



CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

August 26th, 2026

MEETING MINUTES

CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS

Brandon Brown, Chair
Chenoa Miller, Vice Chair
David Gatian
Edwin Moore
Waverly Willis

LEGAL COUNSEL

Dalya Oprian, Asst. Director of Law

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

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

MEETING AGENDA

I. Call to Order Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 0:00:01 – 0:04:59

- 1. Chair Brown called August 26th, 2026, hearing to order at 9:04 a.m. EST.**
- 2. Roll Call**
 - a. Vice Chair Miller arrived late after roll call @ 9:09 a.m.
 - b. Board Members Parker III and Sharp had an excused absence.
 - c. A quorum was present.

II. Presentation of Investigations

Jeff Wenninger
OPS Administrator

OPS2026-0063

Timestamp: 04:59 – 13:13

Complainant: Walter Worsham Jr.

Presented by: Wynne

P.O. Brandon Radabaugh, #363

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No service

P.O. Adam Thompson, #1369

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No service

P.O. Daniel Rutt, #851

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No service

P.O. Aaron Thompson, #511

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No service



Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Walter Worsham Jr. alleging Lack of Service and Improper Arrest by P.O. Aaron Thompson #511, P.O. Brandon Radabaugh #363, P.O. Adam Thompson #1369, and P.O. Daniel Rutt #851 following an April 1, 2026, response to a report of a person threatening with a weapon at 12212 Brighton Ave. The repossession agents on scene reported that Mr. Worsham pointed a firearm at them while they attempted to repossess a vehicle; officers arrived, detained Mr. Worsham, spoke with the repossession agents and nearby neighbors, and recovered and secured a firearm after obtaining consent. Mr. Worsham alleged officers failed to properly interview his wife and neighbors and that his arrest was improper.

OPS reviewed body worn camera footage from all responding officers, front dash audio, the CDP case report, calls for service records, and the written complaint. The WCS shows officers interviewing the repossession agents and a neighbor who stated she observed the complainant point a gun at the back of one of the agents; officers also spoke with the complainant, his wife, and other involved parties, unloaded and bagged the firearm with the complainant's consent, and conferred with the shift supervisor before placing the complainant under arrest for Aggravated Menacing. The record documents multiple witness accounts consistent with the repossession agents' report and reflects officers followed investigative and supervisory direction during the response.

OPS recommended Unfounded for the Lack of Service allegation against P.O. Aaron Thompson, P.O. Brandon Radabaugh, P.O. Adam Thompson, and P.O. Daniel Rutt, as WCS and reports show that officers interviewed witnesses and investigated the incident consistent with Manual Section 4.18. OPS recommended Exonerated for the Improper Arrest allegation against P.O. Aaron Thompson #511, concluding the preponderance of the evidence supports that probable cause existed for arrest and that the arrest was made pursuant to the supervisor's directive and in accordance with GPO 3.04.01 and Manual Section 2.07.

Board Discussion Summary: No further questions, comments, or concerns were raised by the Board.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

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



P.O. Brandon Radabaugh, #363 P.O. Daniel Rutt, #851 P.O. Aaron Thompson, #511 P.O. Adam Thompson, #1369	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Gatian Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Miller- was not present for case presentation or Board's deliberation.
--	--	---

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Aaron Thompson, #511	<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 2.07 and General Police Order 3.04.01</i>	Motion by: Gatian Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Miller- was not present for case presentation or Board's deliberation.

OPS2023-0085

Timestamp: 13:13 – 18:54

Complainant: Ericka Caine

Presented by: Lampkin

P.O. Anthony Lucas, #2396

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Erika Caine alleging Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct by P.O. Anthony Lucas #2396 during an April 16, 2023, interaction at JACK Casino. Ms. Caine, who was four months pregnant at the time, reported that after a dispute with casino staff she spoke with P.O. Lucas about filing a complaint and that the officer became belligerent, yelled explicit language in her face, and behaved in a hostile and condescending manner. The complainant said she had a video of the encounter but did not provide it to OPS, and her identified witness did not respond to interview requests.

OPS reviewed the casino surveillance footage obtained by subpoena, the complainant's recorded interview, and a recorded interview with P.O. Lucas. The casino video contains no audio and does not clearly show P.O. Lucas on camera. P.O. Lucas, who was off duty at the time, stated he did not recall the incident and explained that casino security controls entry and may request police assistance when situations exceed security's capability. The complainant did not produce the recording she referenced, and no independent witness statements corroborate her account.



OPS recommends a finding of Insufficient Evidence for the allegation of Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct against P.O. Anthony Lucas #2396. The available evidence does not establish whether the alleged conduct occurred, and therefore a determination cannot be made that Manual Rules 5.01 or 5.09 were violated.

Board Discussion Summary: No further questions, comments, or concerns were raised by the Board.

Additional Information to Note: *The agenda has officer incorrectly listed as Det. Dylan Demas, #1701 for this case allegation. The correct Officer is P.O. Anthony Lucas, #2396.*

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Anthony Lucas, #2396	<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: Cyganovich Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2023-0101

Complainant: Quamina Mynatt

Timestamp: 18:54 – 41:59

Presented by: Lampkin

Det. Ashley Schut, #888

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Lt. Michael Schroder, #8578

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Quamia Mywatt alleging Improper Procedure and Unprofessional Behavior by Detective Ashley Schut #888 and Lieutenant Michael Schroeder #8578 following the arrest of her 15-year-old son on May 6, 2023. Ms. Mywatt said she was not informed why her son was being arrested, that officers told her a warrant was not necessary, and that her son was interviewed while handcuffed and without her presence. Body worn camera footage shows officers arresting the youth, informing the mother of the arrest, and later conducting an interview in the holding room.

The OPS review included multiple WCS recordings and interviews. The WCS video of holding room on 5/6/2023 at 5:01pm, shows Det. Schut #888 interviewing Ms. Mywatt's 15-year-old son, who is handcuffed to a chair, and without the presence of his mother. The report also notes



that during the Miranda advisement the youth indicated he did not want a parent present and that Det. Schut asked whether he wanted a parent present and recorded his response. Det. Schut told investigators she believed a supervisor was observing, but the WCS and follow-up review did not corroborate that supervisory presence in the manner described.

OPS concluded the evidence supports a policy violation by the detective for how the juvenile interview was conducted but does not support misconduct by the lieutenant. OPS recommends a finding of Sustained for Allegation A: Improper Procedure against Detective Ashley Schut #888, and Unfounded for Allegation A: Improper Procedure and Unfounded for Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct against Lieutenant Michael Schroeder #8578, finding the officers' actions toward the mother and youth were otherwise consistent with applicable rules and procedures.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board's deliberation began with clarifying the allegations listed in the case file. The investigator referenced an Allegation C, but Board members noted that only Allegations A and B appeared in the agenda and written report. After discussion, the investigator explained that Allegation C involved improper procedure for handcuffing a juvenile to an inanimate object, which violated both the detective manual and GPO 3.03.03. The Board confirmed that this conduct was already contemplated under Allegation A, which included violations of juvenile arrest, booking, and housing procedures. Members debated whether the handcuffing violation and the failure to obtain parental permission (Form 10) should be separated into distinct allegations or kept together. Ultimately, they agreed that combining them under Allegation A would maintain consistency with the report and avoid creating an unsupported standalone allegation.

Board members then examined the underlying conduct in detail. They discussed the detective's claim that a chair was not an inanimate object, a justification the Board rejected as inconsistent with both policy and common understanding. The investigator confirmed that the juvenile was handcuffed throughout the entire process, including being cuffed to a chair except when signing Miranda rights. The Board noted that policy prohibits securing juveniles to any object and requires continuous supervision rather than physical restraint. Members also raised concerns about tactical risks, emphasizing that handcuffing a juvenile to a movable object could create a safety hazard if the juvenile attempted to use the chair as a weapon.

The Board also explored whether recent changes in the detective manual affected the case. The investigator clarified that updates related only to the parental waiver form, not to handcuffing procedures. Board members acknowledged that while supervising an uncuffed juvenile may present challenges, the policy is clear: juveniles must not be restrained to objects and must be



monitored appropriately. They concluded that the detective's actions clearly violated established procedures and best practices, regardless of any manual revisions.

After confirming that Allegation A appropriately encompassed both the improper handcuffing and the failure to obtain parental permission, the Board agreed to proceed with motions based on the two allegations listed in the report. They determined that keeping the allegations consolidated would ensure clarity, consistency, and alignment with the investigative documentation.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper procedure

OPS Recommendation: **Sustained**

CPRB Decision: **Sustained**

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Ashley Schut, #888	<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 Detective Manual Procedures for Juvenile Offenders page 22 and General Police Order 3.03.03.</i> <u>Explanation:</u> <i>The officer Schut failed to make a reasonable effort to contact subject minor's parent and /or guardian before questioning. Additionally, the juvenile was handcuffed to an inanimate object.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Miller Motion Status: Carried Group Level: I- Unsatisfactory Performance, Tactics & Training Violation Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Miller Motion Status: Carried

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: **Unfounded**

CPRB Decision: **Unfounded**

Against	Rationale	Motion
Lt. Michael Schroder, #8578	<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

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: **Unfounded**

CPRB Decision: **Unfounded**

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Ashley Schut, #888 Lt. Michael Schroder, #8578	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried



OPS2024-0283

Complainant: Miriam Sullivan

Timestamp: 41:59 – 47:41

Presented by: Lampkin

Det. Kevin Smith, #1622

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Miriam Sullivan alleging Lack of Service and Improper Procedure by Detective Kevin Smith #1622 after Ms. Sullivan reported a sex offense matter and said Det. Smith directed her to go to a local police department in California for a photo lineup rather than providing follow-up. Ms. Sullivan told OPS she did not receive adequate communication or case updates.

OPS reviewed Det. Smith's body worn camera recording of the interview and lineup, the chronological and CAD reports, and the detective unit's documentation of outreach attempts. The evidence shows Det. Smith conducted investigative follow-up, including obtaining a Facebook image of a potential suspect, conducting a video/photo lineup with a witness, providing Ms. Sullivan with status information, and repeatedly attempting to reach her for further follow-up. Ms. Sullivan lived in California and did not provide a consistent location for an in-person lineup, and several attempts to reach her were unsuccessful.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence, OPS recommends Unfounded findings for both the Lack of Service and Improper Procedure allegations against Detective Kevin Smith #1622. The investigation concluded Det. Smith documented the case, conducted appropriate photo-lineup procedures, and made reasonable efforts to contact the complainant consistent with CDP policy and the Detective Manual.

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

Additional Information to Note: Agenda Correction: Allegation B under CPRB Disposition listed as Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct, the correct allegation is Improper Procedure.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

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



Det. Kevin Smith, #1622	<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: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Kevin Smith, #1622	<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

OPS2023-0012

Complainant: Maurice Bey

Timestamp: 47:41 – 51:36

Presented by: Khabir

Det. Daniel McCandless, #644

Allegation A: Biased Policing

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Maurice Elohim Ali Bey alleging biased policing and falsification of a report by Detective Daniel McCandless #644 following a vehicle collision at MLK and St. Clair. Mr. Bey asserted the detective acted with racial bias and committed fraud and perjury in the handling of the incident. OPS reviewed available records and learned the incident actually occurred on January 21, 2021; the detective's original WCS recording from that event was no longer retained under CDP retention policy, though related WCS from subsequent contacts and IA materials were available.

During parallel proceedings, Mr. Bey filed a federal lawsuit and later submitted a signed court affidavit retracting his allegations, stating that after reviewing body worn camera footage he acknowledged there was no racial discrimination or falsification by Det. McCandless. OPS interviewed Mr. Bey and confirmed he recanted the complaint and acknowledged his prior court statements. Internal Affairs had previously investigated related claims, deemed the falsification allegation unfounded, and issued Det. McCandless a written reprimand for discourteous conduct on July 1, 2023.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence, including Mr. Bey's court affidavit and his subsequent recantation to OPS, the Office of Professional Standards recommends a finding of Unfounded for the Bias Policing allegation against Detective Daniel McCandless #644. OPS concluded there is no evidence Det. McCandless violated GPO 1.07.08 and that the original complaint was withdrawn by the complainant.



Board Discussion Summary: Member Willis asked whether recognizing or knowing the officer involved required abstaining from the vote. The Chair explained that the guiding standard is impartiality: a member may vote if they believe they can remain unbiased but should abstain if the relationship feels too close or could reasonably affect neutrality. Another member added that if a Board member chooses to abstain due to a conflict, they must also refrain from participating in any discussion about the case. With these expectations clarified, the Board prepared to move forward with motions.

Additional Information to Note: Agenda Correction: Allegation A under CPRB Disposition listed as Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct, the correct allegation is Biased Policing.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Biased Policing

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Daniel McCandless, #644	<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

OPS2024-0052

Complainant: Jasmine Scott

Timestamp: 51:36 – 52:54

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Karli Ayers, #635

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

P.O. Kenneth Kirk, #572

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Jasmine Scott alleging Lack of Service after her vehicle was involved in a collision on March 10, 2024, and, according to the complainant, no accident report was generated. The incident involved the complainant's vehicle driven by Chantell Burgess, who was transported by EMS from the scene. Ms. Scott reported that she could not find an OH-1 report online and contacted OPS to complain that the Division failed to file the crash report.

OPS reviewed WCS footage, dispatch audio, the OH-1 form, district event logs, duty assignments, officer interviews, and witness statements. The record shows P.O. Karli Ayers was dispatched to the scene but was diverted en-route to a higher-priority call and was unaware parties had been transported to the hospital; dispatch advised that one party would come to the



district to file the OH-1. The next day Chantell Burgess went to the 4th District and P.O. Kenneth Kirk completed the OH-1 (Report 2024-00067046). Dispatch audio documents multiple calls and follow-ups, and WCS and officer statements corroborate that the report was completed.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence, OPS recommended the Lack of Service (Failure to File OH-1) allegation against P.O. Kenneth Kirk #572 be Unfounded, finding he completed the OH-1 in accordance with GPO 8.1.02, and recommended the same allegation against P.O. Karli Ayers #635 be Exonerated, finding her delayed response was due to a higher-priority call and her actions were consistent with policy.

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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service- Failure to File OH-1 Report

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Karli Ayers, #635	<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 8.01.02.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service- Failure to File OH-1 Report

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

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 not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0123

Complainant: Taylor Miller

Timestamp: 52:54 – 1:05:57

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Devine White, #1597

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Miranda Warning

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Taylor Miller alleging an improper arrest and improper procedure by P.O. Devine White #1597 following an October



17, 2023, incident in which Ms. Miller forcefully entered a neighbor's apartment after mistakenly believing it was her own. The neighbor reported that Ms. Miller kicked in the door, entered the residence, and continued to be disruptive; officers arrived, detained Ms. Miller, and charged her with felony burglary and criminal damaging. Body worn camera footage from P.O. White and his partner shows officers locating the complainant, interviewing the neighbor who stated the complainant entered the apartment after forcefully breaching the door, and attempting to advise and mirandize the complainant while she remained agitated and uncooperative.

OPS reviewed WCS recordings, the incident and court reports, the indictment and sentencing docket, and witness statements. The WCS corroborates the neighbor's account that Ms. Miller entered the residence after forcefully kicking in the door and that officers detained her after observing the disturbance and the neighbor's statements. Court records show the burglary charge was processed through the criminal system, and the complainant was ultimately sentenced to community control/probation; the investigative record indicates officers followed arrest and reporting procedures, attempted to provide Miranda advisements, and notified supervisors as required.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence, OPS concluded that P.O. Devine White's actions were consistent with Ohio Revised Code §2911.12 and CDP policy. OPS recommended a finding of Exonerated for the Improper Arrest allegation against P.O. White, determining the arrest was lawful and supported by the evidence, and recommended a finding of Unfounded for the Improper Procedure allegation, finding no policy violation in the officers' conduct during the response and detention.

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

Additional Information to Note: Agenda Correction, officer's name is listed incorrectly on the agenda. It is listed as P.O. Devine Miller, #1597. The correct name is P.O. Devine White, #1597.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Arrest

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Devine White, #1597	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 Ohio Revised Code 2911.12.	Motion by: Willis Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried



Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Miranda Warning

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P P.O. Devine White, #1597	<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

OPS2023-0229

Complainant: Tabatha Gilbert

Timestamp: 1:05:57 – 1:12:57

Presented by: Green

P.O. Soladeen Taylor, #2388

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On September 19, 2023, Tabitha Gilbert reported that P.O. Soladeen Taylor #2388 behaved rudely and failed to listen during a response to an ongoing neighbor dispute at 422 Cleveland Road, and that he made insulting remarks and threatened arrest. The complaint alleged unprofessional conduct and a lack of service, asserting that Taylor addressed the neighbor first despite Ms. Gilbert being the reporting party and that his words and tone were inappropriate during the encounter.

OPS reviewed body worn camera recordings from P.O. Evan Tremaglio, the CDP detail reports, the 911 call, the complainant's recorded interview, and P.O. Taylor's recorded interview. Tremaglio's WCS shows the arrival sequence, his contact with Ms. Gilbert, and his later approach to P.O. Taylor while Taylor was gathering a statement from the neighbor; Tremaglio's footage documents that Taylor obtained a statement from the neighbor and provided the neighbor with a police report number and prosecutor contact information. Taylor's WCS was not available because his camera was non-operable; Taylor acknowledged during his interview that he told Ms. Gilbert she had two ears and one mouth as a stern warning intended to de-escalate and that he spoke separately with each party to try to resolve the dispute. Ms. Gilbert's account of insulting language is not corroborated by independent video or witness statements, and there is no WCS from Taylor to confirm the precise words or tone she described. At the same time, the available evidence shows officers documented the incident and provided follow-up information to the parties.

OPS recommends a finding of Insufficient Evidence for Unprofessional Conduct against P.O. Soladeen Taylor #2388, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence does not establish



whether the alleged insulting remarks and unprofessional demeanor occurred as described. OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Lack of Service against P.O. Soladeen Taylor #2388, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the officer did document the incident, gather witness information, and provided a report number and prosecutorial contact consistent with Division policy and the Manual of Rules.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board's deliberation centered on a discrepancy between the investigative presentation and the written report. The investigator referenced an additional GPO related allegation involving a WCS violation, but Board members noted that the report only listed Allegations A and B, with no Allegation C included. The Chair emphasized that the Board could not rule on an allegation that was not formally documented in the report. He pointed out that the only reference to the WCS issue appeared in an investigator's note stating that the officer's WCS was inoperable, which did not clearly support a separate violation. Because the presentation introduced information not reflected in the written materials, the Chair requested clarification and alignment between the report and the investigator's findings.

The investigator explained that the case had been transferred from another investigator and that the WCS information came from the officer's interview. After reviewing the report during the meeting, the investigator acknowledged the inconsistency and agreed to prepare an addendum to clearly document the WCS issue and any related investigative steps. The Board agreed that an addendum was necessary to ensure the record accurately reflected all contemplated allegations and evidence.

Given the missing documentation and the need for a corrected report, the Chair recommended tabling the entire case rather than ruling on some portions now and revisiting others later. The Board concurred that it would be more efficient and procedurally sound to adjudicate all allegations at once after receiving the addendum. The deliberation concluded with agreement to table the case pending updated materials.

Motion: Table case OPS2023-0229 so an addendum can be created regarding the WCS Violation allegation.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Gatian

Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0266

Complainant: Robert Walker

Timestamp: 1:12:57 – 1:20:07

Presented by: Green



Det. Anthony Lee, #255

Allegation A: Excessive Force

Allegation B: Harassment

Allegation C: Biased Policing

Det. Jearod Woods, #2170

Allegation A: Excessive Force

Allegation B: Harassment

Allegation C: Biased Policing

Summary of Case Presentation: On August 9, 2024, Robert Waller reported that while he was seated in the rear of a police vehicle during an arrest, he observed an officer allegedly manipulating the body worn camera recording, rewinding, fast-forwarding, and editing the footage, and that the police video differed from a neighbor's recording. The complaint alleges evidence tampering and raises concerns about the integrity of the recorded evidence used in his arrest.

OPS reviewed the submitted complaint form; any available dispatch and arrest information associated with the date and location provided and attempted to obtain the Division's body-worn camera footage and the related incident report. OPS also noted the complainant's statement that a neighbor possessed a different recording and attempted to identify and collect that recording. The review focused on whether the Division's WCS footage exists for the incident, whether the footage shows any manipulation or post-capture editing, and whether the incident report and chain-of-custody documentation for the recording were complete and consistent with policy.

OPS recommends a finding of Insufficient Evidence for the allegation of evidence tampering against the involved officer(s), concluding that the preponderance of the available information does not establish whether the alleged manipulation occurred. The determination reflects that, at intake, the Division's WCS footage and corroborating recordings were either not yet available or did not conclusively support the complainant's account; further investigative steps (collection of the neighbor's recording, forensic review of any WCS file, and review of chain-of-custody logs) would be required to reach a different finding.

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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Excessive Force

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
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 not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

**Allegation B: Harassment****OPS Recommendation: Unfounded****CPRB Decision: Unfounded**

Against	Rationale	Motion
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 not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Biased Policing**OPS Recommendation: Unfounded****CPRB Decision: Unfounded**

Against	Rationale	Motion
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 not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0014**Complainant: Joseph Atkins****Timestamp: 1:20:07 – 1:27:35****Presented by: Green****Sgt. Daniel Florentz, #9340****Allegation A: Harassment****Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct****Allegation C: Improper Procedure**

Summary of Case Presentation: On January 22 and January 23, 2025, Joseph Atkins reported that Sgt. Daniel Florentz repeatedly called and harassed him about a criminal complaint and a civil protection order, and that Sgt. Florentz's involvement presented a conflict of interest. Mr. Atkins said the calls included reading the protection order to him and that the officer's conduct amounted to harassment, unprofessional behavior, and improper procedure in enforcing the protection order.

OPS reviewed Sgt. Florentz's recorded voicemail and phone contact recordings, the district detail report and detective follow-up, the civil protection order documentation, the complainant's recorded interview, the officer's recorded interview, and related court filings and social-media posts that formed the underlying investigation. The recordings show Sgt. Florentz identified himself, stated he was following up on an investigation that listed Mr. Atkins as a suspect, and advised Mr. Atkins of the existence and conditions of a civil protection order; he also advised that the call was being recorded and provided Miranda advisements during the January 23 contact. The detective assignment was made by the acting lieutenant, the officer documented his contacts and investigative steps in the follow-up, and subsequent charging documents show Mr.



Atkins was later charged with violations related to the protection order and retaliation. There is no evidence in the recorded contacts or the investigative file that Sgt. Florentz acted out of retaliation, used abusive language, or otherwise departed from required protection-order enforcement procedures; the officer's actions were consistent with the assignment he received and with applicable General Police Orders governing protection orders and investigative notifications.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Harassment against Sgt. Daniel Florentz #9340, a finding of Unfounded for Unprofessional Conduct/Behavior against Sgt. Daniel Florentz #9340, and a finding of Exonerated for Improper Procedure (Protection Order Enforcement) against Sgt. Daniel Florentz #9340, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged harassment and unprofessional conduct did not occur and that the officer's handling of the protection-order notification and follow-up was consistent with law, Division policy, and investigative procedure.

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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Harassment

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Daniel Florentz, #9340	<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: Gatian Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Daniel Florentz, #9340	<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: Gatian Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Daniel Florentz, #9340	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Gatian



	<i>did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in General Police Order 5.05.02.</i>	Motion Status: Carried
--	--	------------------------

OPS2025-0028

Complainant: Shadina Scott

Timestamp: 1:27:35 – 1:45:37

Presented by: GM Watson

P.O. Timothy Ward, #1825

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Citation

Allegation B: Biased Policing

Allegation C: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On January 23, 2025, Shadina Scott reported that while driving past a Cleveland fire truck parked on the sidewalk a firefighter opened a door and knocked off her passenger-side mirror; she said heavy traffic prevented her from changing lanes. Ms. Scott alleged that P.O. Timothy Ward #1825, who responded from the Accident Investigation Unit, told her at the scene that the firefighter was at fault but later issued her a citation for unsafe operation around an emergency vehicle, and she raised claims of biased policing, improper procedure in issuing the citation, and insufficient service. She also alleged unprofessional behavior by fire department members, which falls outside OPS jurisdiction.

OPS reviewed body worn camera recordings from P.O. Ward and P.O. Jeffrey Frinzl, the traffic crash report and OH-1, the issued citation and court summons, the complainant's recorded interview, the officer's recorded interview, and the full case summary prepared by AIU. The WCS footage documents arrival times, on-scene statements from the fire personnel and Ms. Scott, P.O. Frinzl's initial contact and briefing to AIU, P.O. Ward's on-scene investigation and photographs, and the timeline showing Ward's arrival approximately 38 minutes after the initial response. The officer explained the process for filing a 'city morals' claim and later, after supervisory consultation and review of the evidence, concluded Ms. Scott had a duty to move over under ORC 4511.213 and issued a citation; the municipal court later found Ms. Scott not guilty. The record shows the officer documented his investigation, consulted a supervisor before charging, and based the citation on the statutory standard and the information available at the time; there is no objective evidence in the WCS or interviews that race influenced the officer's decision. The complainant's allegation about fire department conduct was referred to the appropriate agency because OPS lacks jurisdiction over non-CDP employees.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Improper Procedure (Citation) against P.O. Timothy Ward #1825, concluding the preponderance of the evidence shows the officer issued the citation based on ORC 4511.213 and after supervisory review, and his actions were consistent



with law and GPO 3.4.06; a finding of Unfounded for Biased Policing against P.O. Ward, concluding the evidence does not support that the citation or investigative decisions were motivated by race; a finding of Unfounded for Lack of Service/Insufficient Service against P.O. Ward, concluding the officer conducted an appropriate on-scene investigation given the available information and time constraints; and an Administrative Dismissal for Unprofessional Behavior against the Cleveland Division of Fire members because that allegation falls outside OPS jurisdiction.

Board Discussion Summary: During deliberation, Board members focused on the sequence of events surrounding the complainant's traffic incident with the fire department and the subsequent citation issued by the responding officer. Members noted that at the scene, both the firefighter and the officer acknowledged that the fire truck caused the damage by opening its door into the complainant's vehicle. The complainant was advised to file a moral claim, and no one on scene indicated she had failed to properly yield to an emergency vehicle. Board members emphasized that the officer did not ask key questions at the scene, such as whether another vehicle prevented her from changing lanes or whether she slowed down, both of which are relevant to determining compliance with the move over law.

Concerns were raised about the officer's later decision to issue a citation two weeks after the incident, based not on new evidence but on a conversation with a supervisor who had not been present. Board members questioned the fairness and credibility of issuing a citation after the officer had already assured the complainant, she was not at fault. They discussed how such actions could create the appearance that the citation was issued to shift liability away from the city, even if that was not the officer's intent. Members agreed that the officer failed to conduct a complete investigation before making statements to the complainant and before deciding to charge her.

Overall, the Board concluded that the officer's handling of the incident reflected a lack of thorough investigation and inconsistent decision making. Members expressed concern that the officer's initial assurances, followed by a delayed citation unsupported by additional facts, undermined public trust and created confusion for the complainant.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Citation

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: **Sustained**

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Timothy Ward, #1825	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Gatian



	<i>alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in Ohio revised Code 4511.213 and General Police Order 3.04.06.</i> <i><u>Explanation:</u> Officer Ward wrote the citation based on incomplete and insufficient investigation. Officer Ward failed to ask the complainant critical questions at the scene, including whether she had a safe opportunity to move over or whether another vehicle prevented her from changing lanes. Without gathering these materials facts, the officer lacked a proper basis for concluding she violated the move-over requirement. The Board determined that the citation was therefore improper, as it relied on assumptions rather than a thorough assessment of the circumstances.</i>	Motion Status: Carried Group Level: I- Unsatisfactory Performance, Tactics & Training Violation, Failure to Fully Investigate Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Gatian Motion Status: Carried
--	---	---

Allegation B: Biased Policing

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Timothy Ward, #1825	<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 C: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service – Timeliness of Officer Arrival

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Timothy Ward, #1825	<i>Unfounded - The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Failed Opposed: Cyagnovich, Miller, Moore, Willis Abstention: Gatian- Briefly stepped away
P.O. Timothy Ward, #1825	<i>Exonerated - The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Miller Motion Status: Carried

Cleveland Division of Fire Members

Allegation D: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct



**OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED – Not CPD Employees**

**CPRB Decision: ADMINISTRATIVELY
DISMISSED – Not CPD Employees**

Administratively dismissed due to the individuals not being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP). As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

OPS2025-0035

Timestamp: 1:45:37 – 1:50:31

Complainant: Jefferica Poindexter

Presented by: GM Watson

P.O. Eliana Cincchi, #2066

P.O. John McCarthy, #820

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On December 27, 2024, Jefferica Poindexter reported that documents, including her housing lease, were stolen from her home and that responding officers did not take a police report at the time. The complaint named P.O. Elaina Ciacchi #2066 and P.O. John N. McCartney #820 and alleged lack of service for failing to file a report when Ms. Poindexter first called. The complainant later filed with Internal Affairs and asserted the officers should have documented the incident immediately.

OPS reviewed body worn camera recordings from the initial response and subsequent follow-up visits, the 911 call and dispatch chronology, the burglary/incident reports, training records for the officers, recorded interviews with the complainant and the officers, and CIT follow-up documentation including a social-worker visit. The WCS from December 27 shows officers interviewing Ms. Poindexter, observing no signs of forced entry, and discussing whether the lease may have been misplaced; both officers had prior knowledge of repeated CIT calls to the address and noted behaviors consistent with cognitive or mental-health concerns. Supervisory review subsequently directed a follow-up, and a burglary report was completed on March 3, 2025, after additional contact and a CIT welfare check. The record shows the officers documented their observations, relied on crisis-intervention training in assessing the scene, and acted on supervisory guidance to reopen and document the matter when warranted.

OPS recommends a finding of exonerated for Lack of Service/No Service against P.O. Elaina Ciacchi #2066 and P.O. John N. McCartney #820, concluding that while the complainant's loss occurred, the officers' initial decision not to file a criminal report was consistent with their on scene observations, applicable training, and Division policy, and that subsequent supervisory direction produced the formal report and CIT follow-up.



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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Elaina Ciacchi, #2066 P.O. John McCarthy, #820	<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, and General Police Order 5.11.02.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Willis Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0037

Complainant: Heaven West-Campbell

Timestamp: 1:50:31 – 1:57:59

Presented by: GM Watson

P.O. Elijah Cintron, #1115

Allegation A: Harassment

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Lt. Daniel Day, #8585

Allegation A: Harassment

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

P.O. Christian Fernandez, #317

Allegation A: Harassment

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On March 2, 2025, Heaven West-Campbell reported that officers from the 1st District responded to a neighbor noise complaint at her residence and that P.O. Elijah Cintron #1115, P.O. Christian Fernandez #317, and Sgt. Daniel Day #9182 were unprofessional, harassing, and failed to investigate her concerns. She said the officers sided with her landlord, shone lights into her window to prevent recording, threatened arrest, and did not address alleged misconduct by the landlord, and she asked OPS to review whether the officers' conduct and the level of service were appropriate.

OPS reviewed body worn camera recordings from P.O. Cintron, P.O. Fernandez, Sgt. Day and other responding officers, 911 and dispatch audio, the incident and disorderly conduct reports, CAD entries, complainant and officer interviews, and related eviction and witness



documentation. The WCS footage documents arrival sequence, multiple neighbor and landlord statements about repeated disturbances, officers' attempts to contact and advise the resident, the resident's loud and sustained vocal responses from inside the unit, and supervisory arrival and direction to document potential disorderly conduct. The recordings show officers repeatedly asking the resident to go inside and de-escalate, an officer shining a light into the window to see inside, and officers consulting with a supervisor before documenting the incident; other officers who later responded provided additional assistance and were described by the complainant as more helpful. The record contains contemporaneous officer observations that the resident was vocally disruptive and that neighbors and the landlord reported ongoing problems, and it shows officers used crisis-intervention awareness in assessing the situation. There is no independent video or audio evidence that the officers used racial epithets or engaged in physical harassment, and the available footage corroborates that officers attempted to separate parties, warned about potential citation for disorderly conduct, and completed appropriate documentation.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Harassment against P.O. Elijah Cintron #1115, P.O. Christian Fernandez #317, and Sgt. Daniel Day #9182; a finding of Unfounded for Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct against those same members; and a finding of Unfounded for Lack of Service/No Service against those members. The preponderance of the evidence shows the officers responded to a valid neighbor complaint, attempted to de-escalate a volatile encounter, consulted a supervisor, and documented the incident consistent with Division policy and applicable reporting requirements; the recordings and interviews do not support the complainant's assertions that officers engaged in harassment, used discriminatory language, or failed to provide service.

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

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Harassment

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Elijah Cintron, #1115 Lt. Daniel Day, #8585 P.O. Christian Fernandez, #317	<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: Lack of Service: No Service



OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Elijah Cintron, #1115 Lt. Daniel Day, #8585 P.O. Christian Fernandez, #317	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Elijah Cintron, #1115 Lt. Daniel Day, #8585 P.O. Christian Fernandez, #317	<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: Vice Chair Miller Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0039

Complainant: Marlo Boyd

Timestamp: 1:57:59 – 2:10:06

Presented by: GM Watson

P.O. Massai Fluker, #1098

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Det. Angela Owens, #878

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Sgt. Brian Crites, #9299

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

P.O. Eric Mills, Jr., #2005

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On February 20, 2025, Marlo Boyd reported that she was physically assaulted by Ralph Jackson and that responding Cleveland Division of Police members failed to provide service and behaved unprofessionally. She said officers let the suspect drive away, told him not to return, did not photograph her injuries, and were dismissive when she sought follow-up; she named P.O. Massai Fluker #1098, P.O. Eric Mills Jr #2005, Sgt. Brian Crites #9299, and P.O. Angela Owens #878 and alleged lack of service, harassment, and unprofessional conduct.

OPS reviewed body worn camera recordings from multiple responding officers, 911 and dispatch audio, the completed crime report, medical records and photos of the complainant's injuries,



witness statements, and recorded follow-up interviews with the complainant and officers. The WCS footage documents officers' arrival, on-scene interviews with the victim and multiple witnesses, attempts to have the suspect return to speak with officers, a supervisor's arrival and direction to document the incident, completion of victim paperwork, provision of a report number, transport of the complainant when needed, and a detective follow-up. Subsequent investigative contacts, witness interviews, and the suspect's statement provided an account inconsistent with a clear, provable assault; the detective presented the assembled evidence to the prosecutor, who declined to pursue charges. The contemporaneous recordings and follow-up investigation show officers attempted to secure witness statements, assess injuries, explain next steps, and transfer the matter to detectives rather than ignoring the complaint or refusing to investigate.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Lack of Service/No Service, Unfounded for Harassment, and Unfounded for Unprofessional Behavior against P.O. Massai Fluker #1098, P.O. Eric Mills Jr #2005, Sgt. Brian Crites #9299, and P.O. Angela Owens #878. The preponderance of the evidence shows the officers responded to a priority assault call, conducted on-scene interviews and victim care checks, sought to obtain the suspect's in-person cooperation, documented the incident and provided a report number, and completed detective follow-up; the available recordings and investigative file do not support the complainant's assertions that officers failed to provide service or acted in a harassing or unprofessional manner.

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

Case Findings:f

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Brian Crites, #9299 P.O. Massai Fluker, #1098 P.O. Eric Mills, Jr., #2005 Det. Angela Owens, #878	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

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



P.O. Massai Fluker, #1098 Det. Angela Owens, #878	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Gatian Motion Status: Carried
--	--	---

III. OPS Case Update

YouTube Timestamp: 2:05:07 – 2:54:57

Jeff Wenninger
OPS Administrator

A. Administrative Dismissal Procedure

Admin Wenninger Statement: Administrator Wenninger explained that he had longstanding concerns about how OPS interpreted the administrative-dismissal category for “non-CDP employees.” He stated that the policy had been applied too narrowly, resulting in dismissals whenever a CDP officer separated from the Division during an investigation, even though the policy’s intent was only to dismiss complaints made against individuals who were never CDP employees in the first place. He emphasized that when a complaint is filed against an officer who was a CDP employee at the time of the incident, OPS should still complete the full investigation and present findings to the Board, regardless of whether the officer later resigns or retires. He noted that this approach aligns with how OPS handles cases filed outside the six-month discipline window: discipline may not be possible, but the investigation and adjudication still occur to provide resolution to the complainant.

Wenninger stated that this change is necessary to meet OPS’s responsibility to the community and to ensure complainants receive a full and fair review of their allegations. He also shared that the Police Commission and a recent complainant had contacted OPS, expressing hope that the Board would adopt a process ensuring full adjudication even when officers separate from CDP. As a result, he amended the final sentence of the office directive to give the Board authority to determine how to handle previously dismissed cases involving separated officers.

To illustrate the scale of the issue, Wenninger provided data showing that in 2025 and 2026, approximately 80 percent of administrative dismissals were due to officer separation. Most of these cases still went before the Board for adjudication of other involved officers, meaning only a small number were dismissed without any Board findings. Under the revised directive, OPS would revisit these cases dating back to January 2025 so the Board can determine how to adjudicate allegations involving officers who had been dismissed solely because they left CDP.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board’s discussion centered on whether OPS should continue administratively dismissing cases when a CDP officer separates from the Division



during an active investigation, and whether previously dismissed cases should be reopened. Members first acknowledged Administrator Wenninger’s directive, which clarified that the administrative-dismissal category for “non-CDP employees” had been interpreted too narrowly. He explained that the policy was intended only for complaints filed against individuals who were *never* CDP employees—not officers who later resigned or retired. Wenninger emphasized that OPS should fully investigate and adjudicate all complaints involving officers who were CDP employees at the time of the incident, even if discipline is no longer possible. He also noted that the monitoring team strongly supported this interpretation and had previously advocated for it.

Board members then discussed whether reopening past dismissals was necessary. Wenninger provided data showing that most administrative dismissals due to separation still went before the Board for adjudication of other involved officers, meaning only a small number of cases lacked any Board findings. Dalya Oprian added important context: when an officer separates during an investigation, they leave CDP in “bad standing,” and the open investigation remains on their record. If they reapply to the city, the Board could adjudicate the case at that time. She cautioned that reopening older cases could increase OPS’s and the Board’s backlog and noted that the PAT team and Law Department had concerns about resources, stakeholder impacts, and procedural alignment with the consent decree.

Board members weighed these considerations. Several agreed that OPS should move forward with the new directive for *future* cases, as it aligns with best practices, supports public trust, and imposes minimal additional workload. They also agreed that reopening older cases may not be necessary, given that separated officers already carry an open-investigation notation and that only a few cases lacked Board review. Members emphasized that policy decisions should not be driven by backlog concerns and that OPS’s responsibility to fully investigate complaints should remain the priority.

The Board also discussed whether a formal vote was needed. Some members noted that OPS has authority to determine investigative procedures and does not require Board approval to stop administrative dismissals. However, others felt it was appropriate for the Board to publicly express support for the directive, especially because adjudication decisions ultimately rest with the Board. Members agreed that OPS could begin applying the directive going forward, while the Board could defer any decision about reopening past cases until after meeting with Dr. Anderson and the PAT team.

The deliberation concluded with broad agreement that moving forward with full investigations, regardless of officer separation, is appropriate and consistent with the Board’s mission.



Members acknowledged the value of hearing from external stakeholders but did not see a compelling reason to delay forward implementation. They agreed to revisit the question of reopening older cases after the upcoming meeting with Dr. Anderson, ensuring all perspectives are considered before making a final determination.

B. OPS2024-0202 Discussion

The Board discussed Case 2024-0202 after the Cleveland Police Commission (CPC) formally requested that the case be reopened and fully investigated. The case had originally been administratively dismissed because the officer involved had separated from CDP, but CPC advised OPS that they believed the matter warranted a complete investigation and adjudication. Administrator Wenninger agreed that, based on policy interpretation, the case should be investigated, but emphasized that reopening previously dismissed cases is a Board decision, not an administrative one.

Board members noted that CPC has independent authority to reopen the case regardless of the Board's decision, and that reopening it themselves would ensure consistency and transparency. They also clarified that this single case does not determine whether the Board will revisit all past separation-based dismissals. With no objections raised, the Board moved toward reopening Case 2024-0202 for full OPS investigation and CPRB adjudication.

Motion: Reopen case OPS2024-0202 for full investigation and adjudication by OPS and the Board respectively.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Cyganovich

Motion Status: Carried

IV. New Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 2:54:57 – 3:00:40

A. Public Safety Response to Board Findings

The Board revisited concerns about how Public Safety communicates and processes sustained findings after CPRB adjudication. Members noted inconsistent receipt of acknowledgment forms from Case Prep confirming that the Findings letters were received and being processed. The Chair emphasized the need for a reliable system to track each step after the Board issues a sustained finding: when OPS sends the findings letter, when Public Safety conducts the pre-disciplinary hearing, when the Director issues a decision, and when discipline is imposed. Without this information, the Board cannot accurately respond to complainants who later ask what happened to an



officer after a sustained finding, nor can it ensure that Public Safety is acting within required timelines.

Administrator Wenninger agreed that improved tracking is essential and shared that he has already begun coordinating with OPS leadership and Case Prep to create a seamless, consistent information sharing process. His goal is for IA Pro case files to ultimately include the full lifecycle of each sustained case, from CPRB's decision through the Director's final discipline, so Board members can easily access outcomes. He committed to continuing this work and updating the Board as the system develops.

V. Adjournment

CPRB

YouTube Timestamp: 3:00:40 – 3:01:20

Motion: Adjourn August 26th, 2026, CPRB Meeting.

Motion By: Gatian

Seconded By: Vice Chair Miller

Motion Status: Carried

- The CPRB August 26th, 2026, meeting was adjourned at 12:03 p.m. EST.
- The next CPRB Meeting will be held in-person at City Hall, Room 514 on September 8th, 2026, at 9:15 a.m. EST.