



MAY 21 2026

Bianca Tirado
City Clerk, South Bend, IN

COMMUNITY POLICE REVIEW OFFICE 2026 CASE SUMMARY REPORT

Prepared by: Community Police Review Office (CPRO)

Date: May 21, 2026

Report Type: CONFIDENTIAL - Privacy-Redacted, For CPRB Use

Executive Summary

This report contains the 2025 citizen complaints currently under review by the Community Police Review Office (CPRO). The summary includes allegations, investigative findings, applicable South Bend Police Department (SBPD) policy references, evidence reviewed, and formal CPRO recommendations. All personally identifiable information (PII) has been redacted. The report is intended for formal review by the Community Police Review Board (CPRB) and relevant city officials.

Key Questions for CPRB Board Members to Consider

1. Are the allegations well-founded based on the preponderance of evidence?
 2. Were departmental policies and legal standards followed in each case?
 3. What recommendations should the board consider regarding training or policy changes to enhance SBPD and minimize incidents of misconduct?
 4. Are there common themes in the complaints that indicate patterns of police misconduct?
-

Case Disposition Definitions (For SBPD classification of dispositions, please refer to Policy 1007.6.4)

Sustained: The investigation determined that the officer's actions violated department policy or procedures.

Not Sustained: The investigation could not determine whether the alleged misconduct occurred. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

Unfounded: *The investigation determined that the alleged incident did not occur.*

THIS OUTCOME NEEDS TO BE ADDED TO THE DETERMINED OUTCOMES TO BE ALIGNED WITH THE SBPD.

Exonerated: The investigation found that the incident occurred, but the officer's actions were lawful and in compliance with policy. Or the investigation found the complaint to be false or unfounded.

Withdrawn: The complainant voluntarily requested that no further action be taken.



**SOUTH BEND
COMMUNITY POLICE
REVIEW OFFICE**

CASE: CPRB2025-013

DATE OF INCIDENT: [REDACTED]

LOCATION OF INCIDENT: [REDACTED]

SBPD CASE: [REDACTED]

***SBPD Outcome: Exonerated.** The investigation found that the incident occurred, but the officer's actions were lawful and in compliance with policy. Or the investigation found the complaint to be false or unfounded.*

Summary of Complaint

The complainant alleges that officers failed to investigate an incident involving a juvenile adequately and failed to utilize available juvenile protection procedures.

Incident Summary

Officers responded to multiple calls regarding a disruptive dispute between a complainant and a juvenile child at a residential address. The reporting officer noted that he was familiar with the residence and the individuals involved due to prior encounters and stated that the complainant and the juvenile had a history of ongoing conflict. Earlier in the shift, officers had already been dispatched to the residence for a juvenile-related complaint.

During the earlier interaction, the juvenile expressed concern that the situation would escalate if officers left. The juvenile reported that she wanted to contact her brother, but the complainant would not allow her to. (Officers often contact a family member to de-escalate the situation.) The juvenile stated that the parties had been arguing intermittently throughout the day and that she had left the residence several times. According to the juvenile, the complainant locked the door after she left the home.

Officers were dispatched again later in the shift due to continued disturbances. Upon arrival, officers described the scene as chaotic. The complainant was observed inside the residence while the juvenile was outside. An exterior window was fully open, and the officer observed the juvenile throwing punches through the window toward the interior of the residence. The officer could not determine whether any contact was made with the complainant. Both individuals were yelling at each other and initially did not respond to the officer's commands.

Officers observed broken or scattered household items in the front yard and noted that the interior of the residence appeared disarrayed, with household items strewn throughout. Due to the escalating situation, the officer detained the juvenile in handcuffs and placed her in the back of a patrol vehicle. According to the officer, the juvenile attempted to pull away while the handcuffs were being applied.



SOUTH BEND
COMMUNITY POLICE
REVIEW OFFICE

While detained, the juvenile stated that she had been struck on the arm with a bat. After the juvenile calmed down, the officer removed the handcuffs and spoke with her further in the patrol vehicle. During this conversation, the officer observed redness and possible swelling on the juvenile's upper left arm when compared to the other arm. The officer documented the injury with photographs. The juvenile reported that the arm was painful to the touch and that movement caused pain in multiple directions. The juvenile expressed concern that the arm might be broken.

The juvenile provided a statement describing the events leading up to the altercation. According to the juvenile, after she had been locked out of the home, she attempted to scratch through the screen of an open side window. The juvenile stated that the complainant punched her through the window, causing the screen to strike her face. The juvenile reported that both parties continued arguing and that the complainant threw a tiki lighter through the window. The juvenile further stated that the complainant later came outside with a baseball bat and swung it once toward the lower part of her leg, but missed. The juvenile indicated that after the complainant returned to the residence, she threw items through the window into the house, and that both parties attempted to strike each other with various objects during the confrontation. However, neither succeeded in striking the other during that portion of the exchange.

A secondary officer spoke with the complainant while the primary officer interviewed the juvenile. Officers documented the condition of the property and photographed the juvenile's injuries. Due to the reported injury and the juvenile's complaints of pain, she was transported to the hospital for medical evaluation. The reporting officer later spoke with the juvenile again at the hospital, and the juvenile provided a statement consistent with the one given at the scene.

Following a discussion among the responding officers, probable cause was established to arrest the complainant. The reporting officer contacted a Department of Child Services (DCS) intake specialist and explained the situation involving the juvenile and the household. A relative arrived and took custody of the other juveniles in the home. Officers noted that DCS and the Special Victims Unit would follow up regarding the incident.

The reporting officer returned to the hospital the following morning to speak with the juvenile and the relative again. After leaving the hospital, the officer obtained a search warrant for the residence where the incident occurred. Officers then secured the residence and released the key to the relative responsible for the juveniles.

The investigation documented an escalating domestic conflict between the complainant and the juvenile, visible injury to the juvenile's arm, and significant disorder inside and outside the residence. The incident ultimately resulted in the arrest of the complainant and the filing of a felony battery charge.



SBPD Policy 300 Standards of Conduct

CPRO Evidence Reviewed

Evidence Reviewed	Evidence Description	Source	Notes
Complaint Materials	Citizen Complaint Form	CPRO	Original complaint submitted for review
Police Reports	Initial Incident Report	SBPD	Primary responding officer report
Police Reports	Supplemental Officer Reports	SBPD	Additional narratives from assisting officers
Police Reports	Arrest Report	SBPD	Documentation of arrest procedures
Video Evidence	Body Worn Camera Footage Primary Officer	SBPD	Officer assigned to initial contact
Video Evidence	Body Worn Camera Footage Assisting Officers	SBPD	Additional responding officers
Video Evidence	Dash Camera Footage	SBPD	In-car camera recordings, if available
Photographic Evidence	Injury Photographs	SBPD	Photographs documenting injuries
Administrative Records	Internal Affairs / OPS Case File	SBPD	Internal investigation file
Policy Materials	SBPD Duty Manual	SBPD	SBPD Duty Manual Provided



**SOUTH BEND
COMMUNITY POLICE
REVIEW OFFICE**

CASE: CPRB2025.021

DATE OF INCIDENT: [REDACTED]

LOCATION OF INCIDENT: [REDACTED]

SBPD CASE: [REDACTED]

Sustained: The investigation determined that the officer's actions violated department policy or procedures.

Incident Type: Traffic Stop / DUI Investigation / Detention

Allegation Categories:

- Unlawful Arrest
- Unlawful Search
- Improper Handcuffing
- Lack of Probable Cause
- Failure to Provide Miranda Warnings

Summary of Complaint

A Complaint Was Submitted Alleging That During a Traffic Stop and DUI Investigation, Officers:

- Conducted An Unlawful Arrest
- Performed An Unlawful Search
- Improperly Applied Handcuffs
- Lacked Probable Cause
- Failed To Provide Miranda Warnings

The complainant reported confusion regarding the process and stated that the encounter left them feeling unsafe and without a clear understanding of the officer's actions.

INCIDENT OVERVIEW

An officer initiated a traffic stop after allegedly observing a vehicle fail to stop for a red traffic signal at an intersection. According to the officer, this observation established the basis for the stop.

During initial contact, the officer reported detecting the odor of an alcoholic beverage. The complainant acknowledged consuming alcoholic beverages prior to operating the vehicle.

The complainant exited the vehicle upon request without incident and agreed to participate in a DUI investigation, including Standardized Field Sobriety Tests (SFSTs).

DUI INVESTIGATION

- **The Following Investigative Steps Were Conducted:**
- The Complainant Admitted to Consuming Alcohol
- Medical Screening Questions Were Administered



SOUTH BEND
COMMUNITY POLICE
REVIEW OFFICE

- **Standardized Field Sobriety Tests Were Conducted, Including:**
 - Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus (HGN)
 - Vertical Gaze Nystagmus (VGN)
 - Walk-and-Turn Test
 - One-Leg Stand Test
- The officer documented observed indicators during these tests.
- A Preliminary Breath Test (PBT) was administered using another officer's device. The officer initially interpreted the result as significantly elevated; however, it was later determined that the reading had been misinterpreted.
- The complainant was advised of Indiana's Implied Consent and, after initial hesitation, agreed to further testing.
- A certified breath test was subsequently administered at a county facility, producing a result within the legal limit.

DETENTION AND RELEASE

Following The Administration of The Certified Breath Test:

- The Complainant Was Removed from Handcuffs
- The Complainant Was Placed in A Patrol Vehicle for Transport
- During Transport, A Supervisor Instructed the Officer to Return to the County Facility
- The Supervisor Reviewed the Officer's Actions and Discussed Procedures with the Complainant

The complainant was ultimately released from custody without charges.

INCIDENT TIMELINE

The Following Timeline Is Derived from Body-Worn Camera Footage and Related Documentation and Reflects Key Events During the Detention and Release Process:

- **9:35 PM** – Handcuffs were removed from the complainant
- **9:37 PM** – The complainant remained unhandcuffed and was seated in the rear of a patrol vehicle awaiting transport
- **9:42 PM** – The officer was instructed by a supervisor to return to the county facility with the complainant
- **9:43 PM** – While stopped at an intersection, the officer advised the complainant of the return to the facility under supervisory direction
- **9:50 PM** – The officer arrived back at the county facility with the complainant
- **10:03 PM** – The complainant was fully released from police custody



INVESTIGATION AND EVIDENCE REVIEWED

The CPRO Reviewed the Following Materials:

- Complaint Submission
- Body-Worn Camera (BWC) Footage
- Mobile Video Recorder (MVR) Footage
- Officer Reports and Documentation
- Follow-Up Communication with The Complainant

The complainant was afforded the right to review video footage at the SBPD, but declined to participate after being advised that the specific test readings were not visible in the recording.

FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

The officer articulated a lawful basis for the initial traffic stop based on a traffic violation.

During the DUI investigation:

- The officer relied in part on a Preliminary Breath Test result that was later determined to be misinterpreted
- The certified breath test contradicted the initial interpretation
- The complainant was detained and later released without charges

The Review Identified Areas for Improvement, Including:

- Accuracy In Interpreting and Articulating PBT Results
- Clarity In Explaining Investigative Procedures
- Communication With the Complainant During the Encounter

The officer did not issue a citation for the initial traffic violation.

POLICY REVIEW

The Following Departmental Policies Were Identified as Relevant to This Case:

Policy 320 – Standards of Conduct

Policy 420 – Detention (Duration)

Officers are required to detain individuals only for the time reasonably necessary to investigate the offense and determine whether arrest or release is appropriate.

COMPLAINANT STATEMENT

The complainant provided a detailed account of her experience during the traffic stop and subsequent DUI investigation. The complainant disputes the basis for the initial stop, stating that she did not believe she committed a traffic violation and maintained that the alleged red-light violation did not occur.

The complainant described the officer's demeanor as confrontational and stated that she felt her statements were dismissed early in the interaction. She reported that she did not fully understand the purpose or progression of the stop and felt confused throughout the encounter. While she acknowledged that field sobriety tests were explained, she indicated that communication challenges contributed to initial confusion during instructions.



**SOUTH BEND
COMMUNITY POLICE
REVIEW OFFICE**

Regarding the DUI investigation, the complainant stated that she complied with the requested tests and believed she performed them without difficulty. She further stated that she was informed her preliminary breath test result was significantly elevated and questioned its accuracy at the time. According to the complainant, her requests for clarification or verification were denied.

The complainant reported that she was placed in handcuffs without explanation and remained restrained during transport and while at the testing facility. She stated that she was not advised of her Miranda rights and believed that she was not free to leave once handcuffed.

The complainant expressed particular concern regarding the change in transport direction after being told she would be taken home. She described being returned to the county facility without a clear explanation, which contributed to feelings of fear, confusion, and loss of control. She reported that she was unable to contact anyone during this time and felt uncertain about what would happen next.

The complainant confirmed that she had a brief interaction with a supervisor, who advised her that there was an issue with the roadside breath-testing device. She stated that this explanation was provided after a period of detention and did not fully address her concerns.

The complainant described the overall experience as distressing and indicated that it significantly impacted her perception of personal safety and trust in law enforcement. She reported experiencing fear during the incident and emotional distress when later reviewing body-worn camera footage.

COMPLAINANT RESOLUTION REQUESTED

The Complainant Has Requested the Following:

- **Access To Additional Information Related to the Incident, Including:**
 - Clarification regarding conversations between officers and supervisors
 - Verification of preliminary breath test results
- Greater transparency regarding the events and decision-making process
- Accountability for the actions taken during the stop and detention
- Consideration of policy adherence and whether procedures were properly followed

The complainant also expressed a desire for assurance that similar incidents are addressed appropriately and that officers are held accountable when they deviate from policy.



**SOUTH BEND
COMMUNITY POLICE
REVIEW OFFICE**

CPRO Evidence Reviewed

Evidence Reviewed	Evidence Description	Source	Notes
Complaint Materials	Citizen Complaint Form	CPRO	Original complaint submitted for review
Police Reports	Initial Incident Report	SBPD	Primary responding officer report
Police Reports	Supplemental Officer Reports	SBPD	Additional narratives from assisting officers
Police Reports	Arrest Report	SBPD	Documentation of arrest procedures
Video Evidence	Body Worn Camera Footage Primary Officer	SBPD	Officer assigned to initial contact
Video Evidence	Body Worn Camera Footage Assisting Officers	SBPD	Additional responding officers
Video Evidence	Dash Camera Footage	SBPD	In-car camera recordings.
Administrative Records	Internal Affairs / OPS Case File	SBPD	Internal investigation file
Policy Materials	SBPD Duty Manual	SBPD	SBPD Duty Manual Provided



SUPPLEMENTAL POLICY REFERENCE

– CASE CPRB2025-013

Juvenile Response / Domestic Disturbance / Detention

POLICY 420 – CONTACTS AND TEMPORARY DETENTIONS

420.3 FIELD INTERVIEWS (REASONABLE SUSPICION)

“An officer may initiate the stop of a person... when there is articulable, reasonable suspicion to do so. A person, however, shall not be detained longer than is reasonably necessary to resolve the officer’s suspicion.”

420.4.1 EXPLANATION TO DETAINED PERSON

“Officers shall act with as much restraint and courtesy towards the person stopped as is possible under the circumstances. At some point during the stop, the officer shall, in every case, give the person stopped an explanation of the purpose of the stop.”

420.4.2 DURATION

“A person stopped pursuant to these rules may be detained... for a reasonable period of time. Officers should detain a person only for the length of time reasonably necessary... to determine if the person should be arrested or released.”

420.4.5 EFFECTING A STOP

“Officers shall use the least coercive means necessary under the circumstances to effect a stop and to detain a person.”

420.4.6 USE OF FORCE

“An officer may use only the amount of non-deadly force that is reasonably necessary to stop and detain a person pursuant to these guidelines.”

420.4.7 HANDCUFFING DURING DETENTION

“Officers have the option to handcuff a person during an investigatory stop. However, the officer must be able to articulate why handcuffing was necessary...”

(b) Handcuffing does not necessarily elevate an investigative stop into an arrest.”

POLICY 303 – HANDCUFFING AND RESTRAINTS

303.2 POLICY

“The South Bend Police Department authorizes the use of restraint devices... Restraint devices shall not be used to punish, to display authority, or as a show of force.”

303.3 USE OF RESTRAINTS

303.3.1 RESTRAINT OF DETAINEES

“The use of restraints on detainees should continue only for as long as is reasonably necessary to ensure the safety of officers and others.”



POLICY 300 – USE OF FORCE (STATEWIDE STANDARD)

300.2 POLICY

“Officers shall only use force that is objectively reasonable... Officers shall use only the level of force which a reasonably prudent officer would use under the same or similar circumstances.”

300.4 USE OF FORCE

“An officer shall use only the amount of force that is objectively reasonable to accomplish a lawful purpose.”

POLICY 312 – SEARCH AND SEIZURE

312.2 POLICY

“Members of this department will conduct searches in strict observance of the constitutional rights of persons being searched.”

312.3 SEARCHES

“A Valid Warrant Is Required... However, Several Exceptions... Include:

- Valid Consent
- Incident of A Lawful Arrest
- Exigent Circumstances
- Pat-Down Weapons Search
- Plain View.”

POLICY 310 – DOMESTIC / FAMILY VIOLENCE RESPONSE (GENERAL STANDARD)

“It is the policy of the South Bend Police Department to treat all acts of domestic violence as criminal conduct and to take appropriate enforcement action when probable cause exists.”

POLICY 901 – TEMPORARY CUSTODY OF JUVENILES

901.2 POLICY

“The South Bend Police Department shall take reasonable steps to provide for the safety, care, and well-being of juveniles in custody while ensuring compliance with Indiana law.”

901.4 TAKING CUSTODY OF A JUVENILE

- “Officers May Take a Juvenile into Custody When:
- The Juvenile Poses An Immediate Safety Risk
- There Is No Responsible Adult Able to Assume Custody
- Child Abuse or Neglect Is Suspected.”

POLICY 320 – STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

“Members are responsible for their own standard of professional performance and are expected to perform their duties in a manner consistent with department policy, training, and applicable laws.”



SUPPLEMENTAL POLICY REFERENCE

– CASE [CPRB2025-021 / DUI CASE]

Traffic Stop / DUI Investigation / Detention

POLICY 100 – LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY

100.2 POLICY

It is the policy of the South Bend Police Department to limit its members to only exercising the authority granted to them by law.

While this department recognizes officers' authority to make arrests and take other enforcement actions, officers are encouraged to exercise sound discretion in enforcing the law. This department does not tolerate abuse of law enforcement authorities.

100.3.1 ARREST AUTHORITY WITHIN THE JURISDICTION

“The Arrest Authority of Officers... Includes:

(b) When any misdemeanor or felony offense is being, or has been, committed in the officer's presence.

(g) When there is probable cause to believe that the offender has committed...

(b) A violation involving operating a vehicle while intoxicated.”

POLICY 420 – CONTACTS AND TEMPORARY DETENTIONS

420.3 FIELD INTERVIEWS (REASONABLE SUSPICION)

“An officer may initiate the stop of a person... when there is articulable, reasonable suspicion to do so. A person... shall not be detained longer than is reasonably necessary to resolve the officer's suspicion.”

420.4.1 EXPLANATION TO DETAINED PERSON

“Officers shall act with as much restraint and courtesy... and shall... give the person stopped an explanation of the purpose of the stop.”

420.4.2 DURATION

“A person stopped... may be detained... for a reasonable period of time. Officers should detain a person only for the length of time reasonably necessary... to determine if the person should be arrested or released.”

420.4.3 RIGHTS OF DETAINED PERSON (MIRANDA)

“Miranda warnings are required at the beginning of a custodial interrogation. An officer may not question a person... then give Miranda warnings...”

420.4.5 EFFECTING A STOP

“Officers shall use the least coercive means necessary under the circumstances to effect a stop and to detain a person.”



**SOUTH BEND
COMMUNITY POLICE
REVIEW OFFICE**

POLICY 504 – OPERATING WHILE INTOXICATED (OWI / DUI)

504.2 POLICY

“The South Bend Police Department is committed to the safety of the roadways and the community and will pursue fair but aggressive enforcement of Indiana’s OWI laws.”

504.3 INVESTIGATIONS

“All officers are expected to enforce these laws with due diligence...”

Information that should be documented includes...

(a) The field sobriety tests (FSTs) administered and the results.

(b) The officer’s observations that indicate impairment.”

504.5 CHEMICAL TESTS (IMPLIED CONSENT)

“A person implies consent to a chemical test...”

(a) The officer has probable cause to believe that the person has committed...

(a) OWI...”

POLICY 312 – SEARCH AND SEIZURE

312.2 POLICY

“Members of this department will conduct searches in strict observance of the constitutional rights of persons being searched.”

312.3 SEARCHES

“A Valid Warrant Is Required... However, Several Exceptions... Include:

- Valid Consent
- Incident Of a Lawful Arrest
- Vehicle Searches
- Exigent Circumstances
- Pat-Down Weapons Search”

POLICY 303 – HANDCUFFING AND RESTRAINTS

303.2 POLICY

“Restraint devices shall not be used to punish, to display authority, or as a show of force.”

303.3 USE OF RESTRAINTS

“Officers should carefully balance officer safety concerns with factors that include...”

- The circumstances...
- The demeanor...
- The age and health of the person.”

303.3.1 RESTRAINT OF DETAINEES

“The use of restraints on detainees should continue only for as long as is reasonably necessary to ensure the safety of officers and others.”



**SOUTH BEND
COMMUNITY POLICE
— REVIEW OFFICE —**

POLICY 300 – USE OF FORCE (STATE STANDARD)

300.2 POLICY

“Officers shall only use force that is objectively reasonable... Officers shall use only the level of force which a reasonably prudent officer would use under the same or similar circumstances.”

300.4 USE OF FORCE

“An officer shall use only the amount of force that is objectively reasonable to accomplish a lawful purpose.”

POLICY 320 – STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

“Members are responsible for their own standard of professional performance and are expected to perform their duties in a manner consistent with department policy, training, and applicable laws.”



Appendix B: Considerations Regarding Legal Protections and Limitations on Information Disclosure

The legal protections outlined below define the information boundaries within which the Community Police Review Office (CPRO) may share information with the Community Police Review Board (CPRB) or the public. These guidelines are based on state statutes, collective bargaining agreements, legal precedents, and department policies, and we are committed to following them while promoting transparency and collaboration.

1. Collective Bargaining Agreement (Working Agreement)
 - Information in the Office of Professional Standards is confidential in the personnel file (CBA, p. 14).
 - The Board of Public Safety (BPS) may not read or view such a file until it is introduced into evidence (CBA, p. 15). While the CBA does not explicitly reference CPRB, the South Bend Police Department applies the same limitation to access to CPRB reviews.
 - Office of Professional Standards files shall not be made available for inspection except as provided in the agreement, by court order, or if the employee consents (CBA, p. 15).

2. Access to Public Records Act (APRA) – Indiana Code § 5-14-3-4(b)(8)
 - Personnel files are exempt from disclosure except for the following:
 - a) Name, compensation, job title, business address and phone number, job description, education and training, prior work history, and dates of employment.
 - b) Status of formal charges, if any, against the employee.
 - c) The factual basis for a disciplinary action in which final action has been taken and that resulted in suspension, demotion, or discharge.

3. South Bend Police Department Policy
 - In accordance with Indiana Code § 5-14-3-4(b)(8), SBPD only discloses records identified in the statute.
 - Witness statements are not disclosed to the officer under investigation or the CPRB members.

4. Indiana State Law – Indiana Code § 36-8.2-1-5(5)
 - There is no legal requirement to disclose the complainant's identity to the officer involved in the complaint.



SOUTH BEND
COMMUNITY POLICE
REVIEW OFFICE

5. Garrity Statement – Garrity v. New Jersey, 385 U.S. 493 (1967)
 - Officers may be compelled to answer questions from the Office of Professional Standards under threat of termination.
 - These statements, known as Garrity-protected statements, are not considered public records and are not accessible to the CPRB or the public.

The following provisions explain why the Review Office may refrain from sharing detailed investigative information, even if such data is in internal records. These limitations strike a balance between transparency and the essential legal obligations of privacy, fairness, and due process.