



CITY OF CHICAGO  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

20  
25

# Recommendation to Inform and Improve the Chicago Police Department's Rule 47

December 31, 2025

DEBORAH WITZBURG | INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE CITY OF CHICAGO  
TOBARA RICHARDSON | DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR PUBLIC SAFETY

December 31, 2025

Pursuant to the Municipal Code of Chicago (MCC) § 2-56-230(c), the Public Safety section of the City of Chicago Office of Inspector General (OIG) conducts reviews of individual closed disciplinary investigations conducted by the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) and the Chicago Police Department's (CPD) Bureau of Internal Affairs (BIA). Based on those reviews, OIG may make recommendations to inform and improve future disciplinary investigations to ensure that they are complete, thorough, objective, and fair.

CPD's Rules and Regulations includes its Rules of Conduct, which serve to inform its members of conduct prohibited by the Department. Rule 47 prohibits members from "[a]ssociating or fraternizing with any person known to have been convicted of any felony or misdemeanor, either State or Federal, excluding traffic and municipal ordinance violations." During its regular review of closed disciplinary investigations conducted by BIA, OIG identified inconsistencies across investigations in BIA's analyses of the relationship between the accused CPD member and the individual convicted of a felony.

While Rule 47 does not identify exclusions to the rule, BIA's investigatory outcomes have informally defined exceptions to its rule. For example, in one investigation BIA determined that a CPD member knowingly associated with a convicted felon, who was their sibling, and briefly allowed that sibling to reside with them. In this investigation, BIA exonerated the allegation of violating Rule 47, concluding that the CPD member's explanation to house their family member was "compelling enough to be exculpatory." Unlike similar policies in other law enforcement jurisdictions, CPD's Rule 47 does not address any familial exceptions to associating or fraternizing with individuals known to have been convicted of any felony or misdemeanor.

Outcomes in investigations where a CPD member has a non-familial relationship with a convicted felon vary significantly. In one case, BIA found that a CPD member who was romantically involved with a convicted felon, but ended the relationship after learning of the person's history, was still in violation of Rule 47. In another investigation, a CPD member who was friends with a convicted felon stated that they knew the individual was previously incarcerated, but did not know that the individual was a convicted felon. Despite this denial, BIA found the CPD member violated Rule 47. However, in other investigations, the CPD member denying knowledge of an individual's status as a convicted felon was enough to not sustain the Rule 47 violation against the CPD member.

Currently, CPD's Rule 47 does not contain explicit exceptions, yet certain exceptions are sometimes—but not always—applied in practice, which risks arbitrary enforcement and unfair outcomes for members accused of violating Rule 47. Accordingly, CPD members and BIA may benefit from an updated Rule 47 that clearly defines expectations and prohibitions to facilitate its fair and consistent application.

In order to inform and improve future investigations, OIG recommended that CPD: (1) reevaluate the purpose and/or goal of Rule 47 to include defining any circumstances that may be exempt from Rule 47 violations and make revisions to the policy accordingly; and (2) outline any reporting procedures that Department members may utilize when associating with a convicted felon. OIG also presented this letter with its recommendations to the Chicago Police Board.

In response to OIG's recommendations, the Chicago Police Board noted that it has "the power to adopt Rules and Regulations for the Chicago Police Department (CPD)" and plans to continue to review and draft revisions to CPD's Rules of Conduct that "will more clearly and effectively communicate to Chicago police officers and the public how CPD members are required to conduct themselves." The Chicago Police Board stated that it will consider OIG's recommendations related to Rule 47.

In response to OIG's recommendations, CPD stated, "...the Police Board has the authority to adopt the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department pursuant to section 2-84-030 of the Municipal Code of Chicago. CPD recognizes the importance of clear and consistent direction to all members, as well as the consistent and fair application of discipline."

OIG's letter to CPD containing its recommendations is attached at Appendix A, the Police Board's response is attached at Appendix B, and CPD's response is attached at Appendix C.



Deborah Witzburg | Inspector General  
City of Chicago  
Office of Inspector General  
231 S. LaSalle St., 12th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60604  
Phone: (773) 478-7799

## Via Electronic Mail

December 1, 2025

Larry Snelling  
Superintendent  
Chicago Police Department  
3510 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60653

Re: Recommendation to Inform and Improve Future Investigations Regarding Allegations of Rule 47 Violations

Dear Superintendent Snelling:

Pursuant to the Municipal Code of Chicago (MCC) §§ 2-56-30 and -230, the Public Safety section of the City of Chicago Office of Inspector General (OIG) writes to recommend measures to inform and improve investigations conducted by the Chicago Police Department's (CPD) Bureau of Internal Affairs (BIA) into alleged violations of CPD's Rule 47.

CPD Rules and Regulations serves as its governing document defining the goals and standards of conduct expected of CPD members. It includes the Law Enforcement Code of Ethics, which are "adopted as a general standard of conduct for all sworn members of the Department."<sup>1</sup> One of these standards states that CPD members, "will keep [their] private life unsullied as an example to all."<sup>2</sup> The Standards of Conduct further state, "The public demands that the integrity of its law enforcement officers be above reproach...Succumbing to even minor temptation can be the genesis which will ultimately destroy an individual's effectiveness and contribute to the corruption of countless others. A member must scrupulously avoid any conduct which might compromise the integrity of himself, his fellow members, or the Department." Finally, the Standards of Conduct state, "Since the conduct of a member, on or off duty, does reflect directly upon the Department, a member must at all times conduct himself in a manner which does not bring discredit to himself, the Department or the city."<sup>3</sup>

CPD's Rules and Regulations contains its Rules of Conduct, which serve to inform its members of conduct prohibited by the Department. Rule 47 prohibits members from "[a]ssociating or fraternizing with any person known to have been convicted of any felony or misdemeanor, either State or Federal, excluding traffic and municipal ordinance violations."<sup>4</sup> In the course of its regular

<sup>1</sup> Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department, effective April 16, 2015.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.



review of closed disciplinary investigations conducted by BIA pursuant to MCC § 2-56-230(c), OIG has identified inconsistencies across investigations in BIA's analyses of the relationship between the accused CPD member and the individual convicted of a felony.

### **CPD's Rule 47 and Related Misconduct Investigations**

The investigations described below are a sample of the relevant ones which OIG has reviewed pursuant to MCC § 2-56-230(c).

#### **Log #2009-1025008**

In Log #2009-1025008, BIA investigated allegations that Officer Samantha Moore, Star #13134, violated Rule 47 after it was discovered that they knowingly associated with a convicted felon. The felon was Officer Moore's sibling, and they were aware of their criminal history when they allowed them to live with them for approximately six months.<sup>5</sup> In an interview with BIA, Officer Moore explained that they allowed their sibling to live with them because the sibling had nowhere else to go.<sup>6</sup> BIA reached a finding of Exonerated, concluding that the fact of the convicted felon at issue's being an immediate family member was "compelling enough to be exculpatory."<sup>7</sup>

#### **Log #2019-0002256**

In Log #2019-0002256, BIA initiated an investigation involving allegations "...that on [an] unknown date, time and location, the accused P.O. Danae MORRIS #14676 associated with convicted felons as discovered through [name omitted] Facebook social media account " and "...that accused P.O. Danae MORRIS #14676 associates with convicted felon [Individual A] and other convicted felons" in violation of Rule 47.<sup>8</sup> BIA also brought three additional allegations that Officer Morris used the Department's Computerized Information System to search for the [Individual A] arrest record, rap sheet, and arrestee history without having official police business. BIA sustained one of the two alleged violations of Rule 47 and the allegations of misuse of Department records.<sup>9</sup>

The Department learned of Officer Morris' association with a convicted felon while using public internet resources during a gang activity investigation. During the Department's investigation, the involved subject, who was engaged to Officer Morris, was identified as an active gang member and convicted felon. The Department found that Officer Morris and the subject frequently interacted on each other's Facebook profiles.<sup>10</sup> During BIA's interview with Officer Morris, she explained that they were Facebook friends with some of the involved subject's friends and family members who were also active gang members and convicted felons, and attended the same social functions as them on a few occasions, but that they never "associated" with them by conversing or maintaining any relationship with them.<sup>11</sup> Also, Officer Morris admitted to using Department systems to access the involved subject's information in March 2018 and January 2019 after the subject began displaying suspicious behavior. Officer Morris began to "create distance" from the subject but continued

---

<sup>5</sup> Attachment 36, p. 3-4.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Attachment 70, p. 8.

<sup>8</sup> Attachment 46, p. 7.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>10</sup> Attachment 12.

<sup>11</sup> Attachment 25, p. 1-2.

associating with them after learning of their conviction history.<sup>12</sup> The relationship between the subject and Officer Morris ended in September 2019.<sup>13</sup> BIA conducted multiple surveillances of Officer Morris between January and February 2020. Officer Morris was not observed associating with the subject or any of their associates.<sup>14</sup>

BIA sustained the allegation that Officer Morris violated Rule 47 by associating with a convicted felon and other convicted felons.<sup>15</sup> Officer Morris requested mediation and agreed to a 90-day suspension.<sup>16</sup>

#### Log #2021-0002004

In Log #2021-0002004, it was alleged that Officer Jennifer Oppedisano-Caputo, Star #9687, associated with a known convicted felon and was married to that individual. CPD members who were friends with Officer Oppedisano-Caputo on social media reported that the individual changed their relationship status as “Married” to Officer Oppedisano-Caputo, linking her account name “Jennifer Lyn.” The individual also made a post referring to their time in prison.<sup>17</sup> A search of the individual’s account found multiple photos posted of themselves with Officer Oppedisano-Caputo, engaging in romantic behavior and referring to Officer Oppedisano-Caputo as “wifey.”<sup>18</sup>

BIA did not sustain either allegation against Officer Oppedisano-Caputo, stating that it could not determine whether Officer Oppedisano-Caputo was aware of the individual’s status as a convicted felon. BIA further wrote that it found no evidence that the two parties were legally married, and that it could not verify that either party appeared in the photos posted on social media.<sup>19</sup> BIA, however, never attempted to interview any of the involved parties, including Officer Oppedisano-Caputo. Officer Oppedisano-Caputo was discharged from CPD in July 2024 following an unrelated Police Board hearing.<sup>20</sup>

#### Log #2021-0003261

In Log #2021-0003261, Officer Charlie Bell, Star #10560, was accused of associating with a known felon after CPD conducted a background check of a person Officer Bell reported as unresponsive in Officer Bell’s recreational vehicle. The friend, whom Officer Bell knew for “two to three years,” was pronounced deceased at the scene. Officer Bell told responding Department members that the friend was using illegal drugs.<sup>21</sup> Responding members conducted a name check of the deceased and learned that the deceased was a convicted felon.<sup>22</sup> BIA investigated allegations that Officer Bell fraternized with a convicted felon in violation of Rule 47 and that they failed to provide the Department with a current address.

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, p. 2.

<sup>13</sup> Attachment 46, p. 10.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 8-9.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>16</sup> Attachment 42.

<sup>17</sup> Attachment 3.

<sup>18</sup> Attachment 6.

<sup>19</sup> Attachment 16, p. 7-8.

<sup>20</sup> Attachment 12, p. 11-12.

<sup>21</sup> Attachment 30, p. 2-3.

<sup>22</sup> Attachment 4.

BIA unfounded the Rule 47 allegation, stating that at no point did Officer Bell tell the responding Department members that they had knowledge that the deceased was a known convicted felon. According to BIA's Investigative Closing Report, a search of CPD databases returned negative results that Officer Bell conducted any search queries of their deceased friend's name; therefore, there was no evidence that Officer Bell could have known that their friend was a convicted felon, and the Original Case Incident Report (OCIR) authored by a responding Department member does not mention Officer Bell had knowledge that the deceased had a criminal record.<sup>23</sup>

One week after the incident, Officer Bell resigned from the Department while under investigation and before BIA could interview him.<sup>24</sup>

#### Log #2023-0003812

Log #2023-0003812 concerned allegations that Officer Jequeta Garner, Star #11448, interfered with a police investigation and fraternized with an individual whom they knew to be a convicted felon.<sup>25</sup> An individual was involved in a traffic stop, during which they contacted Officer Garner regarding the stop. On the phone, Officer Garner expressed their belief that the individual should not have to provide their identification to the officers. Officer Garner also went to the 6<sup>th</sup> District station and questioned a sergeant about the traffic stop.<sup>26</sup> In Officer Garner's interview with BIA, Officer Garner stated that they met the individual in 2013 before joining CPD, and that they attended college together. They briefly dated in 2014 or 2015 and remained friends after dating. Officer Garner stated that they knew the individual was incarcerated in the 1990s, but they did not know why or that the individual was a convicted felon.<sup>27</sup>

BIA Sustained both allegations against Officer Garner and recommended Separation.

#### Log #2024-0006971

Log #2024-0006971 concerned allegations that Officer Alexandra Michalowska, Star #18049, dated and resided with a convicted felon and made fraudulent purchases using the individual's grandparent's credit cards. Officer Michalowska stated that they met the individual approximately 13 to 14 years earlier, had a dating relationship, and they were neighbors. They stated that their dating relationship ended around December 2023. Officer Michalowska denied knowing that the individual was a convicted felon and denied residing at the individual's address. Officer Michalowska could not recall using the individual's grandparent's credit cards.<sup>28</sup>

There was no evidence that Officer Michalowska used CPD databases to search for the individual's criminal history, and neither party had social media accounts that linked them together.<sup>29</sup> Also,

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 7-8.

<sup>24</sup> Attachment 19.

<sup>25</sup> Attachment 29, p. 3-4.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 10-11.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 17-18.

<sup>28</sup> Attachment 31, p. 11-14.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 14.

there was no evidence that Officer Michalowska made unauthorized purchases on a credit card. BIA reached findings of Not Sustained for all allegations against Officer Michalowska.<sup>30</sup>

### Illinois Jurisdictions with Similar Rules

Many law enforcement agencies throughout Illinois have policies prohibiting their sworn members from associating with persons convicted of a felony or misdemeanor. However, some of these agencies explicitly exempt immediate relatives, significant others, and pre-existing relationships in its policies. For example, the Illinois State Police Rules of Conduct state:

Except as necessary to the performance of official duties, or where unavoidable because of other family relationships of the officer, officers shall avoid regular or continuous associations or dealings with persons whom they know, or should know, are persons under criminal investigation or indictment, or who have a reputation in the community or the Department for present or past involvement in felonious or criminal behavior, or who have a felony conviction.<sup>31</sup> The violation of this rule is classified as Level 4 Misconduct where a first offense results in a 31-45 day suspension.<sup>32</sup>

The Evanston Police Department policy states:

Except as required in the performance of official duties or, in the case of immediate relatives, employees shall not develop or maintain personal or financial relationships with any individual they know or reasonably should know is under criminal investigation, is a convicted felon, parolee, fugitive or registered sex offender, or who engages in serious violations of state or federal laws.<sup>33</sup>

The Evanston manual defines “relative” as an employee’s parent, stepparent, spouse, domestic partner, significant other, child (natural, adopted or step), sibling, grandchild, or grandparent.<sup>34</sup>

Requiring employees to inform their supervisors, the Elgin Police Department Rules and Regulations state:

Personnel shall not knowingly commence or maintain a relationship with any person who is under criminal investigation, indictment, arrest or incarcerated or who has been convicted of a felony within the past five years, except as necessary to the performance of official duties or where unavoidable or impractical because of pre-existing familial or marital relationships. In such cases where regular household, physical, or telephone contact is unavoidable, the employee shall inform their supervisor of the relationship.”<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>31</sup> Illinois State Police Rules of Conduct, p. 4, III.A.21, revised January 3, 2023.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 14, Addendum 1, Discipline Schedule, revised January 3, 2023.

<sup>33</sup> Evanston Police Department Policy Manual, p. 773, e., published April 11, 2023.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 772, published April 11, 2023.

<sup>35</sup> Elgin Police Department Rules & Regulations, 2 – p. 3 – 2.26, revised June 30, 2021.



### Non-Illinois Jurisdictions with Similar Rules

Further, policies similar to CPD's Rule 47 exist in various iterations across the United States; at least some of those, too, specifically exempt family relationships. The Dallas Police Department (Texas) Code of Conduct, for example, states:

Except for official police duties, no employee of this Department shall associate with persons whom the employee could reasonably be expected to know were of immoral character, convicted felons, gamblers, or other persons who habitually commit violations of the law. This does not exclude an employee of this Department from associating with immediate members of their family if they fall within the aforementioned category.<sup>36</sup>

The New Orleans Police Department (Louisiana) policy states:

Members shall avoid regular or continuous associations or dealings with persons whom they know, or should know, are racketeers, sexual offenders, suspected felons, persons under criminal investigation or indictment, or who have a reputation in the community for present involvement in felonious or criminal behavior, except as necessary in the performance of official duties, or where unavoidable because of family relationships."<sup>37</sup>

Additionally, the Miami Police Department (Florida) order states:

Members of the department are prohibited from knowingly associating, on duty or off-duty, with any persons who are under criminal investigation, (except arising out of domestic relationships), incarcerated, on parole or probation, prostitutes or persons engaged in criminal activity, excluding traffic violations unless (1) within the scope of official police duties, (2) where unavoidable because of familial relationships, or (3) the association involves a person who is not a spouse or blood relative of the member, but in the opinion of the Chief of Police...such association does not contribute to criminal activity and does not undermine the public's trust and confidence in the integrity of the department..."<sup>38</sup>.

Notably, Miami's Internal Affairs Division conducts assessments and provides the Chief of Police written recommendations on whether the association should be exempt and/or whether there are any limitations to impose on the association. The final decision regarding exemption is made by the Chief of Police and requires concurrence by the City Manager.<sup>39</sup> The Internal Affairs Division will consider the nature of the association, the frequency of the association, the severity of the subject's offense(s) and/or history, time elapsed since the offense(s) and/or activity, and any other relevant and/or redeeming factors.<sup>40</sup> Further, "association" is defined as "joining with a person as a partner, fellow worker, colleague, friend, companion, agent, ally or in some other similar relationship or affiliation, but does not include incidental contacts." "Familial relationship" is defined as a "spouse by marriage, former spouse, or blood relative (limited to children, stepchildren, parents, and siblings)."<sup>41</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Dallas Police Department Code of Conduct, p. 14, 9.16, revised January 30, 2007.

<sup>37</sup> New Orleans Police Department Policy Manual, p. 1, 2, revised November 13, 2016.

<sup>38</sup> Miami Police Department Departmental Order 1, Chapter 14.3, p. 112, revised October 19, 2021.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid, Chapter 14.2.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

### How Does CPD Compare?

The investigations summarized above suggest that BIA makes certain exceptions when determining which associations violate Rule 47, despite those exceptions not appearing as exclusions to the rule. In Log #2009-1025008 BIA made an exception for Officer Moore who had knowledge that their immediate family member had been convicted of a felony and determined that Officer Moore's explanation was "compelling enough to be exculpatory." However, in Log #2019-0002256, BIA determined that relationships with romantic partners did not constitute exceptions to Rule 47. Unlike similar policies in other law enforcement agencies, CPD's Rule 47 does not address any familial exceptions to associating or fraternizing with individuals known to have been convicted of any felony or misdemeanor.

### Recommendations

That CPD's rule does not contain explicit exceptions but certain exceptions are sometimes—but not always—applied in practice risks arbitrary enforcement and unfair outcomes for members accused of violating Rule 47. Accordingly, CPD members and BIA may benefit from an updated Rule 47 that clearly defines expectations and prohibitions to facilitate its fair and consistent application.

In order to inform and improve future investigations, OIG recommends that CPD:

1. Reevaluate the purpose(s) and/or goal(s) of Rule 47 to include defining any relationships or circumstances that may be exempt from Rule 47 violations and make revisions to the policy accordingly.
2. Delineate any reporting procedures Department members may utilize when associating with a convicted felon.

Please provide written responses to these recommendations by December 31, 2025. You may contact Chief Investigative Analyst LaDonna Candia-Flanagan at [lcandia-flanagan@igchicago.org](mailto:lcandia-flanagan@igchicago.org) or (773) 478-5614 with any questions. OIG looks forward to your agency's response, which will be published in accordance with MCC § 2-56-250.

Respectfully,



Tobara Richardson  
Deputy Inspector General for Public Safety  
Office of Inspector General

cc: Deborah Witzburg, Inspector General, OIG  
Nathaniel Wackman, General Counsel, OIG  
Samuel Chae, Associate General Counsel for Public Safety, OIG  
Dana O'Malley, Chief of Staff, CPD  
Scott Spears, General Counsel, CPD  
Chief Timothy Moore, BIA, CPD  
Deputy Chief Traci Walker, BIA, CPD  
Max Caproni, Executive Director, Chicago Police Board  
Kyle Cooper, President, Chicago Police Board

# Appendix B | Department Response, Chicago Police Board



CITY OF CHICAGO



CHICAGO POLICE BOARD

December 16, 2025

Tobara Richardson  
Deputy Inspector General for Public Safety  
Office of Inspector General (OIG)  
City of Chicago  
trichardson@igchicago.org

Dear Deputy Inspector General Richardson:

Thank you for sending a copy of your December 1, 2025, letter to Superintendent of Police Larry Snelling regarding "Recommendation to Inform and Improve Future Investigations Regarding Allegations of Rule 47 Violations" and your invitation to provide a written response.

As you know, Section 2-84-030 of the Municipal Code of Chicago grants the Police Board the power to adopt the Rules and Regulations for the governance of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). One of my goals for 2026 is to continue the work that began this year to review and draft revisions and comments to CPD's Rules of Conduct (Article V of the Rules and Regulations) that will more clearly and effectively communicate to Chicago police officers and the public how CPD members are required to conduct themselves.

I and the members of the Police Board will thoroughly consider your recommendations regarding Rule 47 and the Superintendent's response as we continue our work on this project. I look forward to working with you and Superintendent Snelling as we at the Police Board undertake a transparent revision process that engages stakeholders and the public as required by law, the Consent Decree, and Police Board policy.

Sincerely,

Kyle Cooper  
President

cc: Deborah Witzburg, Inspector General, OIG  
Nathaniel Wackman, General Counsel, OIG  
Samuel Chae, Associate General Counsel for Public Safety, OIG  
Larry Snelling, Superintendent, CPD  
Dana O'Malley, Chief of Staff, CPD  
Scott Spears, General Counsel, CPD  
Chief Timothy Moore, BIA, CPD  
Deputy Chief Traci Walker, BIA, CPD

# Appendix C | Department Response, CPD



**Brandon Johnson**  
Mayor

**Department of Police · City of Chicago**  
3510 S. Michigan Avenue · Chicago, Illinois 60653

**Larry Snelling**  
Superintendent of Police

December 22, 2025

## **VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL**

Ms. Tobar Richardson (TRichardson@igchicago.org)  
Deputy Inspector General for Public Safety  
City of Chicago Office of Inspector General  
231 South LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

**Re: Recommendation to Inform and Improve Future Investigations Regarding Allegations of Rule 47 Violations**

Dear Deputy Inspector General Richardson:

Thank you for sending your recommendations concerning Rule 47 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department. Rule 47 prohibits CPD members from associating or fraternizing with any person known to have been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor, either State or Federal, excluding traffic and municipal ordinance violations.

You recommend that Rule 47 be revised to include defining any relationships or circumstances that may be exempt from Rule 47 violations, that CPD update its directives to reflect the changes to Rule 47, and that CPD members be given reporting procedures to use when associating with a convicted felon. As we discussed, the Police Board has the authority to adopt the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department pursuant to section 2-84-030 of the Municipal Code of Chicago.

CPD recognizes the importance of clear and consistent direction to all members, as well as the consistent and fair application of discipline. CPD will give your recommendations consideration in any upcoming discussions with the Police Board concerning revisions to Rule 47.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Scott Spears".

Scott Spears  
General Counsel  
Chicago Police Department

cc: Deborah Witzburg, Inspector General  
Nathaniel Wackman, General Counsel, Office of Inspector General  
Samuel Chae, Associate General Counsel for Public Safety, Office of Inspector General  
Larry Snelling, Superintendent, Chicago Police Department  
Dana O'Malley, Chief of Staff, Chicago Police Department  
Timothy Moore, Chief, Bureau of Internal Affairs, Chicago Police Department  
Deputy Chief Traci Walker, Bureau of Internal Affairs, Chicago Police Department  
Kyle Cooper, President, Chicago Police Board  
Max Caproni, Executive Director, Chicago Police Board





**LaDonna Candia-Flanagan**  
Chief Investigative Analyst

The City of Chicago Office of Inspector General is an independent, nonpartisan oversight agency whose mission is to promote economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity in the administration of programs and operations of City government.

OIG's authority to produce reports of its findings and recommendations is established in the City of Chicago Municipal Code §§ 2-56-030(d), -035(c), -110, -230, and -240.

For further information about this report, please contact the City of Chicago Office of Inspector General, 231 S. LaSalle Street, 12th Floor, Chicago, IL 60604, or visit our website at [igchicago.org](https://igchicago.org).

#### **Talk to Us**

(833) TALK-2-IG/(833) 825-5244  
[talk2ig@igchicago.org](mailto:talk2ig@igchicago.org)  
[igchicago.org/talk2ig](https://igchicago.org/talk2ig)

#### **OIG Business Office**

(773) 478-7799

Cover photo courtesy of the Department of Fleet and Facilities Management.  
Alternate formats available upon request.

