

EXHIBIT 5

EXPERT OPINIONS OF DR. JON M. SHANE

Supplemental Opinion

SUBMITTED TO:

Scott Rauscher, Esq.
Loevy & Loevy
311 N. Aberdeen St., 3rd Floor
Chicago, IL 60607

February 26, 2025

PERTAINING TO:

Allen Jackson, Plaintiff

v.

CITY OF CHICAGO, Former CHICAGO POLICE SERGEANT RONALD WATTS, SERGEANT, ALVIN JONES, OFFICER ELSWORTH J. SMITH, JR., Former CHICAGO POLICE, OFFICER KALLATT MOHAMMED, PHILIP J. CLINE, KAREN ROWAN, DEBRA KIRBY, and other as-yet-unidentified officers of the Chicago Police Department,

Case No. 1:18-cv-05121

In The United States District Court For The Northern District Of
Illinois Eastern Division

Chicago, Illinois

PREPARED BY:

Dr. Jon M. Shane
jmsnpd@gmail.com

I am Dr. Jon M. Shane. I previously submitted an expert report in the cases of *White v. Chicago*, *Gipson v. Chicago*, and *Baker & Glenn v. Chicago* and associated *Watts* cases. I reviewed the following new discovery documents on February 26, 2025 and I find those documents consistent with the opinions I expressed in my previous report:

1. City BG 31582 – 31588
2. PL Joint 41862 - 41863

The Standard

In 1993, the International Association of Chiefs of Police defined the nationally accepted standards for police report writing (IACP Training Key 434, Principles of Report Writing, p. 2). The standard indicates that police reports must be “complete, clear, concise, concrete and correct. To successfully meet these five requirements, officers must use commonly accepted English that does not contain police jargon or technical terms unless absolutely necessary” (p. 2).

The report writing standard exists for four primary reasons: **1)** to maintain historical records, **2)** support police management decisions, **3)** aid court testimony, and **4)** protect against legal claims. Historical records are essential for the police department, the public, and elected officials, allowing for comparisons over time and across jurisdictions. From a police managerial standpoint, police reports play a role in resource allocation, such as how and where to deploy officers. Crime prevention relies on accurate data, which comes from accurate police reports.

In court, a police report that meets accepted industry standards serves as a critical tool for officers to recall key details and present cases effectively, especially years after the original case. Police reports should provide the most complete and accurate information possible. Police reports protect officers and agencies from false accusations. Detailed and factual accounts of events serve as the best defense against allegations of misconduct.

Completeness

Mr. Allen Jackson alleges that he was wrongfully arrested on January 16, 2006 by members of Sergeant Ronald Watts’ team. Mr. Jackson’s Arrest Report is incomplete because it lacks sufficient details about the officers’ actions (i.e., who saw what, and who did what, and who was involved), as well as the precise nature of his arrest. All police investigations must account for all officers’ actions to ensure the officers behavior comports with legal responsibilities. The formal account is through complete police reports. The Arrest Report and the Vice Case Report (VCR) do not explain how the officers conducted the purported narcotics investigation. What did the investigation consist of?

What investigative tactics were employed? What role did each officer play? Who received the call from the “concerned citizen”? What time was the call received from the “concerned citizen”? Where was the call received from the “concerned citizen”? What was the officers’ investigative plan? Did the officers review the plan with the supervisory? Was their supervisor aware they undertaking a narcotics investigation at the time and location they reported? These essential details are absent from the Arrest Report and the VCR.

Clarity

The VCR refers to “R/O’s.” This jargon that is to be avoided unless absolutely necessary (e.g., technical or scientific terms). There is no reason the officers involved could not be specific as to which officer was the arresting officer. The VCR also does not distinguish between each officer and their specific role in the purported investigation. The report notes that “R/O’s received information from a concerned citizen,” but does not specify which reporting officer (or both of them at once) received the information, what time was the information received from the “concerned citizen,” or where was the information received from the “concerned citizen.”

The listed reporting officers are Jones (box 45) and Smith (box 46) on the VCR. The report also notes that “R/O” was familiar with Jackson from a previous arrest, but it’s not clear if that refers to Jones or Smith, and how the officer knew Mr. Jackson (i.e., reference to previous incident reports with verifiable case numbers). The VCR says, “Allen J’ was on his way to pick-up the remaining narcotics and money from sales at the above location” (p. 1). However, the narrative is not clear: where was Allen J coming from? Where at the “above location” was Allen J heading? Was anyone else involved with Allen J? How did the caller know this information about Allen J? A complete narcotics investigation would clearly identify the extent of the officers’ investigation to ensure all factual details are reported.

Sergeant Watts endorsed the VCR (box 48). Given the incomplete details, and lack of clarity, Sergeant Watts should have returned the VCR to the officers with instructions on how to complete the VCR with the elements that need clarification or elaboration. Before Sergeant Watts endorsed the report he should have ensured that the report met accepted industry standards.

Concreteness

The language used in a police report must be specific. Police officers must stick to the facts while including sufficient detail. Vaguely worded sentences will result in different readers reaching different conclusions, or cause confusion about the incident.

1. **Mr. Jackson's Behavior:** Instead of stating that Mr. Jackson was "observed holding a clear plastic bag with suspect narcotics," (p. 2) the report should specify where Mr. Jackson was standing, what he was doing (e.g., was he engaged in a transaction, attempting to hide the bag, or acting nervously?). The statement, "the offender emerged from the building" is not specific. Emerged from what part of the building? What time did he emerge? Was he with anyone? What direction was walking? What was he doing when the officers observed him?
2. **The Officers' Observations:** The VCR says, "After arriving at the building..." (p. 1) referring to the officers' arrival. This is not concrete. How did the officers arrive? How were the officers positioned to see Mr. Jackson emerge from the building? Which part of the building did Mr. Jackson emerge from? The VCR indicates the officers arrived at 19:10 and the offense occurred at 19:15. What were the officers doing for 5 minutes? The VCR also says that Mr. Jackson was "...holding a clear plastic bag with suspect narcotics" (p. 2). What led the officers to believe the bag contained narcotics compared to anything else? Where were the officers when they observed Mr. Jackson? How far away from Mr. Jackson were the officers so that they could recognize the bag he held as contraband and not something legitimate? Were the officers on foot, or were they conducting a surveillance (e.g., using binoculars, from ground level or elevated position)? The Arrest Report also says, "Further investigation revealed..." and then describes locating suspected heroin. However, the report does not indicate *who* conducted the investigation, or what the investigation consisted of.
3. **The Arrest Process:** Who placed the subject in custody? Neither the arrest nor the VCR indicates which officer developed probable cause for the arrest from their personal observations. The Arrest Report says, "A/O recovered the narcotics and placed the subject in custody" but it does not account for the individual officers' observations and actions. Although Officer Mohammed is listed on the Arrest Report, he is not listed on the VCR (Jones and Smith are listed on the VCR). Neither the Arrest Report nor the VCR explains Officer Mohammed's actions and there is no report in discovery from him that defines his observations or actions.

The Arrest Report is so vague as to be useless on its own to any attorney, police supervisor, or court trying to glean the details of what exactly happened between the officers and Mr. Jackson. The Arrest Report says the arrest was effected "by 0002 Tact unit 264D " (p. 4). Per the report, 264D consisted of Jones, Smith, and Mohammed. It says that "the above subject was placed in custody during a narcotics investigation," without explaining *who* put him in custody, which is a factual element of any arrest.

4. **Handling of Evidence:** The VCR does not indicate who recovered the narcotics, whether it was field tested or identified on the scene s contraband, and how it was secured. All of these elements implicate the chain of custody.
5. **The Role of the Recovered Money:** The Arrest Report says, “A custodial search of the subject revealed \$948.00 U.S.C. suspect narcotics money” (p. 4). The Arrest Report does not specify how the investigating officers connected the money to the narcotics, or otherwise differentiated between illegal proceeds from narcotics sales and personal funds. The officers never documented that they observed Mr. Jackson selling narcotics, or exchanging narcotics for money. The VCR vaguely states, “suspect narcotics money;” but does not indicate how the officers connected the money to any illegal transaction. More specifically, the officers never said they observed any illegal transactions that connected the money they recovered with drug sales.

Conclusion

Had Defendants followed nationally accepted police standards regarding police report writing, then the reports filed in this case would have documented all of the relevant facts and details such as described in the aforementioned sections of this report.

After reviewing the materials, they do not change my opinion.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This report provides my opinion based on the available information at this time. I presume the information provided to me is accurate and correct. If additional information becomes available at a later time, then I may submit a supplemental report. Depending on the new information, my opinion in this report may or may not change. My opinion is based upon a reasonable degree of professional certainty.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Dated: February 26, 2025

/s/ Jon M. Shane

Jon Shane