

**Date:** October 24, 2025  
**To:** Board Members, Citizen Complaint Authority  
**From:** John Kennedy, Director  
**Subject:** Investigation Summary – November 5, 2025 Board Meeting

**INVESTIGATION SUMMARIES – NEW BUSINESS**

# 1

<b>Complaint #</b>	25103
<b>Complainant</b>	R. Hall
<b>Complaint Received</b>	June 10, 2025
<b>CCA Investigator</b>	Dr. Arnie D. Slaughter

**COMPLAINT  
SUMMARY**

Incident Date: June 3, 2025

Complaint Received: June 10, 2025

Incident Time: 11:28 p.m.

Records Requested: June 11, 2025

Location: 2376 Victory Parkway - Marathon gas station

Records Received: July 8, 2025

Per CPD EVT-Database: Officer Bohn attempted to stop a verbal argument occurring in the parking lot at 2376 Victory Parkway involving Mx. Hall and an unidentified female. Mx. R. Hall stated that Officer Matthew Bohn pushed them causing them to fall backwards to the ground.

## FINDINGS

### Allegation

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizen	Finding
1	Excessive Force	Matthew Bohn	R. Hall	Sustained

### Collateral Allegations

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizen	Finding
1	Discourtesy	Matthew Bohn	R. Hall	Sustained
2	Improper Procedure (Failure to De-escalate)	Matthew Bohn	R. Hall	Sustained

## RECOMMENDATION

### #R2509

CCA is concerned about the unprofessional and antagonistic interactions between Officer Bohn and citizens in this encounter and in a previous CCA case. This is the second recommendation for Officer Bohn to receive additional training to better engage with citizens to create more trust between CPD and the citizens of Cincinnati. His previous incident with a different citizen occurred on February 10, 2024 (reference CCA Case #24038). The initial recommendation for Case #24038 comes after the review of Officer Bohn's BWC which showed him being unprofessional and using profane language to address a citizen.

While the incident for this case is a different situation, it is CCA's hope to minimize future encounters where Officer Bohn is discourteous and potentially antagonistic towards the citizens of Cincinnati. Attending a Diversity and/or Customer Service training may provide Officer Bohn with other options in any future encounter with citizens who are compliant but are argumentative.

### # 2

<b>Complaint #</b>	25099
<b>Complainant</b>	Amos Brown III
<b>Complaint Received</b>	June 4, 2024
<b>CCA Investigator</b>	Andrew Alanis

## COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Date: March 24, 2025

Complaint Received: June 04, 2025

Time: 4:59 p.m

Records Request Sent: June 16, 2025

Location: 2994 Gilbert Avenue

Records Request Received: July 14, 2025

Mr. Brown alleged that Officers Matthew Bohn and Blayne Buckler improperly stopped him for not wearing a seat belt while operating a motor vehicle, searched him and his vehicle for no reason.

## FINDINGS

### Original Allegations

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizen	Findings
1	Improper Stop	Matthew Bohn	Amos Brown III	Exonerated
2	Improper Stop	Blayne Buckler	Amos Brown III	Exonerated
3	Improper Search (Person)	Blayne Buckler	Amos Brown III	Sustained
4	Improper Seizure	Matthew Bohn	Amos Brown III	Exonerated
5	Improper Seizure	Blayne Buckler	Amos Brown III	Exonerated
6	Improper Search (Vehicle)	Matthew Bohn	Amos Brown III	Exonerated
7	Improper Search (Vehicle)	Blayne Buckler	Amos Brown III	Exonerated
8	Discourtesy	Matthew Bohn	Amos Brown III	Sustained

### Collateral Allegations

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizens	Findings
1	Improper Procedure (BWC)	Matthew Bohn	Amos Brown III	Sustained
2	Improper Procedure (Failure to Document)	Matthew Bohn	Amos Brown III	Sustained
3	Improper Procedure	Matthew Bohn	Amos Brown III	Sustained
4	Improper Procedure	Blayne Buckler	Amos Brown III	Sustained

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**#R2510**

In this case Officer Bohn and Officer Buckler both unholstered their firearms while seated in their police cruiser in the parking lot of the Shell gas station.

The rules Cincinnati Police Officers must follow regarding the unholstering of a firearm are found CPD Procedure Manual 12.550 Discharging of Firearms, which states (in part):

“At such time as a police officer perceives what he interprets to be a threat of loss of life or serious physical harm to himself or others at the hands of another, he has the authority to display a firearm, with finger outside the trigger guard and have it ready for self-defense. The finger is only to be placed on the trigger when on target and ready to engage a threat.”

Additionally, CPD Manual of Rules and Regulations 1.25 CPD Section One- Failure of Good Behavior states:

“1.25 A. Members of the Department shall only draw or display their firearms in time of demonstrated need or for official inspection. Members shall not use or handle firearms in a careless or imprudent manner.

B. Members shall not use, or handle department issued weapons in a careless or imprudent manner. This rule applies to any department issued weapon except firearms, which are covered under Rule 1.25A.”

In CCA’s respective interviews with Officer Bohn and Officer Buckler both disclosed that they had unholstered their firearms while parked in the lot of the Shell gas station when they were approached by Mr. Brown. Both Officer Bohn and Officer Buckler both cited officer safety issues, specifically that at the time Mr. Brown initiated contact with them they were not sure if they were going to be attacked.

Officer Bohn and Officer Buckler’s unholstering of their firearms was observed in CCA’s review of BWC footage. Further review of the footage showed that both officers unholstered their weapons, with Officer Bohn holding his on his lap with the muzzle pointed at the interior door of the police cruiser and Officer Buckler holding his in a low ready position on his right side while his door was partially opened for the duration for their contact with Mr. Brown at the gas station. The firearms were never pointed at or displayed to Mr. Brown as they were not within his view.

Only CPD Procedure 12.550 Discharging of Firearms and Rules and Regulations 1.25 CPD Section One-Failure of Good Behavior were found to address when an officer can unholster their firearm. Of these two guidelines, only 1.25 CPD Section One- Failure of Good Behavior addresses when an officer is permitted to unholster, or “draw”, their firearm. In this regulation it only states that an officer is permitted to, “draw or display their firearms in time of demonstrated need or for official inspection”. No further clarification is provided.

CCA recommends that CPD Procedure Manual be updated to include when, and under what circumstances an officer may unholster, or “draw”, their firearm. This is not currently addressed in the CPD Procedure Manual which only accounts for the displaying and discharge of a firearm by officers.

Additionally, CCA recommends that CPD Manual of Rules and Regulations 1.25 CPD Section One-Failure of Good Behavior define the term “demonstrated time of need” to reduce ambiguity and clarify for officers the circumstances when they are permitted to unholster their firearms during the course of their duties.

their duties.

**#R2511**

In Officer Bohn and Officer Buckler’s interaction with Mr. Brown both officers demonstrated a lack of understanding in regard to CPD procedure, specifically related to search and seizure, thoroughness of investigations, discourtesy, and proper activation/ deactivation of BWC. It is CCA’s recommendation that officers receive additional training regarding these subjects.

**#R2512**

CCA recommends that Officer Bohn be partnered with a more experienced police officer. In this case, as well as two other recent cases (CCA case #: 24038 and 25103), Officer Bohn was either working by himself, or in this case with a younger officer with less patrol experience. Partnering Officer Bohn with a more experienced Cincinnati Police officer may provide him with guidance for better understanding of CPD Procedure and CPD Rules and Regulations, to make better decisions in the field, and improve his professionalism.

---

---

**# 3**

<b>Complaint #</b>	24168
<b>Complainant</b>	Shawn Cole
<b>Complaint Received</b>	August 23, 2024
<b>CCA Investigator</b>	Dr. Arnie D. Slaughter

**COMPLAINT SUMMARY**

Incident Date: August 22, 2024

Complaint Received: August 23, 2024

Incident Time: 1:00 p.m.

Records Requested: December 31, 2024

Incident Location: Sunfield Drive and Crest Hill Avenue

Records Received: January 15, 2025

Mr. Shawn Cole alleged that two CPD officers stopped him and Witness A as they walked down Sunfield Drive and Crest Hill Avenue. Mr. Cole was detained, placed into handcuffs and his pockets searched. The officers allowed him to leave without a citation but later re-encountered him and Witness A a short time later the same evening and cited them for the initial pedestrian violation.

**FINDINGS**

**Original Allegations**

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizen	Findings
1	Improper Stop	Myles Abt	Shawn Cole	Not Sustained
2	Improper Stop	Jeremy Chitwood	Shawn Cole	Not Sustained
3	Improper Search	Myles Abt	Shawn Cole	Sustained
4	Improper Search	Jeremy Chitwood	Shawn Cole	Unfounded
5	Improper Search	Myles Abt	Witness A	Unfounded
6	Improper Search	Jeremy Chitwood	Witness A	Unfounded

**Collateral Allegations**

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizens	Findings
1	Improper Stop (2 <sup>nd</sup> encounter)	Myles Abt	Shawn Cole	Sustained
2	Improper Stop (2 <sup>nd</sup> encounter)	Myles Abt	Witness A	Sustained

**OBSERVATION**

**#O2502**

Officer Abt stated that Mr. Cole’s hands were shaking, his neck was pulsating, and that he appeared “obviously stressed about the police being involved.” Officers must be cognizant that citizens may show normal, physiological responses (e.g. increased heart rate, rapid breathing, sweating, agitation, nervousness, elevated blood pressure, etc.) in situations that they perceive as stressful or potentially volatile. These reactions do not always indicate a person’s guilt or attempts to deceive. Based on a person’s physical health, mental health, life experiences, family history, and/or previous trauma, these reactions may occur and possibly intensify. It is recommended that officers confirm if a citizen has health issues in lieu of assuming guilt or malintent.

■

**# 4**

<b>Complaint #</b>	24124
<b>Complainant</b>	Justin Smith
<b>Complaint Received</b>	June 18, 2024
<b>CCA Investigator</b>	Jessalyn Goodman

**COMPLAINT SUMMARY**

Incident One:

Date: June 10, 2024

Date Records Requested: 6/18/2024

Time: 11:30 a.m.

Date Records Received: 4/10/2025

Location: 5800 Red Bank Road

Mr. Justin Smith and his fiancée, Witness A, were filming at Daniel Drake Park for Mr. Smith’s company. Officers Kevin Brown and Edsel Osborn approached them because their vehicle was parked next to a “No Parking” sign. Mr. Smith moved his vehicle, but the officers “harassed” him by yelling at him, calling him “stupid,” and using profanity. Further, Officers Brown and Osborn drew their mace, pointed it directly at Mr. Smith, and threatened to deploy it.

Incident Two:

Date: Unknown

Time: Unknown

Location: Unknown

Mr. Smith alleged that on an unknown date, he and his Witness A had another interaction with an officer. The officer used profanity towards Mr. Smith, slammed Witness A against a vehicle, and then pulled out his firearm. However, Mr. Smith had no further information to relay regarding this incident.

**FINDINGS**

**Original Allegations**

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizen	Finding
1	Harassment	Kevin Brown	Justin Smith	Unfounded
2	Harassment	Edsel Osborn	Justin Smith	Unfounded
3	Discourtesy	Kevin Brown	Justin Smith	Sustained
4	Discourtesy	Kevin Brown	Witness A	Unfounded
5	Discourtesy	Edsel Osborn	Justin Smith	Unfounded
6	Discourtesy	Edsel Osborn	Witness A	Unfounded
7	Excessive Force	Unknown	Witness A	Not Sustained
8	Discourtesy	Unknown	Justin Smith	Not Sustained
9	Improper Pointing of a Firearm	Unknown	Witness A	Not Sustained

**COMMENDATION**

CCA extends a commendation to Sergeant King for his role in de-escalating a very tense and heated exchange between Mr. Smith, Witness A, and Officers Brown and Osborn. BWC footage showed that on arrival, Sergeant King actively listened to Mr. Smith and Witness A, watched the footage they provided regarding Officers Brown’s and Osborn’s behavior, and provided them with information on how to address their concerns. Mr. Smith and Witness A thanked Sergeant King for his method and its distinction from previous negative encounters in the past. His calm approach, knowledge of and utilization of de-escalation techniques proved invaluable in preventing a situation from escalating to an arrest or potential use of force scenario. This may be a useful training tool for command staff in the future.

■

# 5

<b>Complaint #</b>	24165
<b>Complainants</b>	Donald Jordan
<b>Complaint Received</b>	August 13, 2024
<b>CCA Investigator</b>	Ronald Pugh

**COMPLAINT SUMMARY**

Date of Incident: August 2, 2024

Date Records Requested: August 13, 2024

Time: 6:30 p.m.

Date Records Received: No Records Received

Mr. Jordan alleged Lieutenant (Lt.) Chantia Miller posted discriminatory messages about him to her social media pages, while in her CPD uniform.

Additionally, Mr. Jordan reported that he has filed complaints with Internal Investigations Section (IIS), but the investigation is “swept under the rug,” and “nothing happens.”

**FINDINGS**

**Original Allegations**

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizen	Finding
1	Discrimination	Chantia Miller	Donald Jordan	Not Sustained

**RECOMMENDATION**

#R2513

The case was very complex and included very minimal evidence (no paperwork and no BWC). CPD's social media policy is vague and antiquated at best and needs to be updated to include specifics on the personal use of social media accounts.

Various police department policies were researched from around the country and a recommendation is being made to update the social media policy (CPD Procedure § 14.205 social media (Revised January 28, 2021))

CCA recommends that the following be added to CPD Procedure § 14.205 social media:

While CPD has some of the following language in their policy CCA recommends the following language:

“Public employees occupy a trusted position in the community, and thus, their statements have the potential to contravene the policies and performance of this department. Due to the nature of the work and influence associated with the law enforcement profession, it is necessary that employees of this department be subject to certain reasonable limitations on their speech and expression. To achieve its mission and efficiently provide service to the public, the Cincinnati Police Department will carefully balance the individual employee's rights against the department's needs and interests when exercising a reasonable degree of control over its employees' speech and expression. Department personnel should always be aware that privacy settings and social media sites are constantly in flux, and that they should never assume that personal information posted on such sites is protected. Department personnel should always carefully consider the implications of their speech and any other form of expression when using social media. Finally, department personnel forfeit any expectation of privacy with regard to anything published or maintained through file-sharing software or any internet site open to public view.

#### A. Precautions and Prohibitions

- Department personnel are free to express themselves as private citizens on social media sites to the degree that their speech and expression does not impair working relationships of this department for which loyalty and confidentiality are important, impede the performance of duties, impair harmony among coworkers, adversely impact the disciplinary process, or cause disruption to the department, or to any other city agency.
- As public employees, department personnel are cautioned that speech, on- or off-duty, made pursuant to their official duties - that is, that owes its existence to the employee's professional duties and responsibilities - is not protected speech under the First Amendment and may form the basis for discipline. Department personnel should assume that their speech and expression, and related activity on social media sites will reflect upon their official capacity and this department.
- Department personnel will not post, transmit, or otherwise disseminate any information to which they have access to as a result of their employment or publish materials that could reasonably be considered to represent the views or positions of this department without written permission from the Chief of Police.”

■

# 6

<b>Complaint #</b>	25049
<b>Complainant</b>	Azar Barasov
<b>Complaint Received</b>	March 28, 2025
<b>CCA Investigator</b>	Jessalyn Goodman

### COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Date: March 25, 2025

Date Complaint Received: 3/28/2025

Time: 11:38 p.m.

Date Records Requested: 3/28/2025

Location: 1962 Westwood Northern Blvd

Date Records Received: 5/08/2025

On Tuesday, March 25, 2025, Mr. Azar Barasov was physically arrested. His car was towed, even though his vehicle was legally parked. Mr. Barasov did not believe his car should have been towed or impounded.

### FINDINGS

#### Original Allegation

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizen	Finding
1	Improper Seizure	Koch-Hutchinson	Azar Barasov	Exonerated

# 7

<b>Complaint #</b>	25088
<b>Complainants</b>	Chantinnelle Jordan
<b>Complaint Received</b>	May 20, 2025
<b>CCA Investigator</b>	Jessalyn Goodman

### COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Date of Incident: May 7, 2025

Date Complaint Received: 5/20/2025

Time: 11:30 p.m.

Date Records Requested: 6/6/2025

Location: 5531 Dunning Place

Date Records Received: 6/27/2025

On May 7, 2025, Officers Garret Gillespie and Porscha Jordan arrested Ms. Chantinnelle Jordan outside of her residence. They did not immediately explain why she was under arrest, read her a Miranda warning, or grant her request to speak with a supervisor. Eventually, they stated the arrest was in relation to a crime reported by Witness A; however, Officers Gillespie and Jordan only spoke to witnesses who supported Witness A and did not speak to anyone else.

Ms. Jordan noted that Witness A’s complaint is one of several that have been made in the past; previous CPD officers determined there were credibility concerns with Witness A. Ms. Jordan is concerned the police officers continue to accept Witness A’s allegations against her, despite historic complaints being without merit.

**FINDINGS**

**Allegations**

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizen	Finding
1	Improper Seizure	Garrett Gillespie	Chantinnelle Jordan	Exonerated
2	Improper Seizure	Porscha Johnson	Chantinnelle Jordan	Exonerated
3	Lack of Service	Garrett Gillespie	Chantinnelle Jordan	Unfounded
4	Lack of Service	Porscha Johnson	Chantinnelle Jordan	Unfounded

**OBSERVATION**

**#O2503**

In previous cases, CCA has noted that citizens have the right to request a supervisor if a citizen objects to an officer’s conduct. Although CPD Procedure lists numerous circumstances which require officers to notify/request a supervisor respond to a scene, it does not require officers to request a supervisor to respond only because a citizen requests one. To promote transparency and community goodwill, CCA has recommended that CPD officers request a supervisor when asked to do so by involved individuals, with the understanding that CPD supervisors have discretion whether to respond. This case serves as an example of an officer whose conduct followed this exact course of action.

■

**# 8**

<b>Complaint #</b>	25094
<b>Complainant</b>	Rasbeem Wooford

<b>Complaint Received</b>	May 27, 2025
<b>CCA Investigator</b>	Joseph Vesper

## COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Date of Incident: May 19, 2025

Date Complaint Received: May 27, 2025

Time: 7:58 p.m.

Date Records Requested: May 27, 2025

Location: 5412 Winneste Avenue

Date Records Received: July 30, 2025

Per CPD EVT database: Mr. Wofford alleged that on Monday, May 19, 2025, Officer Smith improperly "pointed her firearm at a juvenile" and Officer Caudell improperly pushed Mr. Wofford.

## FINDINGS

### Allegations

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizen	Finding
1	Improper Pointing of Firearm	Johanna Smith	Witness A	Exonerated
2	Excessive Force	Seth Caudell	Rasbem Wofford	Unfounded

# 9

<b>Complaint #</b>	25129
<b>Complainant</b>	Orlando Byrden
<b>Complaint Received</b>	July 11, 2025
<b>CCA Investigator</b>	Joseph Vesper

## COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Date of Incident: July 11, 2025

Date Complaint Received: July 11, 2025

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Date Records Requested: July 11, 2025

Location: 3201 Warsaw Avenue

Date Records Received: Partial - August 13, 2025

Mr. Byrden alleged that on July 11, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., Sergeant John Heine approached him while he was parked in a lot near 3201 Warsaw Ave., supervising a Cincinnati Water Works project across the street. Sergeant Heine informed Mr. Byrden that he had seen him parked there for several days and began to question him. Mr. Byrden alleged Sergeant Heine was discourteous, the stop was improper, and the stop was improperly prolonged when Sergeant Heine took possession of his ID.

**FINDINGS**

**Original Allegations**

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizen	Finding
1	Improper Stop	John Heine	Orlando Byrden	Exonerated
2	Improper Seizure	John Heine	Orlando Byrden	Sustained
3	Discourtesy	John Heine	Orlando Byrden	Unfounded

**Collateral Allegations**

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizen	Finding
1	Abuse of Authority	John Heine	Orlando Byrden	Sustained

**RECOMMENDATION**

#R2514

**Definition of Abuse of Authority**

At its core, abuse of authority occurs when an officer misuses the powers of their position for personal gain, interest, or advantage.<sup>1</sup> It occurs when an officer uses their official position not for the public good, but for their own benefit. The CPD Manual of Rules and Regulations § 1.13 states: “Members shall not, at any time, use or attempt to use their official position, badge, or credentials for personal or financial gain.” Similarly, the CCA has traditionally defined Abuse of Authority as, “Misuse of one’s official position, including by (but not limited to) engaging in improperly coercive conduct or by mistreating persons. Such conduct includes misusing one’s official position, through coercive behavior or otherwise, in order to obtain personal benefits, even if those benefits have relatively little financial value.”

While these definitions provide a general understanding, they lack the specificity needed for more effective evaluation of abuse of authority allegations. Therefore, CCA proposes the following, more precise definition to CPD and the following test:

“Abuse of Authority is the misuse of powers, privileges, or symbols by a CPD employees that extends beyond the scope of their official duties or in a manner not allowed legally, ethically, or by departmental standards to gain personal benefit, regardless of value. This includes for example:

- Preferential treatment for oneself or associates (e.g., avoiding a complaint, using status for discounts or services);
- Coercion, threats, or intimidation relying on the officer’s position of power, rather than legal justification;
- Decisions or actions based on personal animus, favoritism, or retaliation;
- Actions that exceed legal boundaries for illegitimate purposes, such as settling personal scores or furthering political agendas.”

This definition provides clarity, flexibility, and a strong ethical foundation. By focusing on personal benefit, it effectively distinguishes abuse of authority from other misconduct such as excessive force or negligence. It encompasses both overt misuse of status and more subtle forms of favoritism or retaliation. Having a shared definition of Abuse of Authority between CCA and IIS also helps establish consistency. This definition aligns with professional ethics and administrative policies, underscoring the principle that officers are entrusted with authority to serve the public, not themselves.

■

# 10

<b>Complaint #</b>	25133
<b>Complainant</b>	Dashiki Hughes
<b>Complaint Received</b>	July 16, 2025
<b>CCA Investigator</b>	Ronald Pugh

**COMPLAINT SUMMARY**

Date of Incident: July 2, 2025

Date Complaint Received: July 16, 2025

Time: 9:03 p.m.

Date Records Requested: July 18, 2025

Location: 1701 Vine St. Cincinnati, Ohio 45223

Date Records Received: August 29, 2025

Ms. Hughes stated that she was leaving the gas station when several officers followed and pulled her over. The Officers had her roll her windows down and had her step out of the vehicle. Her vehicle was searched without her consent. Ms. Hughes was ultimately taken to jail and towed her vehicle. When placed in handcuffs the restraints caused pain and damage to her wrists. Ms. Hughes felt that the officers failed to properly handle her child when the officers left her child with a non-related adult without her permission. Ms. Hughes was concerned about her child’s safety. She also felt the officers were unduly disrespectful and aggressive.

**FINDINGS****Allegations**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Involved Officer</b>	<b>Involved Citizen</b>	<b>Finding</b>
1	Discourtesy	Cameron Mullis	Dashiki Hughes	Exonerated
2	Discourtesy	Cole Dunahay	Dashiki Hughes	Exonerated
3	Excessive Force	Cameron Mullis	Dashiki Hughes	Unfounded
4	Excessive Force	Cole Dunahay	Dashiki Hughes	Unfounded
5	Improper Search	Cameron Mullis	Dashiki Hughes	Exonerated
6	Improper Search	Cole Dunahay	Dashiki Hughes	Exonerated
7	Improper Procedure	Cameron Mullis	Dashiki Hughes	Exonerated
8	Improper Procedure	Cole Dunahay	Dashiki Hughes	Exonerated

■