



## Administrative Summary Report

Log No: 2020-0002605

This ASR provides crucial information to reporting parties, accused members and accused members' supervisors. The information contained herein is intended to display Department member's accountability and foster the relationship with members of the public by ensuring legitimacy and community confidence. The following are definitions of recommended findings:

- Sustained - where it is determined that the allegation is supported by the evidence;
- Not Sustained - where it is determined that there is insufficient evidence to prove the allegations;
- Unfounded - where it is determined by that an allegation is false or not factual; or
- Exonerated - where it is determined that the conduct described in the allegation occurred, but it is lawful and proper.

### INCIDENT DESCRIPTION

I arrived at my former address on the morning of June 11, 2019, to move the remainder of my belongings from my previous marital address. My wife at the time had fabricated a domestic battery complaint on 11/27/17, and had successfully obtained an order of protection that barred me from the premises, so I had arranged with my wife to bring movers clear out the garage, which was where she stated as all my belongings had been placed. Closer inspection revealed that items were missing, including a large desktop. On the advice of my attorney, I had notified CPD of my presence and intent to retrieve my property when I arrived, and was soon joined by Officer Caine (or Kane, unsure of spelling now). Upon exiting his vehicle, he stated "I thought this address sounded familiar-I'm her plumber". Needless to say, I was not happy to discover that the police officer I was relying on to protect my rights had a previous friendly business relationship with my soon-to-be Ex-wife, but I didn't think I had any option but to rely on what I hoped would be his sense of duty and professionalism to see it through. After conferring with my then-wife, [REDACTED] he announced that he would not allow me to enter the premises because she "wasn't comfortable with the idea", but said he would look for the one item I had specified, (the desktop). He subsequently reappeared and stated that he "didn't see it", and that nothing more would be done on my behalf. I should add that in addition to the desktop that she was subsequently forced to relinquish by her own lawyer after my oldest son stumbled across it at a later date, I never recovered my personal set of tools, worth hundreds of dollars, that she later declared to be "mine now", thanks to officers Caine's refusal to perform his job. Several other officers also showed up, (for no reason I could ascertain), and also refused to help. I am curious as to what possible justification could be produced to justify this obvious favoritism. I am assuming CPD body camera was in use, as this would be SOP, to the best of my knowledge.

Was it in a School?: No

Was it in a Police Facility?: No

**LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE:** Residence, 57 [REDACTED] N Mc Vicker , District 016

**DATE & TIME OF INCIDENT:** 11 Jun 2019, 09:00

### NARRATIVE SUMMARY:

The Investigator gathered available evidence as listed. Based on their respective findings, this log number investigation has been concluded with the recommendations listed. Evidence was evaluated and considered by the investigator to reach their findings.



## Administrative Summary Report

Log No: 2020-0002605

- A sworn affidavit was obtained.
- Body Worn Camera video was available and reviewed.
- PCAD records, which document a unit's 911 dispatch history, were identified and reviewed.
- Various CPD reports or other documents related to this incident were available and analyzed.
- Witness(es) were identified and interviewed.
- The Complainant or Reporting Party cooperated in the investigation and provided information.

\*(Listed above are items for which the investigator has indicated as having been obtained and relevant to the investigation. This list is not inclusive of all items. For item list, please see Placeholder narrative text box below for more information.)

### INVESTIGATIVE CONCLUSION:

**Accused:** PATRICK CAIN  
**Rank:** POLICE OFFICER  
**Star Number:**

**RECOMMENDED PENALTY:** 600 - NO ACTION TAKEN / NOT SUSTAINED / EXONERATED / UNFOUNDED

### Allegations



## Administrative Summary Report

Log No: 2020-0002605

### 1 - Not Sustained - Operation/Personnel Violations/Inadequate/Failure to Provide Service

**Allegation:**

Complainant [REDACTED] relates that at the above location on the above date and time, and that on the advice of his attorney, he requested police to escort him to the residence of his ex-wife, [REDACTED] in order to retrieve property, consisting of a desk and various tools. Complainant [REDACTED] further relates that there was an active Order of Protection preventing him from being at the location of 57 [REDACTED] N. McVicker which is why he requested a police escort to retrieve said belongings. Complainant [REDACTED] further relates that upon the arrival of CPD, P.O. CAIN remarked that he was familiar with the address as he was the plumber for [REDACTED]. Subsequently, P.O. CAIN stated to complainant [REDACTED] that he would not allow him access to the residence to retrieve his belongings, but that he did not see the desk, and that nothing could be done on the behalf of complainant [REDACTED]. Complainant [REDACTED] alleges that, due to the private business relationship of [REDACTED] and P.O. CAIN, P.O. CAIN showed favoritism towards [REDACTED] and did not perform his duties properly as a Chicago Police Officer.