 engaged in harassment and improper procedure during multiple interactions concerning Mr. Davis's food truck, alleging the sergeant repeatedly ordered the truck moved without lawful basis, used harassing language and gestures, threatened enforcement action, and otherwise interfered with the lawful operation of the business.

OPS reviewed Sergeant Harris's body-worn camera recordings, complainant provided footage and images, complainant and witness interviews, the Assistant Commissioner of Assessments and Licenses statement regarding food truck permits, applicable City ordinances (including sections 241.37 and 241.38), and related documentation to determine whether the sergeant's conduct complied with Division policy and law. The WCS and civilian footage capture the interactions, the sergeant's repeated directives to move or close the truck, his taking a photograph of the complainant's identification, and the surrounding circumstances; OPS also reviewed licensing guidance showing the truck was permitted to operate at the locations and times observed.

OPS recommends a finding of Sustained for Allegation A: Harassment and Sustained for Allegation B: Improper Procedure against Sergeant David Harris #9146, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged conduct occurred. The WCS and complainant footage demonstrate a pattern of repeated, targeted directives and language directed at Mr. Davis that rose to harassment rather than routine enforcement; the sergeant repeatedly ordered the truck closed or moved despite the truck being parked at a paid meter and operating under a valid permit, and he used language and gestures that were harassing and coercive. OPS found these actions inconsistent with GPO 1.07.08 and Manual Rule 3.01 and determined the sergeant did not follow proper procedure for enforcement in these circumstances, supporting the Sustained recommendations.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board's discussion focused on whether the officer's actions were justified and whether his conduct aligned with departmental authority and established regulations governing mobile food vendors. Members examined the officer's claim that he had



consulted a superior and believed the food truck posed a recurring late-night public safety concern. The Board noted that while the officer expressed frustration with past incidents involving food trucks, his reasoning relied heavily on personal opinion rather than any documented violation or lawful basis for directing the vendor to leave.

Board members emphasized that the officer's actions appeared to exceed his authority. They discussed that the food truck was legally permitted to operate at the time and location in question, and that the officer lacked reasonable suspicion or probable cause to initiate an investigatory encounter. The Board also noted that the officer's statements—particularly suggesting that policy was being changed “because of” the complainant—were inappropriate and created the impression of arbitrary enforcement rather than a legitimate public safety response.

The Board further observed that the officer's attempt to justify his actions as proactive prevention of potential future problems did not meet legal or procedural standards. Members agreed that officers may intervene when an actual nuisance, obstruction, or emergency exists, but cannot remove a legally operating business based solely on subjective concerns or past experiences. The Board concluded that the officer misunderstood the applicable ordinance and improperly used his authority to interfere with the complainant's lawful activity.

Overall, the Board determined that the officer's conduct reflected improper procedure and unprofessional behavior. Members agreed that the officer escalated a consensual encounter without a lawful basis, made coercive statements, and relied on personal frustration rather than policy or regulation. These factors formed the basis of the Board's deliberation and guided their adjudication of the case.

Additional Information to Note:

- **Added allegation:** Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct under Manual Rule 5.01 to address the officer's inappropriate statements and demeanor during the encounter, including comments such as “stop that whining.”
- CPRB Legal clarified that mobile food trucks are legally permitted to operate 24/7 when parked in lawful public spaces, and that the 3 a.m. to 6 a.m. restriction applies only to sidewalk vending.
- ADL Dayla Oprian, CPRB Legal Counsel explained that officers may issue lawful orders to remove a food truck only in situations involving congestion, obstruction, or an emergency, and not based on subjective concerns or anticipated future problems.
- The Board noted that the officer misunderstood the applicable ordinance and lacked lawful authority to direct the complainant to leave, as there was no reasonable suspicion, probable cause, or documented nuisance at the time of the encounter.
- Board Members discussed that the officer's statements suggesting policy changes were being made “because of” the complainant were inappropriate and created the appearance of arbitrary enforcement.

Case Findings:



Allegation A: Harassment

OPS Recommendation: **Sustained**

CPRB Decision: **Exonerated**

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. David Harris, #9146	<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 3.01 and General Police Order 1.07. 08.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: **Sustained**

CPRB Decision: **Sustained**

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. David Harris, #9146	<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 Code Enforcement 241.37 and 241.38.</i> <i>Explanation:</i> <i>Sgt. Harris ordered the complainant to move his legally parked food truck without any lawful basis for doing so. Although Sgt. Harris stated that his intent was to address perceived public-safety concerns, the Board found that no regulation or violation justified directing the complainant to relocate. The Board also noted that Sgt. Harris threatened to issue citations and implied additional enforcement actions despite having no legal grounds to support such orders. His directive and accompanying threats were therefore improper, constituting an unlawful interference with the complainant's business and a misuse of authority.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried Group Level: Group Level I- Unsatisfactory Performance Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: **Sustained**

CPRB Decision: **Sustained**

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. David Harris, #9146	<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 Manual Rule 5.01.</i> <i>Explanation:</i> <i>Sgt. Harris made several disparaging and inappropriate comments toward the complainant, including</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried



	<i>telling him to “stop that whining.” In addition to his remarks, Sgt. Harris took a photograph of the complainant’s identification while threatening to send him a summons for a violation that had not occurred and for which no lawful basis existed. The Board noted that Sgt. Harris had approached the complainant multiple times on the same issue and admitted that he had become frustrated but determined that this frustration did not excuse his conduct. His comments, threats of unwarranted enforcement action, and repeated confrontational interactions constituted unprofessional behavior and conduct unbecoming under Manual Rule 5.01.</i>	Group Level: Group Level I – Discourtesy & Rudeness Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried
--	--	---

OPS2024-0277

Timestamp: 03:48:09 – 3:54:31

Complainant: Matthew Menke

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Claire Fredriks, #562

P.O. Jordan Tooley, #954

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On November 6, 2024, Mr. Matthew Menke filed a complaint alleging that police failed to act after he was attacked outside the JACK Casino on July 28, 2023, and that an unmarked vehicle attempted to run him over on July 27, 2023; he identified two officers who assisted him at the casino but could not identify the officers involved in the alleged unmarked-vehicle incident. In his OPS interview Mr. Menke said the officers who responded to the assault did an exemplary job but maintained a separate complaint about the unmarked vehicle incident.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera recordings from Patrol Officer Claire Fredriks and Patrol Officer Jordan Tooley, the police report for the July 28, 2023, assault, the complainant interview, and available scene evidence to determine whether responding officers provided service and whether the unmarked vehicle allegation could be investigated. The WCS shows Officers Fredriks and Tooley met with Mr. Menke at the casino, offered medical attention which he declined, completed a police report, provided a report number, and transported him to his hotel for safety; OPS found no evidence that those officers failed to provide service. OPS attempted to locate video or other evidence of the alleged unmarked vehicle incident but found that potential private camera footage was not retained and the officers involved could not be identified.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service against Patrol Officer Claire Fredriks #562 and Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service against Patrol



Officer Jordan Tooley #954, concluding the preponderance of the evidence shows the officers provided appropriate assistance, documented the incident, and ensured the complainant's safety. For the allegation involving the unidentifiable officers, OPS recommends Administrative Dismissal because a diligent investigation failed to produce the identity of the officers alleged to have acted improperly, leaving the matter uninvestigable

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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Claire Fredriks, #562 P.O. Jordan Tooley, #954	<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 9.01.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Moore – stepped out during case presentation

Unknown CDP Personnel

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

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

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

Administratively dismissed due to the inability to identify a CDP Employee given the information/ Evidence. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

OPS2024-0305

Timestamp: 3:54:34 – 3:59:02

Complainant: Fran DiDonato

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Kayla Rutherford, #1294

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Summary of Case Presentation: On December 23, 2024, Ms. Fran DiDonato reported Improper Procedure against Patrol Officer Kayla Rutherford #1294, stating that officers used their patrol vehicles and sirens in an aggressive manner to disperse a group of juveniles involved in a physical altercation. She told OPS that officers did not speak to the juveniles and that the method



used to clear the crowd was inappropriate and unsafe. Her complaint focused on concerns about officer conduct and whether the dispersal tactics aligned with CDP expectations for interacting with youth.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage from P.O. Rutherford, the complainant interview, the officer interview, photographs provided by the complainant, and the CDP Daily Duty Assignment to determine whether officers acted in accordance with Division policy and whether the alleged conduct occurred. The review focused on whether officers attempted to locate involved juveniles, whether the use of lights and sirens was consistent with CDP training, and whether remaining inside the patrol vehicle was a reasonable officer-safety decision. The WCS shows that by the time P.O. Rutherford arrived, most of the crowd had already dispersed, and she and another patrol officer searched the area for involved juveniles with negative results. The footage also shows officers using lights and sirens from a safe distance to disperse remaining individuals.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Improper Procedure against P.O. Kayla Rutherford #1294, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged improper conduct did occur but was consistent with CDP policy, training, and officer-safety considerations. The WCS demonstrates that officers used standard crowd-dispersal tactics, including vehicle positioning, horns, and sirens, which are permitted under Manual of Rules 4.18 when responding to suspected criminal or disorderly incidents. Officers reasonably remained inside their vehicles to maintain visibility, control, and safety, especially given the unknown number of juveniles involved and the lack of confirmed information about weapons or ongoing violence. OPS found no evidence that officers acted aggressively or in violation of policy and determined that the actions taken were appropriate for the circumstances.

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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Kayla Rutherford, #1294	<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.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Cyganovich – knows complainant

VII. Executive Session

CPRB

YouTube Timestamp:



- **Motion:** To enter executive session for personnel, Employment and discipline Matters will be considered. Inviting in ADL Dayla Oprian, Acadia Paleo from Legal Department, OPS Administrator Wenninger, General Manager Watson, Labor Relations Manager Mark Shinon.

Roll Call Vote: All Present Board Members said “I”.

Board Members: Brown, Mountcastle, Cyganovich, Gatian, Moore, and Willis.

- Executive Session began at 1:30 p.m. EST
- Adjourn back into open session at 3:33 p.m. EST

VIII. OPS Status Report

YouTube Timestamp: 6:38:41 – 6:38:56

Jeff Wenninger

OPS Administrator

A. OPS Cases & Administrative Update

Due time restrictions, the OPS Status Report suspended to next month to include stats for June and July.

IX. Old Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 6:38:57 – 6:39:37

A. NACOLE 2026 Update

- i. The Board noted that its November meeting conflicts with the scheduled NACOLE conference, and members are still determining how the November meeting will be handled, CPRB Legal Counsel is looking for a resolution.
- ii. Board members were reminded to check their email for a required form sent by Jalecia, which must be completed and returned promptly. The form only needs to be completed by members who plan to attend the conference; those not attending do not need to submit it. Members were advised to verify that they received the correct form and to submit it as soon as possible to ensure proper registration.

B. OPS Staff Matters

- i. No OPS Staff Matters were discussed at this time.

X. New Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 6:39:37 – 6:39:47

- Chair and Vice Chair Nominations
 - Was previously mentioned during Approval of Minutes
 - There will be no Chair or Vice Chair nominations, postponed until August or September CPRB Meeting.

XI. Public Comment

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 6:39:48 – 6:39:53



- No individuals were present for Public Comment

XII. Adjournment

CPRB

YouTube Timestamp: 6:39:54 – 6:40:26

Motion: To Adjourn July 14th, 2026, CPRB Meeting

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Status: Carried

- The CPRB July 14th, 2026, meeting was adjourned at 3:35 pm EST.
- The following CPRB Meeting will be held in-person at City Hall, Room 514 on August 11, 2026, at 9:15 a.m. EST.