

Exhibit 1

**ILLINOIS STATE POLICE
INVESTIGATIVE REPORT**

File #:	Reporting Date(s):	Reporting Agent(s):	ID#:	LEAD #:
16-11765LS	4/7/16	Sgt. C. Monroe	#4561	

Title:	Case Agent: ID#	Office:	Typed by:	Date:
JAMES L. STRAND	Sgt. C. Monroe #4561	Z3/LS	CM	4/12/16

Purpose:

To document interview of LaSalle Police Chief Robert Uranich and LaSalle Detective Mike Smudzinski.

On March 11, 2016, Illinois State Police, Zone 3 Investigations was requested by LaSalle County Assistant State's Attorney Brian Vescogni to conduct an investigation into alleged Solicitation of a Prostitute by LaSalle Police Officer James L. Strand, (M/W, DOB [REDACTED]). Sergeant Monroe was requested to follow-up on the investigation.

On April 7, 2016 at 11:58 AM, (I) Sgt. Monroe #4561 interviewed LaSalle Police Chief Robert Uranich at the LaSalle Police Department, located at 745 Second Street, LaSalle, IL 61301. The purpose of the interview was to obtain any and all information from Chief Uranich which would aid the aforementioned alleged Solicitation of a Prostitute investigation.

According to Chief Uranich, sometime in early February 2016 LaSalle Police Detective Mike Smudzinski informed him Detective Hocking from Peru Police Department advised a female (later identified as [REDACTED], F/W, DOB [REDACTED]) had information about one of our detectives, and that we should meet with her.

Chief Uranich stated they interviewed [REDACTED] who stated she was contacted by text from someone who claimed to be a Police Officer and that he wanted to meet with her. Chief Uranich stated [REDACTED] informed Peru detectives that she was on "Backpage" using an alias name. Chief Uranich mentioned [REDACTED] stated she just offer "back rubs and conversation".

Chief Uranich stated [REDACTED] informed her the guy texted he wanted to meet her. Chief Uranich stated [REDACTED] informed the guy her fee to talk was \$100.00. Chief Uranich stated he was told by [REDACTED] she and the guy made arrangements to meet at Beck's Gas station in LaSalle, IL. Chief Uranich advised [REDACTED] stated the text also said the guy was willing to pay \$100.00, and that he was also a Police Officer. Chief Uranich stated [REDACTED] claims not to know the identity of the guy.

Chief Uranich mentioned, [REDACTED] stated she met with the Police Officer who was in full uniform and driving a Black Ford Taurus. Chief Uranich stated [REDACTED] told him the two talked for a minutes and laughed when the guy gave her \$100.00 for just five minutes of talking. Chief Uranich stated he asked [REDACTED] why did she meet a Police Officer and [REDACTED] stated why not. Chief Uranich stated she asked [REDACTED] if the Police Officer asked for sex and she said "no" and that she wasn't reporting anything illegal. Chief Uranich stated [REDACTED] advised she just thought it was weird and they should know.

Dissemination:

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the Illinois State Police. It and its contents are not to be disseminated outside your agency.

Case #: 16-11765LS

Agent: Monroe

Case Title: James L. Strand

Date: 4/12/16

Page 2 of 4

Chief Uranich advised, that morning Peru Police Detective Hocking got a "Critical Alert" of a person impersonating a police officer. Chief Uranich stated the Critical Alert had a picture of an unmarked, Black Ford Taurus and picture of a white/male name [REDACTED]. Chief Uranich stated they asked [REDACTED] how she could not remember the name of the guy she met. Chief Uranich stated [REDACTED] got flustered, and stated the guy's name started with a [REDACTED] then said [REDACTED]. Chief Uranich stated Peru Police Detective Hocking showed [REDACTED] the "Critical Incident" picture and she said that was the guy, because she remembered those eyes.

Chief Uranich stated they took [REDACTED] into Detective Smudzinski's office to look at pictures of the Officers who work nights, which included a picture of Sgt. Strand. Chief Uranich stated [REDACTED] asked if they could make the pictures larger at which they did. Chief Uranich stated [REDACTED] advised none of the pictures were of the officer she met with.

Chief Uranich stated he called Sgt. Strand to advise him of what was going on, and he voluntarily came in. Chief Uranich stated before he interviewed Sgt. Strand he asked him what was his cell phone number, and it matched the number from the text on [REDACTED]'s phone. Chief Uranich stated he told Sgt. Strand a female said you met with her and gave her \$100.00. Chief Uranich stated Sgt. Strand advised he didn't give anyone \$100.00.

Chief Uranich stated Sgt. Strand mentioned he did go on "Backpage", because he wanted to catch people for Prostitution. Chief Uranich stated Sgt. Strand told him while on "Backpage" he identified people who were involved in Prostitution and Drugs, and sent out text messages to several people. Chief Uranich advised Sgt. Strand told him if they had phone numbers on "Backpage" he would send a message to that number. Chief Uranich stated Sgt. Strand told him he found out [REDACTED]'s true identity and she was the only person that answered him. Chief Uranich stated Sgt. Strand never told the department what he was doing.

Chief Uranich mentioned, Sgt. Strand told him he sent [REDACTED] a text message advising her he was a cop and to meet with him at the Beck's Gas Station. Chief Uranich stated somehow Sgt. Strand realized [REDACTED] wasn't showing up at Beck's in LaSalle, IL, so he goes to the Beck's in Peru, IL. Chief Uranich stated Sgt. Strand tells him he sees [REDACTED] pull up, but she wasn't driving. Chief Uranich stated Sgt. Strand said to himself he's screwed because she wasn't driving. Chief Uranich stated, Sgt. Strand informed him, he walked over to the car [REDACTED] was in advising her she was lucky she wasn't driving. Chief Uranich stated Sgt. Strand told him he and [REDACTED] had a brief conversation, but he didn't pay her \$100.00.

Chief Uranich stated Sgt. Strand didn't know there was no video footage, but he told him they were going to check video footage. Chief Uranich stated he asked Sgt. Strand again about giving [REDACTED] \$100.00. Chief Uranich stated Sgt. Strand said "no, I didn't pay her anything and I'm not worried about any video". Chief Uranich stated Peru Detective Hockings checked the Beck's Gas Station in Peru for video which had none, and the Beck's Gas Station in LaSalle was checked but had been overwritten.

Chief Uranich advised he told Sgt. Strand why didn't he tell him what he was doing before-hand. Chief Uranich stated he told Sgt. Strand his (Chief Uranich) problem is that as a police officer he understand, but a jury wouldn't understand. Chief Uranich stated he informed Sgt. Strand he is to have no contact with [REDACTED] and not to send her any text messages.

Chief Uranich advised he contacted Utica Police Chief Jay Stachowika and told him the story regarding Sgt. Strand and the phone, and Chief Stachowika thanked him for the information but wasn't sure what he did with it.

Case #: 16-11765LS
Agent: Monroe
Case Title: James L. Strand
Date: 4/12/16
Page 3 of 4

Chief Uranich stated a few weeks later he got a call from Peru Detective Hocking, advising Hocking informed him [REDACTED] called him stating she has a friend who was contacted by a police officer. Chief Uranich stated he subsequently spoke with Officer Strand and asked him if he had any other contact with [REDACTED] or anyone else. Chief Uranich stated, Officer Strand told him "No, I haven't made contact with anyone".

Chief Uranich advised there was a rumor going around of Officer Strand in uniform hugging another woman who wasn't his wife on a Utica Police Department's computer. Chief Uranich stated he asked Peru Detective Hockings where the rumors came from, but he didn't want to say. Chief Uranich mentioned he heard the Mayor of Utica was investigating it.

Chief Uranich stated he saw Utica Police Officer Zebron and asked him regarding pictures of Strand on his (Zebron's) phone or on a computer at the Utica Police Department. Officer Zebron told Chief Uranich he didn't have on his phone or seen pictures of Officer Strand on a computer at Utica Police Department.

Chief Uranich advised he called Chief Bernabei of Peru Police Department for him and LaSalle Detective M. Smudzinski to meet with him and Detective Hockings. Chief Uranich stated during the meeting they discussed the details of the interview with Strand and the investigation. Chief Uranich stated Detective Hocking denied he told LaSalle Officer Buffo to directly go and talk to LaSalle Assistant State's Attorney Brian Vescoigni. Chief Uranich stated Detective Hocking stated he told Officer Buffo that if he was that upset he should go and speak with Asst. State's Attorney Vescoigni. Chief Uranich stated they all discussed the case and they all agreed there were no criminal charges.

Chief Uranich mentioned Officer Buffo and a few other officers around the LaSalle Police Department are upset Officer Strand got promoted. Chief Uranich implied Officer Buffo and the other officers have no right to be promoted, and Officer Strand earned that promotion. Chief Uranich stated some LaSalle Police Officers tried to vote Strand out of the Union. Chief Uranich stated Strand was first on the Promotion List and he feel Strand was doing everything he could to help the department. Chief Uranich stated those other officers aren't productive.

Chief Uranich stated Officer Strand and Brian Zeron were in the running to be picked as Chief of Utica. Chief Uranich stated the Mayor wanted to appoint a Police Chief, but the City Council didn't like his selection. Chief Uranich advised he was told the City Council wanted Officer Strand but the Mayor wanted Jay Stochowiak.

Chief Uranich stated approximately two weeks ago he received a call from LaSalle Sgt. Minicki advising he heard something disturbing. Chief Uranich stated Sgt. Minicki advised [REDACTED] who had been arrested for causing a disturbance is at Peru Police Department with Detective Jones. Chief Uranich stated [REDACTED] is a drunk and prostitute. Chief Uranich advised at some point a female officer walked by, Officer [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Chief Uranich stated Officer [REDACTED] is married to LaSalle Officer [REDACTED]. Chief Uranich stated [REDACTED] was interviewed by Detective Smudzinski.

Detective Smudzinski stated he interviewed [REDACTED] and asked her if she knew Officer Strand, at which she said yes they were friends and he was a good cop. Detective Smudzinski advised [REDACTED] showed him her cell phone with all her text messages. Detective Smudzinski advised all the text messages backed up [REDACTED] story that her and Strand were just friends. Detective Smudzinski stated one of the text [REDACTED] asked Strand to run someone and he told her no, he couldn't do that. [REDACTED] wanted to know if her boyfriend [REDACTED] (identifiers unknown) had a [REDACTED]. Detective Smudzinski stated [REDACTED] told him once she needed money for her cell phone and again for [REDACTED].

Case #: 16-11765LS

Agent: Monroe

Case Title: James L. Strand

Date: 4/12/16

Page 4 of 4

cigarettes and [REDACTED] gave it to her. [REDACTED] informed Detective Smudzinski, Officer Strand on occasion would give her a ride to places. Detective Smudzinski stated [REDACTED] to Officer Strand. Detective Smudzinski stated [REDACTED] admitted they kissed at one point.

Detective Smudzinski advised, he had a chance to interview [REDACTED] boyfriend [REDACTED]. Detective Smudzinski asked if he was having problems with any police officers and he said Officer Strand. [REDACTED] informed Detective Smudzinski, Officer Strand was always texting [REDACTED]. Detective Smudzinski asked [REDACTED] if there was anything going on with the two of them. Connor mentioned to Detective Smudzinski, there had been a time or two when he and [REDACTED] were walking and Officer Strand drove by them.

Detective Smudzinski stated he went back to [REDACTED] house and she got mad saying "nothing is going on with her and Strand or [REDACTED]"

Detective Smudzinski stated he interviewed [REDACTED] and asked her about telling-off [REDACTED]. Detective Smudzinski asked [REDACTED] what proofed did she have. Detective Smudzinski advised all [REDACTED] said was give her a computer, she could put something together. Detective Smudzinski had nothing further to provide.

Chief Uranich stated he called Strand and told him [REDACTED] had been interviewed. Chief Uranich stated Officer Strand told him he never had sex with her. Officer Strand admitted he did give her money for a pack of cigarettes and money for her phone because she had given him [REDACTED]. Chief Uranich advised he asked Strand about giving [REDACTED] rides, and told him she said she kissed him twice. Chief Uranich stated Officer Strand told him he took the kiss as a thank you for the ride and it wasn't a sexual kiss.

Chief Uranich mentioned he spoke with LaSalle Asst. State's Attorney Vescogni, who stated he had not talked with anyone from the Utica Police Department. Chief Uranich stated Asst. State's Attorney Vescogni agreed with him that if there is an investigation, he's not getting involved.

Chief Uranich advised Officer Strand did violate some policies -- self assigned police violations. Chief Uranich stated Officer Strand felt bad and accepted whatever punishment he had coming. Chief Uranich mentioned he spoke with LaSalle State's Attorney Brian Towne regarding the case and he too advised, why the Illinois State Police is getting involved when there's no crime.

Chief Uranich provided me with a copy of Officer Strand's Policy Violations which resulted in a two (2) day suspension and a copy of the interview conducted with [REDACTED] on DVD Format. A copy of the Policy Violations and [REDACTED] interview on DVD Format was placed in an ISP Exhibit 1-A Envelope and will remain a part of the case file.

Attachment: A copy of Officer Strand's Policy Violations which resulted in a two (2) day suspension.



LASALLE POLICE DEPARTMENT

745 Second Street - LaSalle IL 61301
[815] 223-2131 - FAX [815] 223-6395

Rob Uranich
Chief of Police

Detectives
Lt. Mike Smudzinski
Pvt. Jason Quinn
Ptl. Curt Martin

03-30-16

To: Sgt. James Strand

Badge #: [REDACTED]

Current Assignment: Midnight Shift Supervisor (6:00pm - 6:00am)

Ref: Alleged on-duty misconduct in and outside the City of LaSalle on various dates and times ranging from 12-13-15 through 02-16-16

Policy Violations (Rules and Regulations)

Unauthorized Self-Assigned Police Actions
Unauthorized Prohibited Associations
Unauthorized Persons in Police Vehicles
Unauthorized Personal Business
Conduct (Inappropriate)
Unauthorized Leaving the City of LaSalle
Unauthorized Personal Use of Cell Phone

As we discussed, the internal investigation disclosed sufficient evidence to clearly prove the allegations of the complaints. As I indicated in our discussions, while I consider most of the infractions to be relatively minor in nature, their cumulative sum proved to be much more serious. As a result, based upon your actions, admissions and your position as a supervisor, I have no choice but to issue you a two day suspension. The suspension dates shall be your scheduled work days on 03-31-16 and 04-05-16.

If you would like to discuss the matter further, please contact me,

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]
Robert Uranich
Chief of Police
LaSalle Police Department

"The City of LaSalle is an equal opportunity provider and employer."

03/30/16 16-11765-5

**ILLINOIS STATE POLICE
CASE ACTION REPORT**

Case No.	Case Title	Case No.	Case No.	Date	Date of Action Case
16-11765LS	James L. Strand	Sgt. C. Monroe	4561	2/1/16	5/5/16
County	County Hearing	Docket No. 22	The Action Case Case		
LaSalle			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	

Proceeding Codes		Action Codes	
A. Contention (15, 17)	1. Bond Over	12. Misdemeanor Conviction	23. Sentencing
B. Preliminary Hearing (1, 4, 6, 8, 7, 10)	2. Trial Set	13. Misdemeanor Conviction (Reduced)	24. Case Under Appeal
C. Order Only (2, 3, 9, 30)	3. No Trial Set	14. Civil Finding for State	25. Appeal Withdrawn
D. Continuance (15, 17, 23, 24)	4. Waived	15. Civil Finding against State	26. Order With Warrant
E. Plea (10, 11, 12, 13, 20)	5. State Proceed	16. Warrant Issued	27. Hung Jury
F. Search Writ (6, 8, 15, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 21, 22)	6. P.O.L.	17. Sentencing/Status Changed	28. Fugitive
G. Jury Trial (2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 21)	7. Dismissed	18. Juvenile Hearing	29. Proseccutor
H. Jury Trial (2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 21)	8. Amended	19. Status Hearing	30. Reassignment to Case Agent
I. Summary Hearing (2, 14, 15, 20)	9. Settled	20. Confirmed	31. Corrected Copy (Caption in Remarks)
J. Other (5, 6, 7, 10, 20, 23, 25, 26)	10. Policy Conviction	21. Bond Hearing	32. Investigation
K. Pleading (2, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29)	11. Felony Conviction (Reduced)	22. Parolure Hearing	33. Other (See Remarks)

Defendant	Date of Arrest	Charge(s)	Case Code	Priority Code	Action Code	Sentence/Fine/Action
1.		1.	6007	J	33	See Remarks
		2.	3020	J	33	See Remarks
		3.				
		4.				
2.		1.				
		2.				
		3.				
		4.				
3.		1.				
		2.				
		3.				
		4.				
4.		1.				
		2.				
		3.				
		4.				

STATUS		REMARKS
<p>OPEN</p> <p>1A <input type="checkbox"/> Active (30 days)</p> <p>1B <input type="checkbox"/> Active Conviction Status (180 days)</p> <p>PENDING</p> <p>2A <input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 (90 days)</p> <p>2B <input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 Disposition at Evidence (180 days)</p> <p>2C <input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 (360 days) COLD CASES</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>3A <input type="checkbox"/> Unassigned (Priority Remarks)</p> <p>3B <input type="checkbox"/> Completed/Status Returned to Computer</p> <p>3C <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptionally Closed (Priority Remarks)</p> <p>3D <input type="checkbox"/> Returned to Another Agency (Priority Remarks)</p> <p>3E <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Closing</p> <p>3F <input type="checkbox"/> Case Settled by Prosecutor</p> <p>3G <input type="checkbox"/> Investigation Completed and Evidence Shipped</p>	<p>Evidence Being Held</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>LaSalle Police Chief Robert Uranich suspended James Strand for Two (2) days for Policy Violations due to self assigned police violations. Case closed.</p>	

Date	Agent	Signature	Case transferred/reassigned to
5/5/16	Sgt. Monroe 4561	<i>[Signature]</i>	
			Case Vested/Retired of case status



LASALLE POLICE DEPARTMENT

745 Second Street - LaSalle IL 61301
[815] 223-2131 - FAX [815] 223-6395

Rob Uranich
Chief of Police

Detectives
Lt. Mike Smudzinski
Ptl Jason Quinn
Ptl. Curt Martin

03-30-16

To: Sgt. James Strand

Badge #: [REDACTED]

Current Assignment: Midnight Shift Supervisor (6:00pm - 6:00am)

Ref: Alleged on-duty misconduct in and outside the City of LaSalle on various dates and times ranging from 12-13-15 through 02-16-16

Policy Violations (Rules and Regulations)

- Unauthorized Self-Assigned Police Actions
- Unauthorized Prohibited Associations
- Unauthorized Persons in Police Vehicles
- Unauthorized Personal Business Conduct (Inappropriate)
- Unauthorized Leaving the City of LaSalle
- Unauthorized Personal Use of Cell Phone



As we discussed, the internal investigation disclosed sufficient evidence to clearly prove the allegations of the complaints. As I indicated in our discussions, while most of the infractions to be relatively minor in nature, their cumulative sum proved to be much more serious. As a result, based upon your actions, admissions and your position as a supervisor, I have no choice but to issue you a two day suspension. The suspension dates shall be your scheduled work days on 03-31-16 and 04-05-16.

If you would like to discuss the matter further, please contact me,

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]
Robert Uranich
Chief of Police
LaSalle Police Department

"The City of LaSalle is an equal opportunity provider and employer."

**ILLINOIS STATE POLICE
INVESTIGATIVE REPORT**

File #:	Reporting Date(s):	Reporting Agent(s):	ID#:	LEAD #:
16-11765LS	03/15/16	S/A Novotney 5110, Sgt. Monroe #4561		

Title:	Case Agent: ID#	Office:	Typed by:	Date:
JAMES L. STRAND	SGT. MONROE #4561	Z3/LS	csn	04/11/16

Purpose:
To document interview of Aaron J. Buffo.

On March 11, 2016, Illinois State Police, Zone 3 investigations was requested by LaSalle County Assistant State's Attorney Brian Vescogni to conduct an investigation into alleged Solicitation of a Prostitute by LaSalle Police Officer JAMES L. STRAND, (M/W, DOB: [REDACTED]). Sgt. Monroe was requested to follow up on the investigation.

The following investigative report documents the interview of Aaron J. Buffo on March 15, 2016 at approximately 3:20PM at District 17 headquarters. Sgt. Cornelious Monroe assisted with the interview. The purpose of the interview with Buffo was to get insight into his claims that some inappropriate things may be going on within his department involving an officer (SGT. JAMES L. STRAND) and a local prostitute.

We advised Buffo the interview would be audio and video recorded and he did not have a problem with it. He has been with the LaSalle P.D for a little over 9 years. He is currently on the midnight shift. He was recently at a wine tasting event and ran into James Clesson, a former officer with LaSalle P.D. now with the Bloomington Police Department. Clesson is close friends with STRAND and Curt Martin, an investigator with LaSalle P.D. Clesson started talking about an internal investigation within the LaSalle P.D. involving STRAND. He told Buffo he could not believe STRAND had actually contacted a prostitute while on duty. Buffo had not heard anything about the investigation up to this point.

The next day Buffo contacted Sgt. Mark Manicki with the LaSalle Police Department and asked him about it. Buffo believes this would have been February 28th. Manicki wanted to meet Buffo for lunch somewhere and said he had more information from Lt. Smudgzinski. Manicki confirmed a departmental investigation on STRAND had begun a month prior to the winetasting event. He went on to tell Buffo that Peru Police Department Detective Dennis Hocking had received a phone call from a female (prostitute) claiming to had met an officer while he was on duty. The number that she was contacted from was traced back to a North Utica Police Department cell phone where STRAND also works part-time. The phone was apparently assigned to him.

Buffo said there was also an issue at the North Utica P.D. where STRAND is a part time officer. Supposedly another officer there had come across some pictures on a work computer that depicted STRAND with a couple different females. One picture apparently had a female in various stages of undress and another picture was of a vagina only. There might have been a video also. Buffo said the pictures were supposedly in the recycle bin on the computer. The North Utica officer was afraid to come forward but was friends with LaSalle P.D K-9 Officer Brian Zebrou. Buffo said Officer Zebrou told him he would fully cooperate with us if we needed to speak with him regarding what he knows about the situation.

Dissemination:

fjc 4599

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the Illinois State Police. It and its contents are not to be disseminated outside your agency.

Case #: 16-11765LS
Agent: Monroe
Case Title: JAMES L. STRAND
Date: 04/11/16
Page 2 of 2

Buffo advised STRAND is good friends with the Jay Stachowiak, the North Utica P.D. Chief. Buffo contacted Matt Jereb, the Utica Mayor, and told him about the information he had received regarding the laptop at the P.D. He then contacted Detective Hocking with Peru P.D. to give him some more information and at that time Detective Hocking advised him to go to Brian Vescogni at the LaSalle County States Attorney Office. He spoke with Vescogni and relayed what he knew to him and Vescogni recommended that he contact Jeff Padilla with the Illinois State Police.

We asked Buffo about the latest round of promotions at the department and he said STRAND promoted to Sgt. about 6-7 months ago. He stated there are certain guys at the department on the same shift as STRAND that are afraid to respond to calls with him because they don't want to get caught up in something that may jeopardize their future. The interview concluded and we informed Buffo that we would contact him for anything further.

PERSONAL DATA:

James L. Strand, M/W, DOB: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Aaron J. Buffo, M/W, DOB: 10/03/82
745 Second Street
LaSalle, IL 61301
TX: 815-223-2131
815-252-4784 (cell)

ATTACHMENT:

ISP I-A envelope containing DVD-R interview of Officer Aaron J. Buffo

**ILLINOIS STATE POLICE
INVESTIGATIVE REPORT**

File No:	Reporting Date:	Reporting Agent(s):	ID#:	Lead No.:	
16-11765LS	04/06/2016	S/A Mike Galletti	5411		
Title:	Case Agent:	IO#:	Office:	Typed By:	Date:
James L Strand	Sgt C. Monroe	4561	Z3/LS	MG	04/15/16
Purpose:					
To document the 2 nd interview of Aaron J. Buffo					

The following investigative report documents the Wednesday, April 06, 2016 9:00 a.m. interview I, S/A Mike Galletti #5411, conducted with of Aaron J. Buffo (M/W, Dob: [REDACTED]) at the Zone 3 Investigation's Office in LaSalle, IL. On March 11, 2016, Illinois State Police, Zone 3, investigations was requested by LaSalle County Assistant State's Attorney Brian Vescogni to conduct an investigation into alleged Solicitation of a Prostitute by LaSalle Police Officer James L Strand, (M/W Dob: [REDACTED]) Buffo requested to not be recorded. Buffo related, in summary, the following:

Buffo is a Police Officer for the City of LaSalle. He originally reported the allegations against Strand to the LaSalle County State's Attorney's Office and was previously interviewed on March 11, 2016 by Zone 3 Investigations. His main reason for contacting Zone 3 again was to check the status of the investigation. Additionally, he provided names of other people who may have information about the case. He informed me that Peru Detective Sgt Hockings had additional information about known prostitutes in the area who may have knowledge of Strand's involvement. He requested that we contact Utica Police Chief Stachowiak and request to look at his department computer and officer assigned cell phones. He believes there are pictures of Officer Strand in uniform with an undressed female in the computer's Trash Files.

Buffo also informed me his department knew that he was speaking to the State Police about Strand's allegations. He has told a few people in the department about his involvement and has discussed it with his Chief. He has been in contact with his union representative and may have consulted with an attorney.

The interview ended.

Identifiers:

Attachments:

Dissemination:

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the Illinois State Police. It and its contents are not to be disseminated outside your agency.

**ILLINOIS STATE POLICE
INVESTIGATIVE REPORT**

File #:	Reporting Date(s):	Reporting Agent(s):	ID#:	LEAD #:
16-117651S	4/7/16	Sgt. C. Monroe	#4561	
Title:	Case Agent: ID#	Office:	Typed by:	Date:
JAMES L. STRAND	Sgt. C. Monroe #4561	Z3/LS	CM	4/11/16

Purpose:

To document interview of Peru Police Detective Dennis Hocking.

On March 11, 2016, Illinois State Police, Zone 3 Investigations was requested by LaSalle County Assistant State's Attorney Brian Vescogni to conduct an investigation into alleged Solicitation of a Prostitute by LaSalle Police Officer James L. Strand (M/W, DOB: [REDACTED]). Sergeant Monroe was requested to follow-up on the investigation.

On April 7, 2016 at 11:15 AM, (I) Sgt. Monroe #4561 interviewed Peru Police Detective Dennis Hocking at the Peru Police Department, located at 1503 4th Street, Peru, IL 61354. The purpose of the interview was to obtain any and all information from Detective Hocking which would aid the aforementioned alleged Solicitation of a Prostitute investigation.

According to Detective Hocking, Peru Police Department had received a Crime Stoppers Tip, January 21, 2016 regarding Prostitution going on at the La Quinta Inn, [REDACTED] located at 4389 Venture Drive, Peru, IL 61354. Detective Hockings stated he and Detective Atkins made contact with a female/white, who denied any type of Prostitution and all she did was "rub downs".

Detective Hocking stated the female white was subsequently identified as [REDACTED], (F/W, DOB: [REDACTED]). Detective Hocking stated he was told by [REDACTED] she had been at the La Quinta Inn, [REDACTED], since November 2015. Detective Hocking stated he and Detective Atkins couldn't prove [REDACTED] was Prostituting so they departed from the hotel. Detective Hockings did state before leaving he gave his business card to [REDACTED] advising if she has any information on any type of illegal activity to give him a call.

Detective Hocking advised the next day he received a telephone call from [REDACTED] stating there was something that had been bugging her and she wanted to meet. Detective Hockings stated himself, Detective Jones and Detective Atkins met with [REDACTED]. Detective Hockings stated [REDACTED] informed them a police officer had contacted her saying he was looking for someone to have a conversation with and wanted to meet with her.

Detective Hockings stated [REDACTED] informed him they eventually met at the Beck's Gas Station in LaSalle, IL. Detective Hockings mentioned [REDACTED] informed him, she had a friend of hers drive her to the Beck's Gas Station. Detective Hockings stated [REDACTED] advised a Black, unmarked Police car pulls up and the two talk alongside of the car. Detective Hockings stated [REDACTED] stayed in the car and the Police Officer stood alongside of the car. Detective Hockings stated he was informed by [REDACTED] the Police Officer gave her \$100.00 to answer her phone and text messages because he needed someone to talk to. Detective Hockings stated, [REDACTED] told him she received a text message the next day from the Police Officer asking her "how was she doing?"

Dissemination: *[Signature]*

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the Illinois State Police. It and its contents are not to be disseminated outside your agency.

Case #: 16-11765LS
Agent: MONROE
Case Title: James L. Strand
Date: 4/11/16
Page 2 of 2

Detective Hockings stated he contacted the LaSalle Police Department and inquired about the phone number that was used to text [REDACTED]. Detective Sherman stated it was a Utica Police Department's telephone number. Detective Hockings mentioned LaSalle Police Chief Robert Uranich, requested to speak with [REDACTED].

Detective Hockings stated [REDACTED] told the same story to Chief Uranich. Detective Hockings stated that same morning [REDACTED] was showed a picture of a possible police impersonator, who had been driving around in a Black, unmarked squad car. Detective Hockings stated [REDACTED] identified the subject as the person she had met with who had previously been arrested by the Chicago Police Department. Detective Hockings stated at this point, it wasn't looking like Officer Strand was the subject of their investigation.

Detective Hockings stated, he was told by Chief Uranich to drop [REDACTED] back off at which he did, and when he returned to the LaSalle Police Department, Officer Strand was there. Detective Hockings stated Strand admitted to meeting with her, in an attempt to catch people suspended. Detective Hockings stated the Utica Police Chief, Chief Jay Stachowiak was contacted and made aware of what was going on.

Detective Hockings stated two week ago, Detective Jones from the Peru Police Department spoke with a LaSalle Police Officers wife who spoke of another female who may have knowledge regarding Officer Strand. Detective Hockings stated the other unknown female has known Strand for a few months and the two have met, but have only kissed. Detective Hockings advised he heard through the grapevine that there were photos of Strand on a computer and phone. Detective Hockings stated he heard Strand subsequently was suspended for two (2) days by LaSalle Police Chief Uranich. Detective Uranich had no further information to provide and the interview concluded.

Detective Hockings provided me with copies of his report and LEADS printout of [REDACTED] and her boyfriend [REDACTED] (M/W, DOB: [REDACTED]) consisting of seven (7) pages. A copy of the report and LEADS printout is an attachment with this Investigative Report. The original copies was placed in an ISP Exhibit 1-A Envelope and will remain a part of the case file.

Attachments:

A Copy of Peru Detective Hockings report and LEADS printout of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] consisting of seven (7) pages.

1/21/16 Lagunita Inn

Room in room since 11/15/15
pd in cash daily '80-\$100
Admitted on Bedc Page just sub down, parties,
parties on, no audity or sex, companionship
[redacted] Heavy issues w/ her,
will do whatever it takes to get rid of her
Advised her to move out of town,
we will be back in 2 wks. [redacted]

 COPY

Possible Police Impersonator

Sent: 2016-01-09 @ 12:29

Case: 16-00164

Author: McCune #226



REF: 1809531

2014 Ford Taurus Police Interceptor

LED Side Marker Lights

Whelen Siren / Light Control Box

INFORMATION ONLY // NO PC TO ARREST

On 07 JAN 16 at 1316 hrs, this black 2014 Ford Taurus Police Interceptor (IL REG # [REDACTED]) was observed parked in the open lot south of the AMC Theaters (7000 Carpenter Rd, Skokie, IL). The vehicle closely resembles an unmarked police car and had clear LED lights mounted in the front and rear wheel wells and on both front quarter panels. The vehicle also had a spotlight mounted to its driver side a-pillar and had passenger car plates which register to a private owner, [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was also a Whelen brand siren / light control box mounted to the front center console and the vehicle's front doors were also labeled as having "Ballistic Panels."

A LEADS check of Saxton revealed that he was arrested on 23 JUL 07 by CPD for illegal use of flashing, oscillating, or rotating lights, and for DWLS. The I-Clear narrative for his arrest on that date stated that he had been driving a black Ford Crown Victoria outfitted with red flashing lights. Chicago PD 18th District officers stopped him near 5702 N. Millmore because his vehicle had matched the description of one associated with a police impersonator in that area at the time. Saxton reportedly told CPD officers that he outfitted his vehicle with the flashing lights because he thought police cars "looked cool."

[REDACTED] vehicle was run by CPD on 31 DEC 15 and 02 JAN 16. It was also run by ISP-Springfield twice on 04 JAN 16.

Anyone needing or having any additional information can contact us via the information listed below.

Skokie Police Department Intelligence Unit
Eric.McCune@skokie.org / 847-982-5969

iver information

<https://sospphoto.isp.state.il.us/ISPLeadsWeb/DL.html>

DL/ID Image Retrieval



DL/ID Image

Driver License/ID #: [REDACTED]

Name: [REDACTED]

Street: [REDACTED]

City: [REDACTED]

Zip: [REDACTED]

Date Of Birth: [REDACTED]

Gender: FEMALE



Only for use as authorized by 625 ILCS 240-110.1 and 625 ILCS Admin. Code 1020.140. This information and image cannot be admitted to be anything other than the information and image of the individual who presented himself or herself to the Secretary of State's Office with the required forms of identification.

01/19/2016

11-117657

1/22/2016 7:51 AM

For Information

<https://sosphoto.isp.state.il.us/ISPLoadWebDLImage>

DL/ID Image Retrieval



DL/ID Image

Driver License/ID #: [REDACTED]

Name: [REDACTED]

Street: [REDACTED]

City: [REDACTED]

Zip: [REDACTED]

Date Of Birth: [REDACTED]

Gender: MALE



Only for use as authorized by 625 ILCS 6/6-110.1 and 62 ILCS 10/0-140. This information and image cannot be certified to be anything other than the information and image of the individual who presented himself or herself to the Secretary of State's Office with the required forms of identification.



Exhibit 2

AGREEMENT
Between the

**ILLINOIS FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE
LABOR COUNCIL**

and

**City of LaSalle
(Sergeants/Lieutenants)**

May 1, 2014 to April 30, 2018

Table of Contents

RECOGNITION	6
Section 1.1 Recognition.....	6
Section 1.2 Gender.....	7
NON-DISCRIMINATION	7
Section 2.1 Prohibition.....	7
Section 2.2 Alleged Violations.....	7
MANAGEMENT RIGHTS	8
Section 3.1.....	8
Section 3.2.....	9
DUES DEDUCTION/FAIR SHARE	9
Section 4.1 Maintenance of Membership.....	9
Section 4.2 Dues Deduction.....	10
Section 4.3 Fair Share Objection Procedure.....	11
Section 4.4 Indemnification.....	12
WORK SAFETY	12
Section 5.1 Compliance with Laws.....	12
Section 5.2 Unsafe Conditions.....	12
Section 5.3 Safety Grievances.....	13
Section 5.4 Immunization.....	13
NO STRIKE - NO LOCKOUT	13
Section 6.1 No Strike Commitment.....	13
Section 6.2 Resumption of Operations.....	14
Section 6.3 Discipline of Strikers.....	14
Section 6.4 No Lockout Commitment.....	14
LABOR MANAGEMENT MEETINGS	14
Section 7.1 Labor-Management Meetings.....	14
Section 7.2 Purpose.....	15
Section 7.3 Attendance.....	15
HOURS OF WORK and OVERTIME	15
Section 8.1 Normal Workweek And Workday.....	15
Section 8.2 Overtime Pay.....	17
Section 8.3 Off-Duty Court Time.....	17
Section 8.4 Overtime List.....	17
Section 8.5 Callback.....	18
Section 8.6 Holdover.....	18
Section 8.7 Training Pay.....	18
Section 8.8 No Pyramiding.....	19
Section 8.9 Trading Shifts.....	19
Section 8.10 Secondary Employment.....	19
Section 8.11 Compensatory Time.....	19
HOLIDAYS	21
Section 9.1 Holidays Recognized and Observed.....	21
Section 9.2 Holiday Compensation.....	21

VACATIONS	22
Section 10.1 Vacation Accrual	22
Section 10.2 Scheduling	22
Section 10.3 Payment Upon Separation From Service	23
SICK LEAVE	24
Section 11.1 Accrual and Use	24
Section 11.2 Verification	24
Section 11.3 Unused Sick Leave and Buyback	25
Section 11.4 Catastrophic Sick Leave	25
JURY DUTY	26
Section 12.1 Jury Duty	26
Section 12.2	26
SENIORITY, LAYOFF, RECALL	26
Section 13.1 Definition of Seniority	26
Section 13.2 Seniority List	27
Section 13.3 Termination of Seniority	28
Section 13.4 Layoff	28
LEAVES OF ABSENCE	29
Section 14.1 Funeral Leave	29
Section 14.2 Personal Days	30
Section 14.3 Return to Duty/Limited Duty Status	30
Section 14.4 Military Leave	31
Section 14.5 Injury Leave	31
Section 14.6 Leave of Absence	31
Section 14.7 Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA)	32
Section 14.8 Maternity and Bonding Leave	32
DISCIPLINE	32
Section 15.1 Discipline/Discharge	32
Section 15.2 Just Cause	32
Section 15.3 Pre-Disciplinary Meeting	33
Section 15.4 Written Notice	33
Section 15.5 Appeal of Discipline	33
Section 15.6 Removal of Discipline	34
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE	35
Section 16.1 Definition	35
Section 16.2 Grievance Procedure	35
Section 16.3 Arbitration	36
Section 16.4 Limitations On Authority Of Arbitrator	37
Section 16.5 Time Limit For Filing	38
WAGES and other BENEFITS	38
Section 17.1 Wages Sergeants	38
Section 17.2 Wages Lieutenants	39
Section 17.3 Assignments	40
Section 17.4 Longevity, and Christmas Bonus	40
Section 17.5 Retroactive pay	41
Section 17.6 SHIR Differential	41

Section 14.7 Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA)

The provisions of the federal Family and Medical Leave Act shall apply to members of this bargaining unit.

Section 14.8 Maternity and Bonding Leave

Employees who give birth and the father of a newborn or employees who adopt a child shall receive eighty (80) hours leave with full pay and benefits for the birth or adoption and bonding.

ARTICLE 15

DISCIPLINE

Section 15.1 Discipline/Discharge

The parties agree with the tenets of corrective and progressive discipline.

Disciplinary action shall include only the following:

- (a) Oral Warning;
- (b) Written Warning;
- (c) Suspension;
- (d) Discharge

Section 15.2 Just Cause

The City agrees that disciplinary action shall be imposed only for just cause and shall be imposed promptly after the City learns of the occurrence giving rise to the need for disciplinary action and after the City has had a reasonable opportunity to investigate the facts. All disciplinary action normally must take place within thirty (30) days of the date of the alleged offense becoming known to the Chief of Police or his designee or from when he/she should have reasonably known. Should the investigation of an administrative matter take longer than such 30 days from the

date it became known, or should have become known to the Employer, then the City bears the burden of showing that additional time to conduct/complete the investigation was warranted. The Chief of Police shall have the authority to discipline an employee, up to and including termination.

Section 15.3 Pre-Disciplinary Meeting

The employees agree that the pre-disciplinary hearing procedures set forth in Section 13.2 provides full due process for employees. Investigations shall be in compliance with Illinois Compiled Statutes 50 ILCS 725/1 (Peace Officer's Bill of Rights). Nothing in this section is intended or should be construed to waive employees' right to representation during questioning that the employee reasonably believes may lead to discipline.

Therefore, prior to disciplining an employee or discharging an employee, the City will give at least seventy-two (72) hours notice to the employee of a meeting at which the potential disciplinary matter will be discussed. In such notice the employee will be advised of the right to have legal representation at the meeting. During the meeting the employee will be informed of the charge(s) against him and given an opportunity to rebut and respond to such charges.

Section 15.4 Written Notice

Except for oral warnings, the officer shall be notified in writing of disciplinary action imposed, and be advised of the specific nature of the offense and, in response to a written request from an employee shall be given written direction as to future behavior.

Section 15.5 Appeal of Discipline

The Chief of Police shall have the authority to discipline a member of the bargaining unit, up to and including termination.

(1) Within seven (7) days of receiving discipline an employee who intends to appeal the discipline must make a binding election to appeal the discipline through the Fire and Police Commission ("Commission") procedures or through the grievance procedure as outlined in this agreement. This election must be done in writing and submitted to the Chief of Police or designee.

(2) Failure to make a timely binding election shall operate automatically as a waiver of the employee's and Bargaining Units rights to have the appeal of such discipline processed through the grievance and arbitration procedure of this Agreement.

(3) An employee who elects the Commission appeal process either by election in (1) above or by failing to make an election in (2) above must comply with all time limits and procedures of the Commission, and appeal of an adverse decision by the Commission must be by complaint to the Circuit Court for Administrative Review.

(4) An election of either the grievance and arbitration procedure of the Commission procedure whether by making an election pursuant to (1) above or by failing to make an election pursuant to (2) above, cannot be changed at a later time. Under no circumstances does an employee or the Bargaining unit, jointly or separately, have the right to proceed under both the grievance and arbitration procedure and the Commission procedure.

Section 15.6 Removal of Discipline

If after a period of one year from the date of receiving an oral or written warning an officer has received no other discipline related to, or for an offense similar to the original warning, the warning shall not be used in any manner or forum adverse to the employee's interest. If after a period of three years from the date of receiving a

suspension an officer has received no other discipline related to, or for an offense similar to the original suspension, the record of suspension shall not be used in any manner or forum adverse to the employee's interest.

ARTICLE 16

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Section 16.1 Definition

A grievance is defined as a dispute or difference of opinion raised by a bargaining unit employee or the Union against the City concerning the application, meaning or interpretation of this Agreement. Disputes or differences and disciplinary matters may be grieved and arbitrated pursuant to the terms of this Article.

Section 16.2 Grievance Procedure

Recognizing that grievances should be raised and settled promptly, a grievance must be raised within ten (10) calendar days after the grievant knew or should have known of the event giving rise to the grievance. A grievance shall be processed as follows:

STEP 1: Chief of Police

The grievant must file a written grievance (see Appendix B) with the Chief of Police ("Chief") or his designee. Such grievance shall set forth a statement of the grievant's position, the Article of the Agreement allegedly violated, the date of the alleged violation, the relief sought and the signature of the grieving officer(s). Within ten (10) calendar days after the grievance has been submitted to the Chief, the grievant and his Union representative, may meet with the Chief or otherwise discuss the grievance. If no agreement is reached in such discussion or no such discussion is held, the Chief's written

answer is due within ten (10) calendar days from the date of the meeting or if no meeting is held within ten (10) days from when the grievance was filed.

STEP 2: Appeal to Mayor

If the grievance is not settled in Step 1 and the grievant wishes to pursue the grievance, the grievant must, within ten (10) calendar days of the date the Chief's answer was received or due, submit the written grievance to the Mayor or his designee. Within ten (10) calendar days of submission of the grievance to the Mayor, the grievant and his Union representative and the Mayor shall meet to discuss the grievance, unless otherwise mutually agreed. The Mayor's written answer is due within ten (10) calendar days from the date of any meeting held, or within ten (10) days from the date the Mayor received the written grievance in the event no meeting is held.

STEP 3: Arbitration

If the grievance is not settled in Step 2 and the Union wishes to appeal the grievance, the Union may refer the grievance to arbitration within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of the City's Step 2 written response.

Section 16.3 Arbitration

- (a) The parties shall attempt to agree upon an arbitrator after receipt of the notice of referral by the Union. In the event the parties are unable to agree upon the arbitrator, the parties shall jointly request the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to submit a panel of seven (7) arbitrators who are members of the National Academy of Arbitrators residing in Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin or Indiana. Each party retains the right to reject one panel in its entirety and request that a new panel be submitted. Upon receipt, each party shall strike a name from the list until there is one name remaining. The order of individual strikes shall be determined by a coin toss, with the loser striking first. The person remaining shall be the arbitrator.

(b) The arbitrator shall be notified of his selection and shall be requested to set a time and place for the hearing, subject to the availability of the Union and the City.

(c) The City and the Union shall have the right to request the arbitrator to subpoena witnesses or documents.

(d) The arbitrator shall submit his decision in writing within thirty (30) calendar days following the close of the hearing or the submission of briefs by the parties, whichever is later.

(e) More than one grievance may be submitted to the same arbitrator if both parties mutually agree in writing.

The fees and expenses of the arbitrator, cost of a hearing room, and the cost of written transcripts for the arbitrator, if any, shall be divided equally between the City and the Union, provided, however, that each party shall be responsible for compensating its own representatives and witnesses.

Section 16.4 Limitations On Authority Of Arbitrator

The arbitrator shall have no right to amend, modify, nullify, ignore, add to, or subtract from the provisions of this Agreement or otherwise impose on any party hereto limitations or obligations not specifically provided for in this Agreement or which are contrary to applicable laws. The arbitrator shall consider and decide only the question of fact as to whether there has been a violation, misinterpretation or misapplication of the specific provisions of this Agreement. Any decision or award of the arbitrator shall be final and binding upon the City, the Union, and the employees covered by this Agreement.

Section 16.5 Time Limit For Filing

Time is of the essence in filing and processing grievances through arbitration.

Consequently, if a grievance is not presented by an employee or the Union within the time limits set forth above, absent extenuating circumstances, it shall be considered waived and may not be further pursued by the employee or the Union. If a grievance is not appealed to the next step within the specified time limit or any mutually agreed-to extension thereof, it shall be considered settled on the basis of the City's last answer or action. If the City does not answer a grievance or an appeal thereof within the specified time limits, or does not hold an anticipated meeting pursuant to this provision, the grievance shall be treated as if it has been denied by the City and it shall be automatically advanced to the next step in the grievance procedure. Nothing herein shall prevent the parties from mutually agreeing to extend any of the time limits set forth in this Article.

ARTICLE 17

WAGES and other BENEFITS

Section 17.1 Wages Sergeants

Effective 05-01-14 Sergeants with the LaSalle Police Department shall receive an initial annual base pay of \$57,000.

Effective 05-01-15 Sergeants with the LaSalle Police Department shall receive an initial annual base pay of \$58,344.

Effective 05-01-16 Sergeants with the LaSalle Police Department shall receive an initial annual base pay of \$59,511.

Exhibit 3



LaSalle Police Department
LaSalle County, Illinois
Police Department - 745 Second Street - LaSalle 61301-2589
Phone: 815-223-2131 Fax: 815-223-8395

Robert Uranich
Chief of Police

DETECTIVES
Lt. Mike Giron
Ptl. Mike Smudzinski
Ptl. Jason Quinn

GENERAL ORDER

Date of Issue: 01-01-06

Effective Date: 01-01-06

General Order No. #3

Subject:

DEPARTMENT DISCIPLINE

PURPOSE:

To establish Uniform Disciplinary Procedures

POLICY:

This General Order insures that all Officers are aware of this Department's disciplinary authority.

PROCEDURE:

Department Discipline shall adhere to the following procedures of this General Order.

By Order of:

Robert Uranich
Chief of Police

INFORMING THE PERSON BEING DISCIPLINED

The member or employee being disciplined shall be informed of the charges, at the time such action is taken.

CITIZEN COMPLAINTS AGAINST DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

Citizen complaints against members or employees of the LaSalle Police Department shall be recorded (this requires a citizen who files a complaint against a sworn peace officer to support the complaint with a sworn affidavit, i.e. a written statement) and may be investigated by the supervisor in charge, as soon as possible in accordance with the following directions. When the investigation cannot be completed on the date it is received, a preliminary report will be prepared by the supervisor in charge outlining the complaint and his or her actions and delivered to the Chief of Police, via chain of command. Cases involving a supervisor, shall be investigated by the next senior supervisor.

SERIOUS COMPLAINTS OR ALLEGATIONS

If, in the opinion of the supervisor in charge, the incident is of sufficient gravity, the supervisor shall notify the Chief of Police regardless of the hour. In addition, immediate action necessary to preserve the integrity of the LaSalle Police Department, until arrival of the Chief of Police, shall be taken.

INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED MISCONDUCT

The individual assigned the investigation of an alleged act of misconduct on the part of a member or employee of the Department, shall conduct a thorough and accurate investigation. (All investigation must be completed within thirty (30) day from the date of the incident)

Such investigation shall include formal statements from all parties concerned; when necessary and pertinent, the gathering and preserving of physical evidence pertaining to the case, and all other information bearing on the matter.

SEXUAL HARRASSMENT

The LaSalle Police Department strictly prohibits any type of Sexual Harassment as Defined by the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and any Other form of unlawful harassment in the work place. Sexual Harassment consists of Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical acts Of sexual or sex-based nature where:

- (1) Submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly.
- (2) Any employment decision which is based on an individual's acceptance or rejection of such conduct.
- (3) Such conduct interferes with an individual's work performance or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive working environment.

It is also unlawful to retaliate to take reprisal in any way against anyone who has articulated any concern about sexual harassment or discrimination against the individual raising the concern or against another individual.

Sexual harassment is unlawful, and such prohibited conduct exposes not only the LaSalle Police Department, but also individuals involved in such conduct to significant liability under the law. Employees at all times should treat other employees respectfully and with dignity in a manner so as not to offend a co-worker. Accordingly, the LaSalle Police Department is committed to vigorously enforcing Sexual Harassment at all employment levels.

The LaSalle Police Department provides employees with a convenient confidential, and reliable mechanisms for reporting incidents of sexual harassment and retaliation. When reporting incidents of Sexual Harassment, employees will advise their immediate supervisor of the incident. If any supervisor is involved in the incident, the employee will report the incident directly to that supervisor's immediate supervisor. If the incident involves the Chief of Police the matter may be reported directly to the Mayor of the City of LaSalle.

REPORTS OF INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED ACTS OF MISCONDUCT

Alleged acts of misconduct must be investigated and results of the investigation must be reduced to a written report.

The investigator shall summarize the pertinent facts, including,

- (1) Summary of the complaint or alleged act of misconduct.
- (2) Pertinent portions of the statements of all parties to the incident.
- (3) A description of the incident, physical evidence and other evidence important to the case.
- (4) The observations and conclusions of the investigating officer.

CONCLUSION OF INVESTIGATION INVOLVING DEPARTMENT MEMBER/EMPLOYEE

All investigations of Department members of employees accused of misconduct will conclude with one of the following findings:

- Unfounded:** The investigation indicates that the act, or acts complained of, did not occur or failed to involve police personnel.
- Exonerated:** Acts did occur but were justified, lawful and proper.
- Not Sustained:** Investigation fails to discover sufficient evidence to clearly prove, or disprove, the allegations made in the complaint.
- Sustained:** The investigation disclosed sufficient evidence to clearly prove the allegations made in the complaint.

Appropriate disciplinary action, if required, will be recommended by the investigator in accordance with the following guide. The report will be forwarded, to the Chief of Police.

PENALTIES

The following penalties may be assessed against any member or employee of the department, as disciplinary action:

- Oral Reprimand.
- Written Reprimand
- Suspension (3 days or less).
- Suspension (More than 3 days to indefinite).
- Dismissal from service.

- note that prior to suspending an employee for more than three (3) days or dismissal of an employee, the Chief of Police/City will give at least seventy-two (72) hours notice to the employee and the Union of a meeting at which the potential disciplinary matter will be discussed. A pre-disciplinary meeting need not be held if the Chief of Police/City determines that it must remove the employee from the work setting immediately, in which the pre-disciplinary meeting can be held at a later date.

REMOVAL OF DISCIPLINE

If after a period of one year from the date of receiving an oral or written warning an officer has received no other discipline related to, or for an offense similar to the original warning, the warning shall not be used in any manner or forum adverse to the employee's interest. If after a period of three years from the date of receiving a suspension an officer has received no other discipline related to, or for an offense similar to the original suspension, the record of suspension shall not be used in any manner or forum adverse to the employee's interest.