



CITY OF CHICAGO
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

20
26

Recommendation to Reopen Chicago Police Department Disciplinary Investigation

CPD Log # 2023-0003174

OIG Case #C2025-0000000396

September 30, 2026

DAVID GLOCKNER | INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE CITY OF CHICAGO
TOBARA RICHARDSON | DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR PUBLIC SAFETY

September 30, 2026

Pursuant to the Municipal Code of Chicago (MCC) § 2-56-230(c)(ii), 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 recommend reopening an investigation to address a deficiency materially affecting its outcome.¹

The investigation concerned allegations that CPD Officer Vanessa Miranda, Star #11806, stopped and seized the complainant without justification, took the complainant's wallet and searched it without consent, and made misleading statements on the Investigatory Stop Report (ISR). It was further alleged that CPD Officer Juan Moreno, Star #11143, stopped and seized the complainant without justification, handcuffed the complainant too tightly and refused to loosen the handcuffs, made misleading statements on the ISR, and made an inappropriate remark to a passing civilian by stating, "Dude, I don't give a fuck bro, fuck off." COPA also alleged that CPD Officer Tywon McCall, Star #11681, failed to activate his body worn camera (BWC) in a timely manner. Following its preliminary review of the allegations, COPA determined that Officers Miranda and Moreno followed Department policy as it related to allegations under COPA's jurisdiction and referred the investigation to BIA to address other infractions.

During its review, OIG identified that neither COPA nor BIA conducted an analysis of whether Officer Miranda's misrepresentation of the facts and sequence of events communicated to a supervisor at the scene and written in the ISR report violated CPD's Rule 14, making a false report, oral or written. Further, COPA acknowledged that Officer Miranda violated the complainant's Fourth Amendment rights by searching their wallet but concluded that the violation did not warrant the service of allegations under its jurisdiction because it was a "minor infraction." Additionally, neither COPA nor BIA conducted an analysis of whether Officer Emmanuel Zepeda's, Star #4321, search of the complainant's wallet and prolonged detention violated the complainant's Fourth Amendment rights or any CPD rules.

OIG recommended that COPA reopen the investigation to consider whether Officer Miranda made false statements to Sergeant Hurley and in their ISR report in violation of CPD's Rule 14, whether Officers Miranda and Zepeda violated the complainant's Fourth Amendment rights by searching the complainant's wallet without consent and by unnecessarily prolonging the detention of the complainant, and whether any other involved CPD members violated any CPD rules or directives.

In response to OIG's recommendations, COPA declined to reopen the investigation, noting that the 18-month deadline to complete the investigation passed, the CPD members were issued Summary Punishment Action Requests (SPARs) and it cannot impose additional discipline due to double jeopardy, and COPA "does not believe it can prove the statements Officer Miranda made regarding the incident were willfully false, and not simply a mistake."

¹ Once BIA or COPA has responded to an OIG recommendation to reopen an investigation, and once the underlying investigation has reached a final disciplinary decision, OIG's recommendation letters and the agencies' responses will be published on OIG's website. In these procedural postures, OIG's recommendations to reopen and the agencies' responses have been available and, from time to time, released pursuant to MCC § 2-56-250 and the Illinois Freedom of Information Act. These recommendations to reopen, issued pursuant to MCC § 2-56-230(c), are separate from OIG's own confidential investigative work, which is governed by the confidentiality provisions set out in MCC § 2-56-110.

OIG's letter to COPA containing its recommendations is attached at Appendix A. COPA's response is attached at Appendix B.

Appendix A | OIG Letter



Tobara Richardson | Interim Inspector General
City of Chicago
Office of Inspector General
231 S. LaSalle Street, 12th Floor
Chicago, IL 60604
Phone: (773) 478-7799

Via Electronic Mail

May 19, 2026

LAKENYA WHITE
CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR
CIVILIAN OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
1615 WEST CHICAGO AVENUE, 4TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60622

Re: Log #2023-0003174

Dear Chief Administrator White:

Pursuant to § 2-56-230(c)(ii) of the Municipal Code of Chicago (MCC), the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) Public Safety section has conducted a preliminary review of the investigation conducted by the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) in Log #2023-0003174. OIG recommends that COPA reopen the investigation to consider all available evidence and to conduct an analysis of whether the complainant's Fourth Amendment rights were violated, and whether CPD members violated the Chicago Police Department (CPD)'s Rule 14, prohibiting false reports. Log #2023-0003174 is Administratively Closed.

Log #2023-0003174 concerns allegations that CPD Officer Vanessa Miranda, Star #11806, stopped and seized the complainant without justification, took the complainant's wallet and searched it without their consent, and made misleading statements on the Investigatory Stop Report (ISR). It was further alleged that CPD Officer Juan Moreno, Star #11143, stopped and seized the complainant without justification, handcuffed the complainant too tightly and refused to loosen the handcuffs, made misleading statements on the ISR, and made an inappropriate remark to a passing civilian by stating, "Dude, I don't give a fuck bro, fuck off." COPA also alleged that CPD Officer Tywon McCall, Star #11681, failed to timely activate their body worn camera (BWC).

Following its preliminary review of the allegations, COPA declined and referred the investigation to CPD's Bureau of Internal Affairs (BIA), noting that while Officer Miranda did commit a "minor 4th [amendment] violation," by searching the complainant's wallet, COPA "will not exercise jurisdiction over the most minor of infractions."¹

¹ See Notes CO-1340935 and CO-1365565.

At the conclusion of its review of the allegations, BIA recommended Summary Punishment Action Requests (SPAR) be initiated for Officer Miranda's failure to provide an ISR receipt, Officer Moreno's verbal abuse toward a civilian, and Officer McCall's late BWC activation.²

According to the ISR in the investigative file, on July 18, 2023, the CPD members observed the complainant enter a parking lot from 62nd Street and exit onto 63rd and Halsted Street presumably to avoid traffic.³ The video from the In-Car Camera (ICC) in Officers Miranda and Moreno's patrol car shows their car make a U-turn, wait for the complainant's car to turn onto 63rd and Halsted Street from the parking lot then initiate a traffic stop.⁴ POD camera footage from the area, before and at the time of the traffic stop, does not depict heavy traffic and all traffic lanes appear to be moving at a normal speed.⁵

On Officer Miranda's BWC footage, at the 2:06 mark, the complainant asks Officer Miranda why they are being stopped and Officer Miranda states, "You're avoiding traffic...you looped around the whole, uh, parking lot then came out this way." The complainant tells Officer Miranda, "No I did not, I [dropped] my mail off, I work for them, for the state and I'm dropping my mail off in the mailbox, so how'd I loop around the whole parking lot?" Officer Miranda states, "Because we just looped around, and you did the same thing."⁶ Officer Miranda does not address the complainant's explanation of their actions and the two debate whether the complainant entered the parking lot to avoid traffic. The complainant repeatedly states, "that's not true." Officer Miranda asks the complainant for their driver's license and insurance, and the complainant continues to question the validity of the stop and why they need to produce their driver's license. At the 5:20 mark of Officer Miranda's BWC footage, Officer Miranda reaches inside the complainant's car, unlocks the door, orders the complainant out of the car, and the complainant eventually complies. At the 6:58 mark, Officer Miranda asks the complainant, "Where is your driver's license?" The complainant responds, "Let me get my purse," as they walk around the front of the complainant's car to the front passenger side. The complainant retrieves their wallet from their purse on the floorboard. At the 7:33 mark, the complainant opens their wallet and attempts to grab their driver's license as requested when Officer Moreno states, "Alright [the complainant]. You know what? You're going to have to go in cuffs,[the complainant]." The complainant continues to look in their wallet and states, "I'm getting my license," when Officers Miranda and Moreno grab the complainant's wallet and wrists.⁷

At the same time, on Officer Emmanuel Zepeda's, Star #4321, BWC footage at the 4:18 mark, Officer Zepeda grabs the complainant's wallet from their hands as Officers Miranda and Moreno place the complainant in handcuffs.⁸ Officer Zepeda's BWC video shows the complainant in

² Attachments 37-40.

³ Attachment 25.

⁴ Attachment 8 at the 0:00 to 1:10 mark.

⁵ Attachment 20; At the 4:23:02 mark of the POD camera footage, a CPD patrol car enters the frame and the footage appears to skip, resuming at the 4:26:12 mark.

⁶ Attachments 6-7 include photos of two grey mailboxes on both sides of the entrance doors for the Illinois Department of Human Services and the Healthcare & Family Services office, located at 6221 S Emerald Drive. Attachments 26-27 include photos of the two grey mailboxes with a parking lot in the background. Attachment 31 is a highlighted map that shows the complainant's route into the parking lot and the subsequent traffic stop.

⁷ Attachment 9.

⁸ Attachment 11.

handcuffs as Officers Miranda and Zepeda search the wallet. Officer Miranda grabs an Illinois state identification card (ID) and walks toward their patrol car.⁹ At no point does Officer Miranda nor any of the other CPD members on scene confirm that the ID card that Officer Miranda took from the complainant's wallet matched the identity of the complainant.¹⁰ Once Officer Miranda enters their patrol car, they conduct a check of the state ID on the portable data terminal (PDT) at 4:27 pm, and determine that the driver's license expired in 2011. Officer Miranda begins writing four traffic citations, naming who Officer Miranda later learned was the complainant's mother.¹¹

Sergeants Michael Hurley, Star #966, and Nicholas Rumsa, Star #1371 respond to the scene. Sergeant Hurley's BWC video at the 2:42 mark, shows Officer Miranda telling Sergeant Hurley, "We saw [the complainant] over on the next block over. [The complainant] went through the parking lot. We went around because we figured [the complainant] was going to avoid traffic through there." At the 4:04 mark, Sergeant Hurley walks over to the complainant, the complainant expresses their concerns with the validity of the stop and explains that they are a state employee and were dropping off their timesheets in the mailboxes outside of the state building. Sergeant Hurley does not address the complainant's explanation and states to the complainant, "Your driver's license expired 12 years ago...your license is no good." The complainant explains that they recently renewed their driver's license on their birthday. At the 6:16 mark, Sergeant Hurley states, "Well your license isn't valid, so...We have a computer, and they run all that." On Sergeant Hurley's BWC video at the 6:35 mark, the complainant states, "My driver's license [is] in my wallet." Sergeant Hurley replies, "What? A second ago you just said [Officer Miranda] had it," as they gesture toward Officer Miranda. The complainant responds, "No. I thought that's what [Officer Miranda] got [because] [Officer Miranda is] the one [that] went in my wallet. Can I have my wallet?" Sergeant Hurley states, "I welcome you to yell at the judge in the same manner. What's illegal is you driving without a driver's license." The complainant states, "My driver's license [is] in my wallet." Sergeant Hurley states, "Okay, we also have a computer to run your name. That supersedes everything. So, when they run all your information, and it comes back that the driver's license expired back in 2011..." At the 7:36 mark, Sergeant Hurley looks in the complainant's car and states, "Where are you saying this driver's license is at?" The complainant responds, "In my wallet." Sergeant Hurley grabs and unzips the complainant's wallet. The complainant states, "Why you all in my wallet? Why they got me in handcuffs, I could've [given] you my driver's license, you all in my wallet." Sergeant Hurley states, "Yes [the complainant], I'm looking for your driver's license...that you apparently say is in here." At the 8:37 mark, Sergeant Hurley grabs the complainant's driver's license out of their wallet and the complainant states, "There go my driver's license right there, thank you."¹² At the 9:17 mark, Sergeant Hurley walks back to Officers Miranda's patrol car and states, "You guys said [the complainant is] expired? It's a different name," and hands the complainant's driver's license to Officer Moreno.¹³

On Officer Miranda's BWC video at the 37:30 mark, Officer Miranda tells Sergeant Hurley, "This is the, the ID [the complainant] gave me," then once Sergeant Hurley walks away, Officer Miranda exclaims to Officer Moreno, "It's a different name? Shut up! So, [the complainant is] getting a charge for, a fucking ID, for a different name."¹⁴ On Sergeant Hurley's BWC video at the 10:00

⁹ Officer Miranda's BWC at the 7:57 mark also shows the Illinois State identification card.

¹⁰ Ibid at the 4:27 to 4:41 mark.

¹¹ Attachment 24.

¹² Attachment 18.

¹³ Attachment 18.

¹⁴ Attachment 9.

mark, Sergeant Hurley walks back to the complainant and asks who's the woman on the state ID, and the complainant responds, "That's my mom." Sergeant Hurley replies, "Well [the complainant], you presented their ID when [the officers] asked you for a driver's license." The complainant replies, "No, I did not," points toward Officer Miranda in the patrol car and states, "[Officer Miranda] went in my wallet and grabbed the wrong thing." Sergeant Hurley replies, "[The complainant] you've already said it on body worn camera that this is what you provided." The complainant denies Sergeant Hurley's assertion multiple times and states, "[Officer Miranda] went in my wallet and grabbed it, I didn't because they had me in handcuffs... If you want to see it, y'all can pull y'all's camera back, [Officer Miranda] went in my wallet and grabbed the wrong thing." Sergeant Hurley continues to insist that the complainant gave Officer Miranda the wrong ID, tells the complainant they are acting "foolish," and the complainant continues to state that Officer Miranda took the wrong ID out of their wallet while the complainant was in handcuffs.

At 4:57 pm, 31 minutes after being placed in handcuffs, Sergeant Hurley removes the handcuffs off the complainant.¹⁵ At 4:56 pm, Officer Miranda runs the complainant's driver's license on the PDT and the results confirm that the complainant did have a valid driver's license.¹⁶ On Officer McCall's BWC footage, at the 32:40 mark, Officer McCall asks Officer Miranda, "So that's [the complainant] [while pointing to the complainant's driver's license] and the one you pulled out the wallet is [the complainant's] mom?" Officer Miranda states, "by [the complainant]."¹⁷ Ultimately, Officer Miranda gave the complainant a traffic citation for avoiding traffic.¹⁸

In the ISR, Officer Miranda wrote that following numerous requests for the complainant to step out of their car, the complainant complied and that "[R/Os] continued to request driver identification at which time [the complainant] continued to refuse, [R/Os] detained [the complainant] to conduct further investigation." Officer Miranda then wrote that following a license plate inquiry via radio, the complainant,

Related [their] identification was in [their] wallet at which time [R/Os] obtained an IL state ID bearing the name [complainant's mother's name] ...field [sergeant] arrived on scene at which time [the complainant] related [where their] IL driver's license was to field sergeant... [R/Os] conducted a LEADs inquiry which revealed driver to have a valid driver's license. [R/Os] used discretion and did not place above listed individual in custody for obstruction of identification.¹⁹

In the ISR, Officer Miranda also checked "No," in the box "Was a search beyond a protective pat down conducted of his/her effects." The BWC video shows Officers Miranda and Zepeda take the complainant's wallet, search it, and remove the complainant's mother's state ID from the wallet.

Neither COPA nor BIA conducted an analysis of whether Officer Miranda's misrepresentation of the facts and sequence of events communicated to Sergeant Hurley at the scene and written in the ISR report violated CPD's Rule 14, making a false report, oral or written. BWC footage depicts Officers Miranda and Zepeda remove the complainant's wallet from the complainant's hands, Officers Miranda and Moreno handcuff the complainant, and Officers Miranda and Zepeda search the

¹⁵ Attachment 18 at the 11:38 mark.

¹⁶ Attachment 24.

¹⁷ Attachment 14.

¹⁸ Attachment 25; Attachment 22.

¹⁹ Attachment 25.

complainant's wallet. Footage also shows Officer Miranda remove the complainant's mother's state ID from the wallet.

In the Notes section of the case management system (CMS), a COPA investigator wrote:

I believe log should go to General because a CPD member searched the complainant's wallet without [their] consent (the officer took the wallet out of the complainant's hand as [they were] looking for [their] DL so [they] could give it to the officers.) There is also a possible issue with the length of the stop. It was about 48 minutes long for a simple traffic ticket. The officers took the wrong driver's license out of the complainant's wallet ([their] mother's). By the time they realized the error, they then had to spend more time running the complainant's DL.²⁰

Ten days later, a COPA supervisor wrote:

COPA's review of the evidence shows that Officers Miranda and Moreno likely followed Department policy as it relates to [the complainant's] allegations of police misconduct under COPA's jurisdiction (Entry into [the complainant's] wallet may have amount to at most an extremely minor 4th [amendment] violation; however, COPA will not exercise jurisdiction over this most minor of infractions).²¹

The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution protects individuals from "unreasonable searches and seizures."²² This includes protection against prolonged detentions.²³ COPA acknowledges that Officer Miranda did violate the complainant's Fourth Amendment rights by searching their wallet but concluded that the violation did not warrant the service of allegations under its jurisdiction because it was a "minor infraction." However, neither COPA nor BIA conducted an analysis of whether Officer Zepeda, who also searched the complainant's wallet, violated any CPD rules or the complainant's Fourth Amendment rights by searching the complainant's wallet without consent and by prolonging the detention of the complainant. Further, Officers Miranda and Moreno initiated the traffic stop at 4:20 pm and concluded it at 5:06 pm—a total of 46 minutes.²⁴ Of the 46 minutes, the complainant was handcuffed for 31 minutes.²⁵

Based on OIG's preliminary review, and without taking any position on any other aspect of the investigation or its findings, OIG recommends that COPA reopen the investigation to consider whether Officer Miranda made a false statements to Sergeant Hurley that the complainant gave them the state ID and in their ISR report in violation of Rule 14, whether Officers Miranda and Zepeda violated the complainant's Fourth Amendment rights by searching the complainant's wallet without consent and by unnecessarily prolonging the detention of the complainant, and whether any other involved CPD members violated any CPD rules or directives.

Please contact Chief Investigative Analyst LaDonna Candia-Flanagan at

²⁰ Note: CO-1340935.

²¹ Note: CO-1365565.

²² United States Constitution. Amend. IV..

²³ *People v. Burej*, 404 Ill.App.3d 558 (1st Dist. 2010).

²⁴ Attachment 9.

²⁵ Attachment 9; Attachment 18.

lcandia-flanagan@igchicago.org or (773) 478-5614 with any questions. Please send your response to this recommendation within the time allowed by MCC § 2-56-245. OIG will consider a failure to respond in the time permitted by ordinance to be a declination of our recommendation. OIG looks forward to COPA's response, and recommends that COPA incorporate this letter and its response into the electronic case file to provide for a complete record.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Tobara Richardson', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Tobara Richardson
Interim Inspector General
City of Chicago

cc: Samuel Chae, Associate General Counsel for Public Safety, OIG
LaDonna Candia-Flanagan, Chief Investigative Analyst for Public Safety, OIG
Angela Snell, Acting General Counsel, COPA
Timothy Moore, Chief, Bureau of Internal Affairs, CPD

Appendix B | Department Response



August 12, 2026

Tobara Richardson
Deputy Inspector General for Public Safety
Office of Inspector General
740 North Sedgwick Street, Suite 200
Chicago, Illinois 60654

Via Electronic Mail

Re: Re-Open Recommendation Log No. 2023-0003174

Dear Deputy Inspector General Richardson:

I am in receipt of your May 19, 2026 letter recommending that COPA re-open and conduct additional investigation in Log No. 2023-0003174. We understand the Office of the Inspector General - Deputy Inspector General for Public Safety (PSIG) recommends re-opening this case to consider additional allegations. For the reasons stated below, COPA does not concur with PSIG's recommendation to re-open.

First, the officers' collective bargaining agreement requires that investigations be completed within 18 months of opening.¹ That deadline passed in January 2025. Reopening the log at this time would not result in any viable sustained findings or discipline.

Second, BIA investigated this log and the officers each received a SPAR.² COPA cannot seek to impose additional discipline for this incident under principles of double jeopardy.

Finally, COPA does not believe the evidence supports a finding that Officer Vanessa Miranda³ violated Rule 14. In particular, COPA does not believe it can prove the statements Officer Miranda made regarding the incident were willfully false, and not simply a mistake.⁴

Under COPA's ordinance, the Chief Administrator may, in their discretion, re-open any closed investigation upon PSIG's recommendation.⁵ Here, I cannot find an appropriate basis to re-open this investigation. I appreciate your continued diligent and careful review of closed COPA investigations.

¹ *Agreement between the City of Chicago and Chicago John Dineen Lodge No. 7*, effective July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2027, § 8.10.

² Att. 11.

³ Star #11806.

⁴ To establish a Rule 14 violation, COPA must prove: (1) that a false statement was made, (2) that it was made willfully, and (3) that it was made about a fact that was material to the investigation. *See Agreement between City of Chicago Department of Police and John Dineen Lodge No. 7* §6.1(M).

⁵ MCC § 2-78-120(x)(iii).

Page 2 of 2
August 12, 2026
Ms. Tobar Richardson

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "LaKenya White".

LaKenya White
Chief Administrator
Civilian Office of Police Accountability

cc:

Samuel Chae (OIG)
LaDonna Candia-Flanagan (OIG)
Angie Snell (COPA)



LaDonna Candia-Flanagan

Chief Investigative Analyst for Public Safety

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.

Talk to Us

(833) TALK-2-IG/(833) 825-5244

talk2ig@igchicago.org

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.

