



CITY OF CHICAGO
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Recommendation to Reopen Chicago Police Department Misconduct Investigation

Log #2023-0004935

Published July 9, 2024

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

July 9, 2024

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 that the investigating agency reopen the investigation to address deficiency materially affecting its outcome.¹

OIG reviewed a BIA investigation concerning allegations that eight CPD members were associated with the Oath Keepers. National Public Radio (NPR) reported the accused members' involvement with the Oath Keepers in an article naming active CPD members who had been "identified as likely matches on [an] Oath Keepers list." Furthermore, the Anti-Defamation League made allegations regarding the accused members' associations with the Oath Keepers in an email to former CPD First Deputy Superintendent Eric Carter on August 8, 2022.

BIA's investigation consisted of, among other things, interviews of the eight accused CPD members; each provided information in their interview which established a connection to or association with the Oath Keepers at some point in time. BIA did not sustain allegations against the accused members and concluded that "membership into organizations in itself is not a rule violation."

OIG found BIA's investigation to suffer from deficiencies materially affecting its outcome. Specifically, BIA conducted deficient interviews, failed to conduct an additional investigative step, and failed to document an analysis of whether association with or membership in the Oath Keepers may have brought discredit upon the Department or failed to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals, in violation of CPD's Rules of Conduct.

OIG recommended that CPD take whatever procedural steps available to it to remedy these deficiencies; CPD declined to do so.

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

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.

Appendix A | OIG Letter



Deborah Witzburg | Inspector General
City of Chicago
Office of Inspector General
740 N. Sedgwick St., Ste 200
Chicago, IL 60654
Phone: (773) 478-7799

Via Electronic Mail

June 13, 2024

CHIEF YOLANDA TALLEY
BUREAU OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS
CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT
3510 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60653

Re: Log #2023-0004935

Dear Chief Talley:

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 Chicago Police Department's (CPD) Bureau of Internal Affairs (BIA) in Log #2023-0004935, and found deficiencies in both the conduct of the investigation and analysis of the facts that materially affected the outcome of the investigation. Specifically, during the investigation, BIA conducted deficient interviews, failed to conduct an additional investigative step, and concluded that "membership [in] organizations in itself is not a rule violation," an analysis that is materially deficient because it runs contrary to CPD's Rules and Regulations.

In closing Log #2023-0004935, BIA bypassed CPD's internal Command Channel Review process, and thereby bypassed OIG's contemporaneous review. In light of this procedural posture, OIG recommends that CPD take whatever procedural steps are available to it to remedy the investigation's deficiencies, specifically:

- conduct an additional interview of Sergeant Michael Nowacki, Star #2373, to address what the assigned BIA Investigator described as "unanswered questions" about Nowacki's involvement with the Oath Keepers;¹
- re-interview Officer Dennis Mack and Officer Anthony Keany and strictly enforce prohibitions against counsel interfering with a BIA interview; and
- conduct and explain an analysis of whether admitted membership in the Oath Keepers is a violation of CPD rules.

¹ Attachment 59.

Log #2023-0004935 is currently in a Closed/Final status.²

Log #2023-0004935 concerns allegations against seven CPD Officers: John Nicezyporuk, Star # 14461; Alberto Retamozo, Star# 12845; Alexander Kim, Star# 20153; Dennis Mack, Star # 4390; Anthony Keany, Star # 20934; Matthew Bracken, Star #13910; and Bienvenido Acevedo, Star# 6380; and one CPD Sergeant, Michael Nowacki, Star # 2373, related to their alleged membership in the Oath Keepers. National Public Radio (NPR) reported the accused members' involvement with the group in an article naming active CPD members who had been "identified as likely matches on [an] Oath Keepers list."³ Furthermore, the Anti-Defamation League made allegations regarding the accused members' associations with the Oath Keepers in an email to former CPD First Deputy Superintendent Eric Carter dated August 8, 2022.⁴

BIA's investigation consisted of open-source social media searches regarding each of the accused CPD members, a key-word search for "Oath Keepers" within each accused's CPD email account from November 2013 to present, and an interview with each of the accused CPD members, each accompanied by their union counsel. Each accused CPD member provided information in their interview which established a connection to or association with the Oath Keepers. None of the accused admitted to being current members of the Oath Keepers; several—specifically Nicezyporuk, Retamozo, and Kim—admitted to having been members at some point.

OIG addresses each of the deficiencies in BIA's conduct of the investigation and subsequent analysis of the investigation in turn.

1. Deficiencies in the Investigation.

a. Sergeant Michael Nowacki

During the subject interview of accused Sergeant Michael Nowacki, when asked whether he was ever a member of the Oath Keepers, Sergeant Nowacki stated, "as far as I'm concerned, no." However, when asked to explain what he meant by that, he stated, "I am not consciously aware of any membership forms or dues paid or any association with this group."⁵ Sergeant Nowacki told the assigned BIA Investigator that he "did receive some emails from the Oath Keepers going back to 2016 through 2018," but he was not aware of them because they allegedly went into his spam folder.

² Pursuant to the Chicago Municipal Code § 2-56-030 and -230, the Public Safety section of the City of Chicago Office of Inspector General has the power and duty to review individual closed CPD disciplinary investigations, and "if it finds a deficiency that it concludes materially affected the outcome of the investigation, recommend that the investigation be reopened." MCC § 2-56-230(c)(ii). Moreover, the Public Safety Deputy shall "have full access to all information in the possession or control of [CPD] in order to conduct, any review or audit within the Public Safety Deputy's jurisdiction." MCC § 2-56-230(h). On April 10, 2024, BIA bypassed Command Channel Review, and thereby OIG's contemporaneous review, and closed this investigation with findings of Not Sustained. OIG notes that other recent BIA investigations into similar allegations (e.g. Log #2020-0001998 and Log #2021-0004419) have been subject to Command Channel Review. Had CPD not bypassed OIG's review, OIG would have recommended that Log #2023-0004935 be reopened before it reached a Closed/Final status.

³ Attachment 11.

⁴ Attachment 4.

⁵ Attachment 66.

Following Sergeant Nowacki's interview, his counsel emailed the BIA Investigator. In the email included in the electronic case file his counsel wrote, "After our statement, Sgt Nowacki reviewed his spam folder. Sgt. Nowacki has not counted the spam emails he received, but there are countless emails. I have attached three as an example. As Sgt. Nowacki said, all of these emails went to his spam and he was unaware of their existence for years." The BIA Investigator responded:

I understand that there may be countless emails but [I] need all of them to show the time period that Nowacki was still receiving Oath Keeper emails. Nowacki didn't remember joining or paying but is still receiving emails? We may need to set up a second interview based on the emails I receive because there are still a lot of unanswered questions.⁶

Subsequently, Sergeant Nowacki's union counsel sent the BIA Investigator over 150 pages of Oath Keeper emails received by Sergeant Nowacki. Despite the assigned BIA Investigator identifying the need to collect the emails, there is no indication in the case file that they were reviewed or analyzed in any way. Furthermore, despite the BIA Investigator identifying "a lot of unanswered questions" related to the emails, there is no indication that Sergeant Nowacki was re-interviewed or that BIA took any other steps to resolve those unanswered questions.

As stated above, OIG recommends that CPD reopen this investigation and re-interview Sergeant Nowacki to answer the "unanswered questions" that the BIA Investigator identified in their email. As part of this investigative step, BIA should review and document its review of the emails received from Sergeant Nowacki's union counsel. BIA should also consider whether it should provide Sergeant Nowacki with notice of a Rule 14 allegation based on any of his testimony in the first interview and any new facts developed during the email review or based on the fact of the existence of over 150 pages of emails.

b. Officer Dennis Mack and Officer Anthony Keany

During the subject interviews of Officer Dennis Mack and Officer Anthony Keany, their attorney (each was represented by the same counsel) can be heard providing answers for questions asked to each of the accused officers during multiple audio recorded interviews. Specifically, the attorney can be audibly heard whispering an answer to accused Officer Dennis Mack at the 20:05 mark of his interview and to accused Officer Anthony Keany at the 12:57 mark of his interview.⁷ During Mack's interview he was asked, "And what did you expect to get with your membership?" to which Mack briefly answered, "Because they're a pro-Second Amendment group that protected Second Amendment rights of all people," and then, during a pause between questions, the attorney can be heard whispering the words "legal challenges." Likewise, during Keany's interview Keany was asked, "have you ever emailed the Oath Keepers?" and before Keany answers the attorney can be heard whispering, "I don't think so," in the background, followed by Keany answering, "I don't believe so apart from the initial registration." The BIA Investigator conducting the interview did not note these instances of counsel dictating answers to the accused member for the

⁶ Attachment 59.

⁷ In the interviews of the CPD Officers, there were never more than three male voices: a BIA investigator, the accused CPD member who answered questions, and the attorney. The attorney was also the identified voice heard prior to the start of the interviews.

record. Under CPD Directive S08-01-05, the BIA Investigator violated CPD policy (and the consent decree entered in *Illinois v. Chicago*) both by failing to “not[e] on the record of the interview anytime [a] Department member seeks or obtains information from his . . . legal . . . representative” and by failing to “ensur[e] that the Department member’s counsel . . . does nothing to disrupt or interfere with the interview.” S08-01-05 § IV(A)(2)(f); see also Consent Decree ¶ 465(d).

As stated above, OIG recommend that CPD reopen this investigation and re-interview Officers Mack and Keany. BIA investigators should question them again about their alleged membership in the Oath Keepers and strictly enforce the rule against counsel interference.

2. Deficiencies in the Analysis.

As OIG has previously described to CPD in Recommendation to Reopen Log # 2021-0004419, the Oath Keepers, recognized by the Southern Poverty Law Center as a “far-right antigovernment group,”⁸ is described by the Anti-Defamation League as “a large but loosely organized collection of right-wing anti-government extremists who are part of the militia movement, which believes that the federal government has been coopted by a shadowing conspiracy that is trying to strip American citizens of their rights.”⁹ While the group, which was founded in 2009, has become more widely known following the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol, its members have been involved in numerous armed confrontations with government actors throughout the country dating back to the group’s inception.¹⁰

BIA’s investigative record does not reflect any analysis of whether association with or membership in an anti-government extremist group may have brought discredit upon the Department or failed to promote the Department’s efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals, in violation of Rules 2 and 3, respectively. Notably, Rule 2 prohibits “[a]ny action which impedes the Department’s efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.” The comment to the Rule notes that the Rule “applies to both the professional and private conduct of all members. It prohibits any and all conduct which is contrary to the letter and spirit of Departmental policy or goals or which would adversely reflect upon the Department or its members. It includes not only all unlawful acts by members but also all acts, which although not unlawful in themselves, would degrade or bring disrespect upon the member or the Department, including public

⁸ [Oath Keepers | Southern Poverty Law Center \(splcenter.org\)](https://www.splcenter.org/)

⁹ Indictment ¶ 3, *United States v. Rhodes*, No. 22-cr-15 (D.D.C. June 22, 2022) (ECF No. 167) (indicting Oath Keepers’ founder and associates on charges, including Seditious Conspiracy, in connection with January 6 attack on U.S. Capitol); see also Statement of Offense ¶ 3, *United States v. Ulrich*, No. 22-cr-15 (D.D.C. April 29, 2022) (ECF No. 117) (same; statement of offense filed with plea agreement in Oath Keepers case); Oath Keepers | ADL

¹⁰ 8 See, e.g., *United States v. Bundy*, 968 F.3d 1019, 1023-24 (9th Cir. 2020) (describing 2014 incident where Oath Keepers joined with Nevada rancher Cliven Bundy in an armed standoff with federal law enforcement); *United States v. Huff*, 630 F. App’x 471, 474-76, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2015) (affirming federal firearms conviction of Oath Keepers member in connection with a 2010 attempt to take over a Tennessee courthouse to perform citizens’ arrest on local officials for failure indict President Obama on fraud and treason charges). See also Examining Extremism: The Oath Keepers | Center for Strategic and International Studies (csis.org).

and open association with persons of known bad or criminal reputation in the community unless such association is in the performance of police duties.”

In both recent memory and dating back more than 50 years, CPD has conducted and applied analyses of Rule 2 in similar or analogous circumstances. In 1968, CPD initiated an investigation into the alleged memberships of multiple CPD members in the Ku Klux Klan (KKK). During a related disciplinary hearing, City of Chicago Department of Law attorney Jerome Zurla stated, “it is incongruous for the Board to believe that he can be a Klansman with robes one minute and a patrolman with his star and his gun the next.”¹¹ In the Police Board’s findings, they found three CPD members violated Rule 2 by being associated with an extremist group and fired them.¹²

In Log # 2020-0001998, BIA investigated Officer Robert Bakker’s, Star #5927, involvement with the Proud Boys organization. BIA’s initial investigation sustained an allegation that Officer Bakker failed to submit a written report that he was under investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) relative to his involvement in the Proud Boys. OIG’s review of the evidence in the investigative file found inconsistencies in Officer Bakker’s statements to the FBI and BIA not addressed in BIA’s investigation. OIG recommended that BIA reopen the investigation to account for all available evidence—BIA accepted the recommendation. BIA’s additional analysis of the evidence found Officer Bakker to be in violation of CPD’s Rule 2 in that he witnessed a battery and failed to report it to police; made false statements about his frequency in posting in the chat group “Fuck Antifa;” for his attendance at a Proud Boys barbeque; and, for his participation in online forums associated with the Proud Boys where he showed support for an individual who committed a battery. BIA sustained a Rule 2 violation and Officer Bakker entered into a mediation agreement where he was suspended for 120 Days.¹³

Recently, in Log #2023-0003679, CPD applied Rule 2 to a member’s association with a group, specifically a street gang. In August 2023, a CPD Lieutenant recommended termination of a CPD Recruit for using “street gang terminology” in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6- “Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.”¹⁴ “It was alleged that the CPD Recruit, while standing in formation in a hallway at CPD’s Education and Training Division, stated, “on BD, y’all gonna make me bug up in this bitch. I’m trying to hold this hood shit in but y’all bringing it out on me on BD,” after allegedly being bumped into by another recruit and their duffle bag.¹⁵ The CPD Lieutenant in their termination request wrote that they were aware of the phrase “on BD” to be “common street gang terminology used by members of the Black Disciples street gang to swear upon their allegiance to said gang...”¹⁶ Despite the CPD’s member denial of making the statement, no admission of gang

¹¹ Chicago Police Board, Case No. 274, February 23, 1968, pg. 399 to 400, accessed March 27, 2024.

¹² Dan Mihalopoulos, “What Chicago police did when the ku klux klan infiltrated its ranks,” *Chicago Sun-Times*, October 23, 2023, accessed December 2023, <https://chicago.suntimes.com/2023/10/23/23912008/chicago-police-kkk-crackdown>

¹³ Log #2020-0001998, Attachment 50, Supplemental Closing Log.

¹⁴ Chicago Police Department, “Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department,” April 16, 2015, accessed March 20, 2024, <https://directives.chicagopolice.org/#directive/public/6412>.

¹⁵ Bureau of Internal Affairs “Investigative Closing Report Log No : 2023-0003679,” February 26, 2024.

¹⁶ *Id.*

membership, and denial of knowledge of the meaning of “BD,” in less than two weeks after being hired by CPD, the Recruit was separated from the Chicago Police Department.”¹⁷

Nonetheless, despite the plain language, long-established precedent, and recent reliance on the application of Rule 2 to CPD members’ associations with certain groups, BIA’s analysis in the case at hand appears to rest at least in part on the conclusion that “membership into organizations in itself is not a rule violation.” OIG finds that analysis deficient and that it materially affected the outcome of this investigation.

OIG’s Public Safety Section recommends that BIA take any available procedural steps to address the material deficiencies in Log #2023-0004935.

Please contact Chief Investigative Analyst LaDonna Candia-Flanagan at lcandiaflanagan@igchicago.org or (773) 478-5614 with any questions. Please send your response to this recommendation by July 15, 2024. OIG will consider a failure to respond in the time permitted by ordinance to be a declination of our recommendation. OIG looks forward to BIA’s response, and recommends that BIA incorporate this letter and its response into the electronic case file to provide for a complete record.

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
LaDonna Candia-Flanagan, Chief Investigative Analyst for Public Safety, OIG
Deputy Chief Traci Walker, BIA, CPD
Scott Spears, General Counsel, CPD

¹⁷ *Id.* at pages 4 and 6.

Appendix B | Department Response



Brandon Johnson
Mayor

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

Larry Snelling
Superintendent of Police

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

June 28, 2024

Tobara Richardson
Deputy Inspector General for Public Safety
City of Chicago Inspector General
740 N. Sedgwick, Suite 200
Chicago, Illinois 60654

RE: Log Number 2023-0004935

Dear Deputy Inspector General Richardson:

Introduction

On June 13, 2024, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) drafted a letter addressed to Chief Yolanda L. Talley requesting that Log Number 2023-0004935 be reopened for further investigative work. Pursuant to the Chicago Municipal Code § 2-56-230(c), the Public Safety Deputy shall have the following powers and duties, "to review and audit individual closed Office and Police Department disciplinary investigations, and to make findings and recommendations based on those findings: (i) to inform and improve future investigations and ensure that they are complete, thorough, objective, and fair; and (ii) if it finds a deficiency that it concludes *materially affected the outcome* of the investigation, recommend that the investigation be reopened." The Bureau of Internal Affairs (BIA) understands and recognizes the importance of OIG's public safety section review. However, as it will be explained below, BIA does not believe OIG's listed investigative deficiencies materially affected the overall outcome of BIA's investigation. In addition, the BIA would like to clarify that this investigation bypassed Command Channel Review (CCR) because of the sensitivity of the investigation.

Below are the procedural steps within the investigation that OIG has concerns about and BIA's response:

- 1. Conduct an additional interview of Sergeant Michael Nowacki, Star #2373, to address what the assigned BIA investigator described as "unanswered questions" about Nowacki's involvement with the Oath Keepers.**

OIG recommends that the Chicago Police Department (CPD) reopen this investigation and re-interview Sergeant Nowacki to answer the "unanswered questions" that Sergeant Bartuch mentions in his email to Sergeant Nowacki's counsel.¹ The email referred by OIG was sent February 09, 2024 and the closing report was submitted April 04, 2024. Sergeant Bartuch reviewed the numerous emails between that timeframe and based on his review states "during the review of the emails sent to Nowacki, the R/Sgt. noted the emails contained the Oath Keepers general information and nothing specific to Nowacki. The emails contained recent events, legislation, discounts, calls to action, and memberships."² OIG states BIA should review and document its review of the emails received from Sergeant Nowacki's union counsel. However, the emails were reviewed and the review was documented on the closing report of the investigation. Therefore, BIA does not agree that this procedural step warrants remedy.

2. Re-interview Officer Dennis Mack and Officer Anthony Keany and strictly enforce prohibitions against counsel interfering with a BIA interview.

Deputy Inspector General Tobar Richardson states the attorney for Police Officer Dennis Mack and Police Officer Anthony Keany can be heard providing answers for questions asked to each of the accused officers during multiple audio recorded interviews. Deputy Inspector Richardson provided specific instances in which counsel for PO Mack and PO Keany can be overheard whispering answers during the interviews; 1) at the 20:05 mark of Officer Dennis Mack's interview the attorney can be heard saying "Legal Challenges," 2) at the 12:57 mark of Officer Keany's interview the attorney can be heard whispering, "I don't think so," followed by Officer Keany answering "I don't believe so apart for the initial registration."

When the attorney whispers "Legal Challenges" during PO Mack's interview it is unclear whether the attorney was speaking to himself or to PO Mack. Even if BIA assumed that the attorney was speaking to PO Mack, PO Mack never used "Legal Challenges" as part of his response to any interview questions. Therefore, BIA does not agree that the attorney's whisper rises to the level of "deficiency" in the investigation nor that it materially affects the outcome of the investigation.

Moreover, Deputy Inspector Richardson notes that the BIA Investigator conducting the interview did not note these instances on the record. Deputy Inspector Richardson cites Special Order S08-01-05 and Paragraph 465 of the Consent Decree as justification for revisiting the Officer's interviews to address the Officers' counsel disrupting or interfering with the interview. Interfere is defined as in the Merriam-Webster Dictionary as "to interpose in a way that hinders or impedes."

¹ Attachment #59.

² Attachment #72 at pg. 28.

Here, the two separate occasions of whispers by counsel do not constitute "interference with the interview." All of the questions asked by the Investigator were answered and the interview was completed without issue. Moreover, in these situations, it is the judgment call of the Investigator to determine whether an attorney is interfering with or disrupting an interview. During PO Mack's interview, PO Mack clearly ignored counsel's utterance. In addition, during PO Keany's interview, counsel's whisper was similar in nature to PO Keany's response. However, Sergeant Bartuch concluded that counsel's whisper didn't constitute a disruption or rose to the level of interference. It is BIA's position that the determination of whether disruptive behavior or interference with an investigation is present will be at the Investigator's discretion. Therefore, BIA does not believe this procedural step rises to the level of "deficiency" in the investigation or materially affects the outcome of the investigation.

3. Conduct and explain an analysis of whether admitted membership in the Oath Keepers is a violation of CPD rules.

This case concerns allegations against eight members of the Chicago Police Department related to their alleged association in the "Oath Keepers." Upon review of the entire investigative file the following was learned:

1. Seven (7) of the eight (8) Department members recall signing documents related to the Oath Keepers;
2. Five (5) of the eight (8) Department members stated they were current/former military members;
3. All of the Department members were gun enthusiasts; and
4. Five (5) of the eight (8) Department members stated they signed the Oath Keepers documents between 2008-2012.

The named accused members stated they were approached about the Oath Keepers over ten years ago as an organization that advocates for 2nd Amendment rights. None of the accused members stated that they had knowledge that the Oath Keepers were a violent extremist group nor did they state that they had intentions of joining a violent extremist group. Most importantly, none of the accused members were actively participating or had previously participated in the group. Spam email notifications do not warrant a violation of Rule 2 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department. The mere fact that the accused members signed up to become a member of an organization long before the average citizen and the Office of the Inspector General knew the group existed, is not enough evidence to suggest the Chicago Police Department currently employs members of the Oath Keepers. For the foregoing reasons, BIA does not agree that its investigative analysis is "deficient" or materially affected this investigation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, BIA does not believe OIG's listed investigative deficiencies materially affect

the outcome of BIA's investigation. Black's Law Dictionary defines material as "important" and states "evidence offered in a cause, or a question propounded, is material when it is relevant and goes to the substantial matters in dispute, or has a legitimate and effective influence or bearing on the decision of the case." All three OIG deficiencies do not materially affect the outcome of BIA's investigation. Therefore, BIA respectfully declines to reopen Log Number 2023-0004935.

Respectfully,



Timothy L. Moore
Deputy Director
Bureau of Internal Affairs

TLM/cc

Attachment

cc: Yolanda L. Talley, Chief, BIA, CPD
Traci L. Walker, Deputy Chief, BIA, CPD
Scott Spears, General Counsel, CPD
Deborah Witzburg, Inspector General, OIG
Nathaniel Wackman, General Counsel, OIG
Samuel Chae, Associate General Counsel for Public Safety, OIG
LaDonna Candia-Flanagan, Chief Investigative Analyst for Public Safety, OIG



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, 740 N. Sedgwick St., Suite 200, Chicago, IL 60654, 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 Assets, Information and Services.
Alternate formats available upon request.

