



CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

August 12th, 2025

MEETING MINUTES

CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

MEMBERS

Billy Sharp, Chair
Brandon Brown, Vice Chair
Diana Cyganovich
David Gatian
Sherall Hardy - excused
Chenoa Miller
Kenneth Mountcastle
Glenn Parker III

LEGAL COUNCIL

Lillian Hall, Asst. Director of Law
Michael Hess, Asst. Director of Law

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

Kristen Traxler, Interim Administrator
Jessyca Watson, Interim General Manager
and Investigator
Vince Funari, Senior Investigator
Art Bowker, Investigator
Adam Eisen, Investigator
LJ Green, Investigator
Hamza Khabir, Investigator
Kimberly Maxwell, Investigator
James Ouk, Investigator
Joseph Szymanski, Investigator
Alayne Koenig, Investigative Assistant
Katerina Metheney, Investigative Assistant
Mary Smith-Moore, Investigative Assistant

MEETING AGENDA

I. Call to Order

Brandon Brown, Vice Chair

1. Vice Chair Brown called the August 12, 2025, the hearing to order at 9:15 a.m. and made a motion to suspend regular order.
 - a. **Chair Sharp made a motion to elect Vice Chair Brown as Chair. Member Cyganovich Seconded the motion. A Roll Call Vote was made and the motion Carried.**
 - b. **Chair Sharp made another motion to elect Member Mountcastle as Vice Chair. Motion Seconded by Member Cyganovich. Roll Call Vote was made and the motion Carried.**
 - c. Chair Sharp presented Vice Chair Brown with recognition from the County Counsel in honor of his service to the CPRB as Vice Chair. Chair Sharp thanked Vice Chair Brown and the board for their service and counsel. Chair Sharp passed the gavel, making Vice Chair Brown the new Chair.
 - d. Chair Brown thanked the board for selecting him and stated his dedication to the board. He called to action that the board not only continues to do the work that they have been doing but also step their work and involvement. Chair



Brown stated the board owes it to not only the City of Cleveland and its citizens, but also the Office of Professional Standards (OPS) to do everything they can as a board to ensure police oversight and accountability is a space of transparency and accountability “of our own”. Chair Brown stated he is excited to have Member Mountcastle serve as Vice Chair and that they will work well together and provide a good balance of backgrounds.

- e. Member Gatian expressed his appreciation to Former Chair Sharp for his work and recognized the obstacles he navigated during his term. Chair Brown echoed Member Gatian and further stated his appreciation for having the foresight as a leader to foster growth in the organization.

2. Roll Call

- a. Member Sherall Hardy had an excused absence.
- b. Member Chenoa Miller arrived right before the Roll Call Vote for Vice Chair began.

II. Approval of Minutes

Brandon Brown, Vice Chair

1. Approval of the July 8, 2025, Meeting Minutes

- a. Member Cyganovich moved for an amendment to be made in the case summary of OPS2024-0001, so it reflects “P.O. Smith then unreasonably detained the complainant’s daughter while waiting for her husband, Mr. Gibbons”. Former Chair Sharp Seconded the motion. The motion Carried.
- b. Chair Brown moved to approve the meeting minutes pending the edit of the previous motion for an amendment. Member Gatian Seconded the motion, and the motion Carried.

III. Public Comment

- a. No members of the public were present for public comment.

IV. Presentation of Investigations

Kristen Traxler
Interim Administrator



New Cases

OPS2024-0096

Complainant: Teodoro (Not-Present)

Presented by: Arthur Bowker

P.O. Valentino Vajusi, #532

Allegation A: Lack of Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On October 27, 2023, responding officers failed to complete a domestic violence report and arrest her husband, Carmen Garcia, for assaulting her on that date. The officers first met with the complainant who advised them her husband had slapped her in the face twice and struck her in the back. The officers initially observed a red mark on the complainant's face and P.O. Valentino Vajusi, #532 prepared a misdemeanor complaint statement that the complainant signed. P.O. Vajusi advised the complainant a report would be prepared. The complainant's husband stated they argued verbally but denied hitting the complainant. P.O. Vajusi realized he had previously worked with the complainant's husband and contacted his sergeant. P.O. Vajusi told his sergeant it was a "good" domestic violence case, but he was concerned of a possible conflict of interest. He was advised there was no conflict and proceeded with the investigation. The officers determined the incident to be a "he said, she said" situation and did not meet statutory requirements of a domestic violence arrest. Officers removed the complainant's husband because he was intoxicated. A police report was not filed and the officers failed to advise the complainant that a report would not be filed.

Board Discussion Summary: Member Parker III asks for clarification P.O. Vajusi's badge number as the meeting's agenda presented a different number than the one that was presented in the report. Interim Administrator Traxler states the number on the report is correct. **Former Chair Sharp made a motion for the agenda to be amended to reflect the correct badge number "532". Member Cyganovich Seconded the motion, and the motion Carried.** Member Miller asked what the officer's rationale was for not following up with the report. Investigator Bowker advised P.O. Vajusi believed it to be a verbal altercation and confirmed P.O. Vajusi did not consider the mark on the complainant's face enough evidence that the altercation became physical. Investigator Bowker informed the board that the misdemeanor report that was filled out at the beginning was discarded after the officers' investigation as they believe it to be a verbal argument which would not warrant a report. Chair Brown states that going forward all members of the board shall include factual rationale in their motions in addition to the Manual Rules and the GPOs, so the investigators be as prepared as possible when presenting information in Police Chief Hearings. Moving forward board members should include as much rationale as possible - the board is working on creating a motion template for the board to work off of. There was discussion as to when the complaint was made – the email came through within 6 months of the incident occurred,



however, the received stamp notated it as after 6 months. Discipline was deemed acceptable as OPS received the complaint within 6 months of the incident.

Additional Information to Note: *The complainant was not present but her attorney, Kathleen Lasley-Donovan, of the Legal Aid Society was present and read a statement on her behalf. After Mr. Garcia was removed from the scene, the complainant received a text from his cousin advising her that the police dropped him off at his house and she needed to be careful as the police knew Mr. Garcia. The complainant found out no report was made when she went to obtain a copy from the Justice Center and was informed no report had been made. This left the complainant to feel helpless and deceived by the people who were supposed to help her. The complainant indicated that after nothing happened to Mr. Garcia, he returned to their home and made fun of her. He threatened her not to call the police again as nothing would happen because he has his contacts there. This caused the complaint to think she would have to think twice if she needed to call 911 again. The complainant asks that her affidavit along with screenshots, with translations, be added as an addendum to OPS' report to reflect what occurred on October 27, 2023. Ms. Lasley-Donovan provided clarification that the complainant and Mr. Garcia were not married but were long-term partners who lived together and had a child together. Investigator Bowker encouraged the complainant take the information Ms. Lasley-Donovan to the police and file a new report. Member Gatian suggests that OPS revises the "received" stamp to notate when the complaint was received by OPS to help prevent administrative confusion.*

Case Findings:

P.O. Valentino Vajusi, #532

Allegation A: Lack of Service

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Recommendation: Sustained

Explanation and supporting evidence: Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include the WCS footage and OPS interviews support that there was a lack of service as on October 27, 2023, P.O. Vajusi had the complainant sign a misdemeanor complaint form and promised her a report would be made for the domestic violence allegations. A report was not taken, nor was the complainant advised a report would be taken, therefore, violating Manual Rules 4.19, 9.05, and GPO 5.05.01.

Motion by: Former Chair Sharp

Second by: Member Cyganovich

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Group Level: Group One (Reports Failure to Submit or Timeliness)



P.O. Valentino Vajusi, #532, promised the complainant, Ms. Liloa Teodoro, a police report got her allegations of domestic violence against her partner. A report was never completed. In reaching this recommendation for corrective action, the Board has determined that it is consistent with CDP's disciplinary matrix.

Motion by: Former Chair Sharp

Second by: Member Mountcastle

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

OPS2023-0257

Complainant: Crutchfield (Present)

Presented by: Joseph S. Szymanski

P.O. Tyrence James, #1208

Allegation A: Lack of Service – No Service

Allegation B: Harassment

P.O. Shanay Robinson, #408

Allegation A: Lack of Service – No Service

Allegation B: Harassment

Summary of Case Presentation: Ms. Crutchfield alleged harassment and lack of service – no service on September 21, 2023, and September 22, 2023, by P.O. Tyrence James #1208 and P.O. Shanay Robinson #408. Ms. Crutchfield stated the officers allowed her landlord, Mr. Eric Walton, to harass her and make unauthorized entry into her residence. She said she felt harassed by the officers during these incidences which caused her to experience a medical emergency due to her Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Board Discussion Summary: Chair Brown asked if this case was flagged for CIT (Crisis Intervention Team) officers. Investigator Szymanski advised that the officers did complete a CIT form, and a CIT Coordinator was assigned. Member Cyganovich said that to her recollection of the WCS footage, the call was not originally flagged as CIT – the officers thought they were coming to deal with a landlord issues. The officers realized it was a CIT case and flagged it. Member Cyganovich stated she didn't see the officers acting in a threatening or dismissive manner. She stated she believes the officers' tone was consistent to for what they were trying to do – she can understand how Ms. Crutchfield felt but did not see anything indicating any violations of policies or procedures. Chair Brown said he agrees with Member Cyganovich. Member Cyganovich asked Ms. Crutchfield if officers from CIT contacted her later. Ms. Crutchfield said they did not. The board discussed that CIT usually follows up after the incident. Former Chair Sharps asked if there is a requirement for officers to get a CIT officer on the scene when an



individual is displaying a mental health episode. Senior Investigator Funari stated it appeared that everything happened so fast and as soon as the complainant had what appeared to be a panic attack, they contact EMS treated her on scene. It is unknown if they are required to reach out to CIT. Senior Investigator referred back to previous explanations that officers do get 8 hours of training in the academy whereas CIT officers get 40 hours of training. Investigator Szymanski informed the board that the WCS footage shows that the officers exhibited de-escalation efforts and provided calm communication. The officers requested a sergeant and used crisis intervention techniques – their actions were consistent with GPO 2.01.02 which mandates the use of de-escalation when safe and feasible. Former Chair Sharp asked is there a requirement for CIT to come out when a mental health crisis is being demonstrated and if any of the officers on scene had the complete CIT training. Interim Administrator Traxler stated that on the incident report the crisis intervention section, noted the officers received a radio broadcast to respond to a tenant – landlord issues. The report indicated that a Brazos form was completed, and summary of the call was included. Interim Administrator Traxler informed Former Chair Sharp the report does not specify if P.O. James is a CIT officer but the GPO Investigator Szymanski referred to explains that if a CIT officer is not available, dispatch will send a patrol car with two officers. Chair Brown stated that to his understanding, there are not enough CIT officers to handle every situation, and he does not believe it is required for a CIT officer to be dispatched immediately. Chair Brown did not see anything that rose to a violation of GPOs and understands that the situation may have been exacerbated and manipulated by someone who did not have good intentions. He stated he does not want to discipline officers for being used as pawns in the situation the landlord may have been facilitating. Member Gatian concurred with Chair Brown and the findings of OPS. Interim Administrator Traxler went through the incident report and informed the board that the incident was coded as a crisis intervention call.

Additional Information to Note: This case is an addition to the agenda as it was that was not heard on July 30, 2025. Due to a miscommunication the complainant thought it was going to be heard on August 12, 2025, but it was scheduled to be heard on August 27, 2025. ***Former Chair Sharp made a motion to add OPS2023-0257 to the agenda. Member Cyganovich Seconded the motion, and the motion Carried.*** The complainant, as well as her mother, were present. She made a statement saying she has multiple illnesses and disabilities and further stated the interaction with the officers in this incident triggered her PTSD from previous interactions with officers. Ms. Crutchfield stated the police were called to her home under false pretenses by her former landlord. She said the officers acting in a manner that disregarded her rights and well-being. It was alleged that the officers treated her with aggression, intimidation, and disrespect; the officers did not come to mediate or protect. Ms. Crutchfield claimed the female officer (P.O. Robinson) disregarded her mental state and that the ambulance she called for herself was dismissed by the officers. She alleged that P.O. Robinson only called for an ambulance after she “criminally interrogated” Ms.



Crutchfield. Ms. Crutchfield said this incident has left her traumatized and fearful of the police. She wants fear to not be the first thing she feels when seeing a police officer. Ms. Crutchfield stated she heard all of the information presented for the first time and that is a problem. She said it appears to her as though the officer put together information to make it look as though they acted properly after she was taken to the hospital. Ms. Crutchfield expressed frustration with the board for their findings. The complainant provided OPS a copy of her statement to be added to the case file.

Case Findings:

P.O. Tyrence James, #1208

Allegation A: Lack of Service – No Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Recommendation: Exonerated

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence gathered throughout the investigation, the alleged incident did occur, however, the officers were consistent with law and based on their interaction they contacted EMS when they believe a mental health crisis was taking place.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Opposed by: Former Chair Sharp for the reasoning that the policy does not seem clear.

Motion Carried/Failed (Member Miller abstained as she knows one of the officer's involved with this case): Motion Carried

P.O. Tyrence James #1208

Allegation B: Harassment

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include WCS and the incident report the alleged conduct did not occur.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Carried/Failed (Member Miller abstained as she knows one of the officer's involved with this case): Motion Carried

P.O. Shanay Robinson, #408

Allegation A: Lack of Service – No Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Recommendation: Exonerated



Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence gathered throughout the investigation, the alleged incident did occur, however, the officers were consistent with law and based on their interaction they contacted EMS when they believe a mental health crisis was taking place.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Opposed by: Former Chair Sharp for the reasoning that the policy does not seem clear.

Motion Carried/Failed (Member Miller abstained as she knows one of the officer's involved with this case): Motion Carried

P.O. Shanay Robinson, #408

Allegation B: Harassment

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include WCS and the incident report the alleged conduct did not occur.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Carried/Failed (Member Miller abstained as she knows one of the officer's involved with this case): Motion Carried

OPS2024-0070

Complainant: Huff (Not-Present)

Presented by: Hamza Khabir

Sgt. Andre Bays, #9300

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Sgt. Randolph Murphy, #227

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Summary of Case Presentation: Ms. Huff alleged improper procedure on February 22, 2024, by Sgt. Andre Bays, #9300, and Sgt. Randolph Murphy, #227. She stated they entered the property without a warrant or complaint of criminal activity to shut down the event that was taking place stating the building has “no occupancy”. Ms. Huff alleged that when she attempted to show officers the paperwork regarding the occupancy, they refused to look at it. She indicated the officers entered the property a second time – without a warrant – and shut down a funeral service and repast stating, “they were not religious events”.



Board Discussion Summary: Former Chair Sharp asked what the reasoning was for the officers entering the establishment and Investigator Khabir informed they entered for a liquor inspection. Investigator Khabir clarified the officers were part of the 5th District's Vice Unit per Former Chair Sharp's inquiry. Member Gatian stated that to his recollection a minister, who was the property owner, stated this was a religious event, and an officer said "No it isn't. It's a birthday party." and inquired if there is anything that constitutes was a religious function. He stated that he is not sure if officers have the right to pass judgement on what is considered a religious event. Investigator Khabir informed that the officers had discretion in handling this incident and chose to shut the event down. Former Chair Sharp asked if liquor was being sold and Investigator Khabir stated that liquor was on the premise – the occupancy law only refers to liquor on the premises it does not differentiate between if the liquor is being sold or not. Member Gatian also asked if Mr. Smith was given inaccurate information regarding the occupancy permit. Investigator Khabir stated that as he investigated the case there was misinformation presented but it is unclear as to where it originated. Former Chair Sharp inquired who stated there was a religious event taking place. Investigator Khabir advised the complainant states it was a religious event.

***Additional Information to Note:** The complainant was not present, but Ellory Smith, manager of Oasis Party Center, was present and made a statement. He clarified the event was a birthday party, and specified alcohol was given away, not sold. Mr. Smith stated he felt as though the officers involved had it out for him. He said the officers told him they "knew the establishment was fronted by drug money" – he denied the officers' claim. Mr. Smith stated the officers shut down the repast and threatened him. He alleged the officers told him, off the record, the repast would not be reopened as they "knew for a fact" it was being used to sell drugs. Mr. Smith said the SWAT team was brought in to shut down the event because there was liquor present. He voiced that there was confusion in regard to the occupancy permit for the establishment. Member Gatian asked Mr. Smith if, to his knowledge, he had a valid occupancy permit. Mr. Smith stated to his knowledge he had followed the proper steps and did have a valid occupancy permit in place.*

Case Findings:

Sgt. Andre Bays, #9300

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Recommendation: Exonerated

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include the WCS footage and OPS interviews, the alleged incident did occur; however, it within the purview ORC 5502.19.

Motion by: Member Cyganovich

Second by: Member Parker III



Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Sgt. Randolph Murphy, #227

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Recommendation: Exonerated

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include the WCS footage and OPS interviews, the alleged incident did occur; however, it within the purview ORC 5502.19.

Motion by: Member Cyganovich

Second by: Member Parker III

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

OPS2023-0131

Complainant: Gilbert (Not-Present)

Presented by: Jessyca Watson

Sgt. Dalia Lopez, #9310

Allegation A: Lack of Service

Summary of Case Presentation: The complainant alleged lack of service by Sgt. Dalia Lopez, #9310, in relation to an Internal Affairs (IA) investigation for a delayed response allegation against the officers responding to an emergency call of a murder in progress on September 6, 2022. The complainant represents the family of Carly Capek. He alleged that the delayed response time resulted in the murder of Carly Capek. The Internal Affairs Report did not find any policy violations. The complainant did not think Sgt. Lopez investigated the case thoroughly and is concerned with the way it was handled.

Board Discussion Summary: Chair Brown clarifies the complaint is not in regard to the response time, it is regarding the investigation into the response time. Chair Brown asked if any rationale was provided for why it took so long for officers to respond. Investigator Watson noted it was the end of shift, and the officers had already turned off their MCAD and turned it back on because the other car was not available. The officers indicated it was raining so they did not use lights and sirens or speed – traffic was also noted at this time. Investigator Watson informed the board that Sgt. Lopez made a policy recommendation that light and sirens be a requirement for priority 1 calls – the GPO does not say lights and sirens are necessary. Chair Brown and Former Chair Sharp expressed concerns about lights and sirens not being used for a priority 1 call because it was raining. Chair Brown stated this appears to be a policy issue for the delayed response and there is no indication that Sgt. Lopez did not complete a thorough investigation. Former Chair Sharp stated



that after this matter is adjudicated, they assist Sgt. Lopez by asking the Office of Professional Standards to draft a recommendation in regard to the lights and sirens. Chair Sharp agreed with Vice Chair Brown and noted it may be a good idea for OPS to reach out to the Community Policing Commission (CPC) and ask them to do a review of priority 1 response policy. Investigator Watson read Sgt. Watson recommendation. Chair Brown stated he thinks it is a fine policy recommendation. Chair Brown made a motion for OPS to send Sgt. Lopez's recommendation to CPC and ask them to review for further inquiry. Member Miller brought up the possible issue of this complaint being filed more than six months after the incident. Law advised that does not change the board's position in adjudicating the matter.

Additional Information to Note: Investigator Watson noted Sgt. Lopez found 4 additional allegations during her IA investigator. Those allegations are as follows: district assignment (not sustained), WCS violation (sustained), unprofessional behavior (sustained), and missing key information (sustained). The sustained allegations have already gone through discipline with the CDP. Investigator Watson read a statement on behalf of the complainant, who was not present. The complainant stated the original 911 call was made at 12:32 p.m. and officers arrived on scene at 12:46 p.m. - 14 minutes after the 911 call. Officers did not enter the residence until 12:52 p.m. - 20 minutes after the 911 call. He noted that EMS arrived on scene at 12:41 p.m. and the fire department arrived at 12:42 p.m. - both of these responding units arrived before cruiser 2B15. He emphasized the importance of these minutes and specified that those minutes make the difference between life and death. The complainant noted that cruiser 2B15 did not have its lights and sirens which was disturbing given the seriousness of the call. He indicated that he is concerned that if the officers had used their lights and sirens, the outcome of the incident may have been different. ***Former Chair Sharp made a motion that OPS drafts a policy regarding light and sirens on priority calls for the board to send to CPRB and send Sgt. Lopez's findings to CPC. Vice Chair Mountcastle Seconded the motion – Member Cyganovich abstained as she knows the complainant – the motion carried.***

Case Findings:

Sgt. Dalia Lopez, #9310

Allegation A: Lack of Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerate

CPRB Recommendation: Exonerate

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include the WCS footage, OPS interviews, and records the alleged incident did occur, however, it was in compliance with Manual Rules 4.01.

Motion by: Vice Chair Mountcastle



Second by: Member Gatian

Motion Carried/Failed (Member Cyganovich abstained as she knows the complainant,
Terry Gilbert): Motion Carried

OPS2024-0029

Complainant: Allen (Not-Present)

Presented by: Adam Eisen

P.O. Karli Ayers, #635

Allegation A: Harassment

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Det. Richard Adams, #12

Allegation A: Harassment

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: The complainant alleged that she was harassed by CDP in relation to a probate warrant. WCS footage shows officers attempting to serve the warrant, but no one answered the door. The incident report indicated the complainant reported officers sitting outside, but she did not want to go outside. During an interview with OPS, Det. Adams stated that he never interacted with Ms. Allen (the complainant) and double checked his detective logs to confirm in after Ms. Allen named him as an officer harassing her. P.O. Ayers did not interact with the complainant in the attempt to serve the warrant.

Board Discussion Summary: No questions.

***Additional Information to Note:** The allegation was also against P.O. Dana Lieberger, who resigned effective May 30, 2024.*

Case Findings:

P.O. Karli Ayers, #635

Allegation A: Harassment

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include the investigation and supporting documentation indicating there was no interaction and therefore the harassment did not occur.

Motion by: Member Cyganovich

Second by: Former Chair Sharp



Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

P.O. Karli Ayers, #635

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include the investigation and supporting documentation indicating there was no interaction and therefore there is no unprofessional conduct that could have occurred.

Motion by: Member Cyganovich

Second by: Former Chair Sharp

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Det. Richard Adams, #12

Allegation A: Harassment

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence, Det. Adams never had contact with the complainant.

Motion by: Member Cyganovich

Second by: Former Chair Sharp

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Det. Richard Adams, #12

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence, Det. Adams never had contact with the complainant.

Motion by: Member Cyganovich

Second by: Former Chair Sharp

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

OPS2022-0025

Complainant: Cloud (Not-Present)

Presented by: Adam Eisen

Chief Dispatcher Lisa Blevins, #229

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct



Dispatcher Jessica Hayes-Bertulies, #30

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Dispatcher Paige Vargo, #60

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Safety Telephone Operator Michelle Wagner, #001

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: The complainant, Ms. Cloud, alleged unprofessional behavior/misconduct by a dispatcher named “Aqua” on January 26, 2022. Ms. Cloud was in a car accident and called 911 five times in the span of 44 minutes. Her sister made one additional call in relation to the incident. The call was initially marked at a priority 3. Call priority logs showed a priority 1, a priority 2, and three other priority 3 calls during the same time frame as Ms. Cloud’s call, leading to an unavoidable work delay. There was no evidence to indicate the dispatchers did not act in a way that would diminish the esteem of CDP in the eyes of the public.

Board Discussion Summary: Chair Brown asked why the Chief moved the call up to a priority 2 call. Investigator Eisen advised it was due to the complainant's repetitive calls. Chair Brown stated that is not abnormal to do when a caller continuously calls dispatch. Member Cyganovich inquired as to why the allegation against the Communications Specialist was dismissed. Investigator Eisen informed that Ms. Mazzei has since resigned and therefore no longer employed by CDP.

Additional Information to Note: *The allegation against Bi-Lingual Communications Specialist Allison Mazzei, #063 was administratively dismissed.*

Case Findings:

Chief Dispatcher Lisa Blevins, #229

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include the audio recording from the dispatcher, there were no violations of Manual Rules 5.01.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Cyganovich

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried



Dispatcher Jessica Hayes-Bertulies, #30

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include the audio recording from the dispatcher, there were no violations of Manual Rules 5.01.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Cyganovich

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Dispatcher Paige Vargo, #60

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include the audio recording from the dispatcher, there were no violations of Manual Rules 5.01.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Cyganovich

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Safety Telephone Operator Michelle Wagner, #001

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include the audio recording from the dispatcher, there were no violations of Manual Rules 5.01.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Cyganovich

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

OPS2024-0089

Complainant: Hampton (Not-Present)

Presented by: Hamza Khabir

P.O. Josue Ballesteros-Flores, #227

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Citation



Summary of Case Presentation: The complainant stated he was in a car accident where a vehicle hit him from behind causing him to crash into a pole. The airbag deployed and he suffered nonlife-threatening injuries. P.O. Ballesteros-Flores cited the complainant for failing to control his vehicle. P.O. Ballesteros-Flores stated to OPS that he was dispatched to the scene and the Real Time Camera (RTC) personnel advised him, Mr. Hampton (the complainant) was the one who lost control and struck a vehicle causing the accident. The complainant's recollection is not consistent with the video footage or analysis. Mr. Hampton made several statements to OPS that were inconsistent with the facts of the case.

Board Discussion Summary: Member Cyganovich inquired if there is an OH-1 for the incident. Investigator Khabir confirmed there is and provided Member Cyganovich a copy.

Additional Information to Note: OPS was asked for the OH-1 report to be added to the file.

Case Findings:

P.O. Josue Ballesteros-Flores, #227

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Citation

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Recommendation: Exonerated

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include WCS footage, OPS interviews, and records, the alleged incident did occur; however, P.O. Ballesteros-Flores, acted in compliance with Manual Rules 3.12 and GPO 8.1.02.

Motion by: Former Chair Sharp

Second by: Member Parker III

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

OPS2022-0162

Complainant: Thomas (Not-Present)

Presented by: Joseph S. Szymanski

P.O. Jennifer Bachman, #703

Allegation A: Biased Policing

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation C: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: Mr. Thomas alleged racial bias policing, unprofessional behavior/misconduct, and insufficient service by P.O. Jennifer Bachman, #703 on July 5, 2022. He said he was made to feel racial bias, a negative assessment, and treated with less respect and fairness than a white adult. Mr. Thomas stated he waited for 3 hours to file an incident report. Mr.



Thomas did not view the first district lobby as busy. P.O. Bachman indicated a high workload, and she was the only officer taking report with each report taking her approximately 40-55 minutes to complete.

Board Discussion Summary: Vice Chair Mountcastle inquired if insufficient evidence was considered for all three of the allegations due to the lack of WCS footage. Investigator Szymanski stated he examined the reports and other evidence to determine the other allegations as unfounded and exonerated. Former Chair Sharp asked if the complaint was submitted within 30 days after the incident. Investigator Szymanski confirmed it was. Former Chair Sharp inquired as to why the WCS was not automatically marked as the complaint was submitted within the 30-day retention period. The case was not originally assigned to Investigator Szymanski; it was transferred to him after the investigation has started. Both Investigator Szymanski and Senior Investigator Funari inform the board that they are unable to confirm if the original investigator had obtained the original WCS footage as they cannot access IAPRO outside of the office. **Former Chair Sharp made a motion for OPS to figure out the retention issues for WCS, as well as redo the report for the next CPRB session. Member Cyganovich Seconded the motion and the motion Carried.** Chair Brown asked Investigator Szymanski is in his experience if taking 45 minutes to write a report is normal. Investigator Szymanski indicated he believed standard practice to be 30-45 minutes.

Additional Information to Note: *The WCS video reached retention and was deleted from Axon (evidence.com).*

Case Findings:

P.O. Jennifer Bachman, #703

Allegation A: Biased Policing

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence to include visitor logs, the alleged conduct did not occur.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Parker III

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

P.O. Jennifer Bachman, #703

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence



Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence there is no indication as to whether the alleged incident did or did not occur.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Parker III

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

P.O. Jennifer Bachman, #703

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Recommendation: Exonerated

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence the alleged conduct did occur – it did take 3 hours for the complainant's report to be completed – however, the officer's actions were consistent with Manual Rules 4.06 and 9.05. Reports can take upwards of 45 minutes and logs indicate there were six citizens ahead of the complainant with only one officer taking the complaints.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Parker III

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

OPS2023-0195

Complainant: Jackson (Not-Present)

Presented by: James Ouk

P.O. Jalen Deon Smith, #2158

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Det. Daniel R. Taylor, #1090

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Excessive Force

Allegation D: Other Matter – Divisional Values

Sgt. Kevin Walker, #9234

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Excessive Force

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Failure to Report

Summary of Case Presentation: This was a complex case. On August 4, 2023, Mr. Jackson chased a male into the Jack Casino while attempting to throw bricks at him. He was escorted out of the casino by Sgt. Walker and Det. Taylor. Mr. Taylor waited outside of the casino for the male



and proceeded to once again chase and throw bricks at him. Sgt. Walker and Det. Taylor detained Mr. Jackson for throwing bricks at the male. Mr. Jackson stated to patrol officers that he was wronged by Sgt. Walker and Det. Taylor. He alleged that Det. Taylor and Sgt. Walker rubbed his head against concrete wall, causing him to bleed. All officers testified that they did not see blood nor head injuries on Mr. Jackson. Sgt. Walker testified that only de minimis force was used to apprehend Mr. Jackson. It was noted that there is not footage of the alleged excessive force, and the Jack Casino security cameras do not have audio. None of the officers in contact with Mr. Jackson used profanity. P.O. Searles-Fowler and P.O. Smith took Mr. Jackson to University Hospital for a psych evaluation due to his interaction being labeled as CIT. Mr. Jackson was detained on August 4, 2023; however, he did not complete his report until October 25, 2024 – 446 days after the alleged incident. Sgt. Walker admitted he did not complete the report until OPS brought it to his attention that one had not been completed. During the course of the investigation, Det. Taylor was not forthcoming with information during his interview with OPS. He stated multiple times that he did not recall the incident or the events that took place. He continued to say he did not recall any details after he was shown video footage from the incident. It was noted that every other officer involved recalled the incident and provided a detailed recount of the events. The previous OPS Administrator felt that these actions violated CDP divisional values, specifically integrity. Det. Taylor has two separate violations of not reporting use of force, specifically while working off duty at the casino.

Board Discussion Summary: Member Gatian asked Investigator Ouk how long after the incident did the officer interview take place – the interviews took place in early 2025, approximately two years later. Member Gatian asked if it is unreasonable for someone to not remember the incident roughly two years later and inquired to the basis of the Det. Taylor saying “I don’t remember” as dishonesty. Investigator Ouk stated Det. Taylor is a narcotics detective and assumes that this is something a detective would be able to remember. He noted that Det. Taylor has two separate incidences of not reporting use of force, which indicated to him the detective was alluding that he did not want to answer the questions. Chair Brown confirmed with Administrator Traxler and advised that prior issues with reporting, cannot be used to determine whether or not he is lying about not remembering. Former Chair Sharp said that, for the future, investigators should refrain from indicating what their personal belief would be. Member Cyganovich stated that she finds it concerning that after being shown footage from all of the events, Det. Taylor still does not remember. In response to Former Chair Sharp, Chair Brown stated that when asking investigators for recommendations like this, it somewhat requires the officer to give some kind of guidance. Chair Brown asked if Sgt. Walker was required to do the report as he was off duty at the time of the incident or if it should have been the on-duty officers – questioned the clarity of the Manual Rules. Investigator Ouk stated Sgt. Walker was the supervisor on scene, even though he was off



duty. Chronology report from dispatch also show that Sgt. Walker indicated he would complete the report.

Additional Information to Note: P.O. Rashaun Thomas Searles-Fowler, #2157 was also accused of Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct. He separated from CDP as of April 10, 2025.

Case Findings:

P.O. Jalen Deon Smith, #2158

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence gathered throughout the investigation; the alleged conduct did not occur, and the officer was in compliance with Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, and 5.09.

Motion by: Former Chair Sharp

Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Det. Daniel R. Taylor, #1090

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

The Preponderance of the Evidence fails to indicate if the officer acting in accordance with Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, and 5.09.

Motion by: Former Chair Sharp

Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Sgt. Kevin Walker, #9234

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

The Preponderance of the Evidence fails to indicate if the officer acting in accordance with Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, and 5.09.

Motion by: Former Chair Sharp

Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried



Det. Daniel R. Taylor, #1090

Allegation B: Excessive Force

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

As the Preponderance of the Evidence fails to establish whether the conduct did or did not occur.

Motion by: Former Chair Sharp

Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Sgt. Kevin Walker, #9234

Allegation B: Excessive Force

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

As the Preponderance of the Evidence fails to establish whether the conduct did or did not occur.

Motion by: Former Chair Sharp

Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Sgt. Kevin Walker, #9234

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Failure to Report

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Recommendation: Sustained

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence, Sgt. Walker, who was the supervisor on scene, did not complete the initial report until over a year after the incident; despite filling out a chronology stating he would handle the report. The report was completed once he was alerted by OPS that a report was needed. Furthermore, Sgt. Walker was in violation of Manual Rules 9.05, 9.07, and 9.08.

Motion by: Former Chair Sharp

Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Group Level: Group one (Failure to Report, Failure to Submit, or Timeliness)

Sgt. Kevin Walker, #9234 failed to complete the incident report until over a year after the incident when it was brought up to him. In reaching this recommendation for corrective action, the Board has determined that it is consistent with CDP's disciplinary matrix.



Motion by: Former Chair Sharp
Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle
Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Det. Daniel R. Taylor, #1090

Allegation D: Other Matter – Divisional Values

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Recommendation: Sustained

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence, the alleged conduct did occur, and the officer's actions were in violation GPO 1.01.03 and Manual Rule 5.01.

Motion by: Former Chair Sharp

Second by: Member Cyganovich

Opposed by: Member Gatian and Chair Brown with the rationale that it is impossible to “get into the head of the officer” and it is possible for someone to be shown a video of something they do not remember. Sgt. Walker claimed he did not remember the incident, not that the incident did not happen.

Motion Carried/Failed (Member Parker III abstained as he was not present for deliberation on this matter): Motion Carried

Motion to amend the original finding of sustained to include additional rationale – GPO 1.01.03 and Manual Rule 5.01 were violated as the officer failed to display high moral and ethical standards that diminished the esteem of the CDP stating he failed to remember incident, even after viewing record of the incident.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Opposed by: Member Gatian for the same rational as previously discussed.

Motion Carried/Failed (Member Parker III abstained for the same rationale as previously discussed): Motion Carried

Group Level: Group Two (Conduct Unbecoming)

Det. Daniel R. Taylor, #1090

In reaching this recommendation for corrective action, the Board has determined that it is consistent with CDP's disciplinary matrix.

Motion by: Former Chair Sharp

Second by: Member Cyganovich

Opposed by: Member Gatian for the same rationale previously discussed

Motion Carried/Failed (Member Parker III abstained for the same rationale as previously stated): Motion Carried



MEETING RECESS

Departed at 12:57 p.m. and returned at 1:20 p.m.

OPS2022-0137

Complainant: Tucker (Not-Present)

Presented by: Joseph S. Szymanski

P.O. Dimitri Blackwell, #710

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Response Time

P.O. Mason Sedlak, #1157

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Response Time

Det. Richard Adams, #12

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation D: Other Matter - Impropriety

Lt. Michael Shroeder, #9246

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On May 2, 2022, P.O. Mason Sedlak, #1157 and P.O. Dimitri Blackwell, #710 had a response time that was complicit with Manual Rules. On May 8, 2022, Det. Richard Adams, #12 and Lt. Michael Shroeder, #9246 were assigned to investigate the burglary – investigation involved obtaining search warrants which could not be executed due to logistical and procedural delays beyond their control. Ms. Tucker claimed Detective Adams and Sergeant Schroeder were dismissive, aggressive, rude, and there was a pattern of unprofessional behavior. No evidence of substantiated violations of CDP Manual Rules. There was a concern of potential conflict of interest and propriety involving Det. Adams and Ms. Tucker’s father. The relationship was disclosed, and no evidence supported a violation of CDP.

Board Discussion Summary: No questions.

Additional Information to Note: Allegation A: lack of service: response time for P.O. Juan Ceden, #483 was administratively dismissed – CDP separated.

Case Findings:



P.O. Dimitri Blackwell, #710

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Response Time

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Recommendation: Exonerated

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence, the alleged conduct did occur; however, it was in compliance with GPOs and Manual Rules as there were legitimate reasons for delay.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Parker III

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

P.O. Mason Sedlak, #1157

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Response Time

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Recommendation: Exonerated

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence, the alleged conduct did occur; however, it was in compliance with GPOs and Manual Rules as there were legitimate reasons for delay.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Parker III

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Det. Richard Allen #12

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence the alleged conduct did not occur.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Parker III

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Lt. Michael Shroeder, #9246

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

Based on the Preponderance of the Evidence the alleged conduct did not occur.

Motion by: Chair Brown



Second by: Member Parker III

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Det. Richard Allen #12

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

As the Preponderance of the Evidence suggests that the allegations did not occur.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Parker III

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Lt. Michael Shroeder, #9246

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

As the Preponderance of the Evidence suggests that the allegations did not occur.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Parker III

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

Det. Richard Allen #12

Allegation D: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Recommendation: Unfounded

As the Preponderance of the Evidence suggests that the allegations did not occur.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Member Parker III

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried



Departures

OPS2023-0086

Complainant: Alexander

Investigator Hamza Khabir

Motion made to continue with original finding and issue a final summary to the Chief on the basis that the Chief's rationale did not show by clear and convincing evidence that the board's original finding was incorrect.

Motion by: Chair Brown.

Second by: Member Cyganovich

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

OPS2024-0047

Complainant: Anonymous

Investigator: Art Bowker

Motion made to table this case until the September 9, 2025, meeting so the board can gather their thoughts and review the file to formulate their opinion, with a friendly amendment for OPS to resend the entire case file.

Motion by: Chair Brown.

Second by: Member Cyganovich

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried

OPS2024-0130

Complainant: Anonymous

Investigator: Art Bowker

Motion to table the third departure with the friendly amendment for that it be tabled until the August 27, 2025, meeting.

Motion by: Former Chair Sharp

Second by: Chair Brown

Motion Carried/Failed: Motion Carried



VI. OPS Status Report

A. Update

Person 1

Title

VII. Old Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

A. NACOLE registrations are complete.

VIII. New Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

A. Chair Brown made a motion to suspend regular agenda order. Seconded by Former Chair Sharp. Motion Carried

a. OPS requested the CPRB to approve a subpoena to speak to a Jack Casino employee regarding OPS2025-0046.

i. Chair Brown moved to approve the subpoena and Former Chair Sharp Seconded the motion. Motion Carried.

b. OPS asked for Elan Pavlinich resignation to be accepted. He resigned on July 15, 2025 and his last day was August 1, 2025.

i. Chair Brown stated the board is saddened to see him go but wishes him the best and stated he did a great job in this position. Chair Brown made a motion to accept. Member Cyganovich Seconded. Motion Carried.

B. Chair Brown made a motion to hire Jalecia Fair as the Administrative Assistant/CPRB Secretary. Member Miller Seconded the motion. Motion Carried.

IX. Executive Session

CPRB

A. Chair Brown move to enter executive session at starting 2:31 p.m. to discuss personnel, employment, and discipline matters, as well as OPS dashboard matters which is required by law to be confidential. Unanimous roll call vote. Motion Carried.

B. The board returned from executive session at 2:56 p.m.

X. Adjournment

CPRB

A. Former Chair Sharp moved to adjourn the hearing. Member Miller Seconded the motion. Motion Carried.