

**BEFORE THE POLICE BOARD OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO**

**IN THE MATTER OF CHARGES FILED AGAINST )**  
**POLICE OFFICER ALBERTO COVARRUBIAS, )** **No. 18 PB 2947**  
**STAR No. 18769, DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, )**  
**CITY OF CHICAGO, )**  
**RESPONDENT. )** **(CR No. 1079817)**

**FINDINGS AND DECISION**

On August 16, 2018, the Superintendent of Police filed with the Police Board of the City of Chicago charges against Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias, Star No. 18769 (hereinafter sometimes referred to as “Respondent”), recommending the Respondent be discharged from the Chicago Police Department for violating several Rules of Conduct.

A hearing on these charges against the Respondent took place before Hearing Officer Allison L. Wood on March 22 and May 21, 2019. Following this evidentiary hearing, the members of the Police Board read and reviewed the record of the proceedings and viewed the video-recording of the entire evidentiary hearing. Hearing Officer Wood made an oral report to and conferred with the Police Board before it rendered its findings and decision.

**POLICE BOARD FINDINGS**

The Police Board of the City of Chicago, as a result of its hearing on the charges, finds and determines that:

1. The Respondent was at all times mentioned herein employed as a police officer by the Department of Police of the City of Chicago.
2. A copy of the charges filed, and a notice stating the date, place, and time the initial status hearing would be held, were personally served upon the Respondent not fewer than five (5) days

before the date of the initial status hearing for this case.

3. Throughout the hearing on the charges the Respondent appeared in person and was represented by legal counsel.

### **Introduction**

4. On March 26, 2016, at or around 5:24am, Officer Miguel Delgado and Officer Christopher Oehmen, partners assigned to the 4<sup>th</sup> District Tactical Team, responded to a call that there was a domestic disturbance involving a man and a woman at xxxxx South Avenue J, in Chicago. When they arrived at the location, they observed a woman (later identified as Guadalupe Morales) and a man (later identified as Respondent), who both appeared to be intoxicated. When questioned by the officers, Ms. Morales was unable to provide answers to any questions, including what her name was or where she lived. It was decided that since Ms. Morales appeared to be intoxicated and it was cold outside, she was placed in the back of Officer Delgado's vehicle. Respondent identified himself as a Chicago police officer from the 6<sup>th</sup> District, and he presented the officers with his police star. Respondent was not able to answer any questions about who the woman was, where he was coming from, or where he was going.

The officers determined that since the woman was so unresponsive to the simple questions posed to her, it would not be safe to leave her on the street alone. They contacted their direct supervisor for guidance on how to handle this situation. Their direct supervisor, Sergeant James Butler, was the field supervisor assigned to the 4<sup>th</sup> District. He drove to the scene in response to their call. When he arrived, he directed Officer Oehmen to escort Respondent to his vehicle and Respondent was placed in the passenger seat of Sergeant Butler's vehicle. Sergeant Butler asked Respondent a series of questions such as what was going on, who was the woman, and where were

Police Board Case No. 18 PB 2947  
Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias  
Findings and Decision

they coming from. Respondent was unable to provide him with any direct answers to any of his questions. Sergeant Butler then exited his vehicle to speak to the woman who was still sitting in the back of Officer Delgado's vehicle. Officer Oehmen was standing next to the driver's side of Sergeant Butler's vehicle when he observed Respondent, who was still sitting on the passenger side of the vehicle, touching the Personal Data Terminal (PDT) computer screen in Sergeant Butler's vehicle. Officer Oehmen directed Respondent to stop touching the PDT and Respondent said something to the effect that he thought they were "brothers." Officer Oehmen replied that they were not "brothers." Respondent then threatened to exit the car and kick Officer Oehmen's ass. Officer Oehmen relayed Respondent's threat to Sergeant Butler, who then advised that Respondent was to be arrested. Officer Delgado placed Respondent under arrest and handcuffed Respondent. He also searched Respondent to see if he had a weapon and to take his badge. Respondent, who was on furlough at the time, was not carrying a weapon. When Officer Delgado took Respondent's wallet and examined the contents, he found a piece of paper that was identified as a line up sheet. In observing Respondent's arrest, Sergeant Butler recognized the line up sheet as his document that he kept between the screen and the keyboard of the PDT in his vehicle. The line up sheet is a list of the officers' assignments for the night, the beat they are working, and who they are working with. Respondent was then placed in the back of Officer Delgado's vehicle to be taken to the 4<sup>th</sup> District for processing. The woman was taken to Trinity Hospital for observation and to find out if she had been the victim of a crime. Personnel at Trinity Hospital later advised the officers that she had not been the victim of a crime.

Respondent was charged with assault and was handcuffed to a ring on the wall of the processing area at the 4<sup>th</sup> District. The Watch Operational Lieutenant of the 4<sup>th</sup> District was Lieutenant Migdalia Bulnes. Lieutenant Bulnes notified the Internal Affairs Division to send

Police Board Case No. 18 PB 2947  
Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias  
Findings and Decision

someone from their office to speak with Respondent.

Sergeant Joseph Stehlik, who worked in Bureau of Internal Affairs and was assigned to investigate off-duty police conduct, received a call that an officer had been arrested for drinking and that he was to go to the 4<sup>th</sup> district to administer a breathalyzer test. When he arrived at the 4<sup>th</sup> district, he identified himself to Respondent, explained that since there were allegations that he was intoxicated he was required to take a breathalyzer test. Respondent refused to take a breathalyzer test, refused to sign any of the documentation that Sergeant Stehlik advised him that he had to sign as part of the administrative process, and repeatedly asked to have legal representation. Lieutenant Migdalia Bulnes, who overheard Respondent's refusal to take the breathalyzer test, attempted to explain the process to Respondent and advised him that if he did not take the breathalyzer test he would risk being discharged from the Police Department. Respondent still refused to take the breathalyzer test and he refused to sign any of the documents that Sergeant Stehlik explained needed to be signed as part of the administrative protocol.

The Superintendent presented the testimony of Respondent as an adverse witness, Officer Oehmen, Sergeant Butler, Sergeant Stehlik, and Lieutenant Bulnes. The Superintendent also presented: the Watch Log of Sergeant Butler; the Administration of Rights form for Respondent dated March 26, 2016; the Notice of Duty form for Respondent dated March 26, 2016; the Notification of Charges form for Respondent dated March 26, 2016; the August 19, 2016, transcript of Respondent's interview with the Independent Police Review Authority; the June 29, 2017, transcript of Respondent with the Independent Police Review Authority; Section 5/12-1(a) of the Illinois Compiled Statutes, 720 ILCS 5/12-1(a); and Section 5/16-1(a) of the Illinois Compiled Statutes, 720 ILCS 5/16-1(a).

Respondent testified on his own behalf and he presented two character witnesses, Sergeant

Police Board Case No. 18 PB 2947  
Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias  
Findings and Decision

Richard Steinbrenner and Yolanda Montejano. Sergeant Steinbrenner was Respondent's direct supervisor in the 6<sup>th</sup> District. He testified that Respondent was a good officer who always cared about doing the right thing; and who was always interested in learning how he could be better. Ms. Montejano has known Respondent since high school. She testified that he is a good person and a good friend. She teaches first grade for CPS and he spoke to her class. He did such a great job that many of her students wanted to become police officers. She has always known him as someone who keeps fit and maintains a healthy lifestyle.

Respondent admitted that he had been drinking on March 26, 2016. He testified that he first went to a family gathering at his sister's house in Indiana around 2:00pm, and that he had four or five beers. He left his sister's house around 4 hours later and went with Miguel Valdivia, his brother-in-law's younger brother, to a bar and then to the home of Edgar Romeo, drinking at every stop. Respondent testified that he had no independent recollection of his movements or actions after leaving his sister's house, but that he had no basis to dispute any of the evidence presented as to his movements or actions as they were presented in this hearing. Respondent maintained that he had been under enormous amounts of stress related to his job as a police officer and that he did not drink prior to joining the Police Department. He testified that he was affected by the poverty, despair, and violence that he encountered on a daily basis. A fellow police officer that he was close friends with was hit by a car and died. While he initially drank to build camaraderie with fellow officers, he came to realize that drinking numbed the pain and helped him sleep. He didn't recognize that he had a drinking problem until after the night of March 26, 2016, when he woke up in a jail cell. Afterwards, he immediately sought in-patient treatment and outpatient treatment and he testified that he has not consumed any alcohol since the date of the incident, three years ago. He testified that he feels better, he has resumed his healthy lifestyle, and he has learned how to handle

stress in more productive ways. He further testified that he believes having gone through this experience, he is better equipped to handle the challenges of being a police officer. He wants the opportunity to be reinstated to his position.

The Board finds Respondent guilty of all of the charges brought against him by the Superintendent. The Board finds the testimony provided by Officer Oehmen, Sergeant Butler, and Sergeant Stehlik as to the events of March 26, 2019, to be credible. The Board also finds Respondent's testimony that he sought help after this incident, that he has been sober since the incident, and that he hopes to continue as a Chicago Police Officer to also be credible. The Board finds that discharge was not the only remedy for Respondent's actions. Given the completion of certain conditions as set forth herein, the Board agrees that Respondent can still honorably contribute to the mission and the goals of the Chicago Police Department.

### **Charges Against the Respondent**

5. The Respondent, Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias, Star No. 18769, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating Rule 2, Rule 8, and Rule 9 in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charges:

On or about March 26, 2016, at approximately 5:30 a.m., in the vicinity of xxxxx South Avenue J, Chicago, Officer Alberto Covarrubias engaged in a verbal argument with Guadalupe Morales while they were on a public street. Officer Covarrubias's actions caused the Chicago Police Department to be summoned to the area and respond to a disturbance call. Officer Covarrubias thereby violated:

- a. Rule 2, which prohibits any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department;
- b. Rule 8, which prohibits disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty; and
- c. Rule 9, which prohibits engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation

with any person, while on or off duty.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 4, which are incorporated herein by reference.

It was undisputed that Respondent and Ms. Morales were walking along the street near xxxxx South Avenue J, in Chicago, on March 26, 2016. Respondent disrespected Ms. Morales by getting into an unjustified verbal altercation with her at 5am, and by disturbing the peace of the residents in the immediate vicinity such that the police were called to that location. Officer Oehmen credibly testified that Respondent appeared to be intoxicated, and that Respondent was unable to answer basic questions about what happened, where he was coming from, or where he was going. He was unable to answer any questions about the woman he was with. Respondent's actions clearly brought discredit upon the Police Department.

6. The Respondent, Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias, Star No. 18769, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating Rule 1, Rule 2, Rule 7, and Rule 8 in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charges:

On or about March 26, 2016, at approximately 5:30 a.m., in the vicinity of xxxxx South Avenue J, Chicago, while Officer Alberto Covarrubias was placed by officers in the front passenger compartment of a Chicago Police Department issued vehicle, he removed Sergeant James Butler's Watch Line-up sheet from that vehicle without permission. The Watch Line-up sheet was recovered on Officer Covarrubias's person during a custodial search. Officer Covarrubias thereby violated:

- a. Rule 1, which prohibits violation of any law or ordinance, by committing theft in violation of 720 ILCS 5/16-1(a)(1);
- b. Rule 2, which prohibits any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department;
- c. Rule 7, which prohibits insubordination or disrespect toward a supervisory member on or off duty; and
- d. Rule 8, which prohibits disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off

duty.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 4 above, which are incorporated herein by reference. It was undisputed that Respondent was placed in the passenger side of Sergeant Butler's vehicle, and that he was later found to have taken the Watch Line Up sheet out of the vehicle without Sergeant Butler's permission. This action was disrespectful to Sergeant Butler, who was his superior, and had the list not been found, it would have adversely impacted Sergeant Butler's ability to know where his officers would be for the remainder of his shift, which impedes his ability to effectively do his job.

(Board Members Flores and Sweeney dissent from the majority's finding that the Respondent violated Rule 1 by taking the Watch Line Up sheet out of the vehicle, for they find that there is insufficient evidence to prove that the Respondent knowingly committed theft in violation of 720 ILCS 5/16-1(a)(1).)

7. The Respondent, Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias, Star No. 18769, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating Rule 1, Rule 2, Rule 8, and Rule 9 in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charges:

On or about March 26, 2016, at approximately 5:30 a.m., in the vicinity of xxxxx South Avenue J, Chicago, Officer Alberto Covarrubias, while being detained by police officers, threatened Chicago Police Officer Christopher Oehmen, who was dressed in full police uniform and driving a marked police vehicle, by stating words to the effect of "Do you want me to step out of this car and kick your fuckin' ass." Officer Covarrubias thereby violated:

- a. Rule 1, which prohibits violation of any law or ordinance, by committing an assault in violation of 720 ILCS 5/12-1(A);
- b. Rule 2, which prohibits any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department;
- c. Rule 8, which prohibits disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off

duty; and

- d. Rule 9, which prohibits engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 4 above, which are incorporated herein by reference. It is undisputed that Respondent was touching the Personal Data Terminal in Sergeant Butler's vehicle, and that when he was admonished to stop touching the screen by Officer Oehmen, he threatened to harm him using crude and disrespectful language. Officer Oehmen credibly testified that he felt Respondent was threatening him and that was why he immediately reported the incident to Sergeant Butler. This was an unlawful verbal altercation that constituted an assault and that was completely unjustified. Such conduct impeded the efforts of the officers to investigate the case and find out what happened between Respondent and Ms. Morales.

8. The Respondent, Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias, Star No. 18769, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating Rule 2, Rule 3, and Rule 15 in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charges:

On or about March 26, 2016, between approximately 5:30 a.m. and approximately 11:00 a.m., between the vicinity of xxxxx South Avenue J, Chicago, and the Chicago Police Department 4<sup>th</sup> District Station, Officer Alberto Covarrubias was intoxicated while he was off duty. Officer Covarrubias thereby violated:

- a. Rule 2, which prohibits any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department;
- b. Rule 3, which prohibits any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals; and
- c. Rule 15, which prohibits intoxication on or off duty.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 4 above, which are incorporated herein by reference. Officer Oehmen credibly testified that when he approached Respondent he could smell

alcohol on him, and that Respondent was unable to answer simple questions. Sergeant Butler credibly testified that when he approached Respondent he smelled alcohol on him and that Respondent was unable to answer simple questions. When encountered by Lieutenant Bulnes and Sergeant Stehlik, respectively, they both credibly testified that Respondent's eyes were glassy and that he smelled of alcohol. Respondent admitted that he had been drinking that day. His choice to drink to excess created the situation where he had a verbal altercation with Ms. Morales at 5am, which triggered the call to dispatch and demanded the attention of two officers, two sergeants, and one lieutenant, clearly impeding the Department's efforts to advance its policies and goals.

9. The Respondent, Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias, Star No. 18769, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating Rule 2, Rule 3, and Rule 6 in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charges:

On or about March 26, 2016, at approximately 8:25 a.m. at the Chicago Police Department 4<sup>th</sup> District Station, Officer Alberto Covarrubias refused to cooperate in an investigation being conducted by the Chicago Police Department by refusing to answer police officers' and a police sergeant's questions about himself and Guadalupe Morales, thereby obstructing the police investigation of this incident. Officer Covarrubias thereby violated:

- a. Rule 2, which prohibits any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department;
- b. Rule 3, which prohibits any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals; and
- c. Rule 6, which prohibits disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 4 above, which are incorporated herein by reference. It was undisputed that Respondent failed to provide officers on the scene with information that would help them understand the nature of the dispute and/or the verbal altercation

he had with Ms. Morales that triggered the dispatch call.

10. The Respondent, Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias, Star No. 18769, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating Rule 2, Rule 3, and Rule 6 in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charges:

On or about March 26, 2016, at approximately 8:30 a.m. at the Chicago Police Department 4<sup>th</sup> District Station, Officer Alberto Covarrubias was given a direct order by Sergeant Joseph Stehlik to submit to a breathalyzer as part of the Administrative Investigation into Officer Covarrubias's actions. Officer Covarrubias refused to submit to a breathalyzer examination as ordered. Officer Covarrubias thereby violated:

- a. Rule 2, which prohibits any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department;
- b. Rule 3, which prohibits any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals; and
- c. Rule 6, which prohibits disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 4 above, which are incorporated herein by reference. It is undisputed that Sergeant Stehlik gave Respondent a direct order to submit to a breathalyzer test and Respondent repeatedly refused this direct order. Lieutenant Bulnes also advised Respondent that he had to comply with the direct order from Sergeant Stehlik, yet he still refused to comply.

11. The Respondent, Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias, Star No. 18769, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating Rule 2, Rule 3, and Rule 6 in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charges:

On or about March 26, 2016, between approximately 8:25 a.m. and 8:45 a.m., at the Chicago Police Department 4<sup>th</sup> District Station, Officer Alberto Covarrubias refused to cooperate with

an Administrative Investigation into his actions by refusing to sign his Notification of Charges and/or his Administrative Rights and/or his Notification of Duty Restriction after being advised by Sergeant Joseph Stehlik to acknowledge said notifications and rights. Officer Covarrubias thereby violated:

- a. Rule 2, which prohibits any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department;
- b. Rule 3, which prohibits any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals; and
- c. Rule 6, which prohibits disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 4 above, which are incorporated herein by reference. It is undisputed that Sergeant Stehlik gave Respondent the direct order to cooperate with the Administrative Investigation, and to sign certain documents in relation to the events of March 26, 2016. The Superintendent presented all of the documents Respondent was ordered to sign. The evidence is undisputed that Respondent failed to sign any of the documents he was ordered to sign, which further frustrated the process as well as the investigation to determine what happened between Respondent and Ms. Morales. Failure to follow a direct order clearly impedes the Department's ability to accomplish its goals and policies.

### **Penalty**

12. The Police Board has considered the facts and circumstances of the conduct of which it has found the Respondent guilty and the evidence the Respondent presented in their defense and mitigation.

Respondent, while off duty, engaged in unjustified verbal altercation with an individual that led to police being called, threatened a police officer, removed a sergeant's watch line-up sheet from a squad car without permission, and refused to cooperate in the investigation of his

Police Board Case No. 18 PB 2947  
Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias  
Findings and Decision

conduct, all while intoxicated. His conduct warrants a severe penalty. Nonetheless, the Board finds that discharging Respondent from the Chicago Police Department is not warranted at this time. Respondent immediately sought treatment for alcohol dependency, and he submitted documentation that from April through June 2016 he completed a 30-day in-patient treatment program in Florida and a six-week intensive out-patient treatment program in Chicago (Respondent's Ex. Nos. 2 and 3). Based on the totality of the circumstances of the incidents that led to the charges in this case, Respondent's immediate actions to address his issues with alcohol, and his lack of any prior disciplinary history, the Board finds that a suspension is a more fitting penalty on the facts of this particular case. It should be noted that the Board does not condone the actions of Respondent, nor should this decision be relied upon to support a case where an officer refuses any direct order. The Board finds the facts of this case are unique in that Respondent was off-duty, was not armed, did not harm himself or anyone else, and was remorseful for what appears to have been an aberration of his character.

In addition, based on the nature of the conduct of which the Board has found Respondent guilty, the Board determines that in order to be considered for reinstatement to his position as a police officer, Respondent must be certified as psychologically fit for duty and must submit information as to what action he has taken to remain sober since completing treatment in 2016, as set forth below.

Respondent is required to undergo a psychological examination and be certified as psychologically fit for duty by a provider regularly used by the Chicago Police Department for such examinations. The provider shall report in writing on official letterhead whether Officer Covarrubias is psychologically fit for duty. Respondent shall sign the necessary waivers of confidentiality to permit the Board to receive such a report. Respondent shall undertake the

Police Board Case No. 18 PB 2947  
Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias  
Findings and Decision

psychological examination on his own time and at his own expense.

Officer Covarrubias also must submit to the Board information as to what action he has taken to remain sober since completing treatment in 2016, such as participation in Alcoholics Anonymous. Information submitted by Respondent shall be accompanied by documentation (such as a sworn statement from his AA sponsor), if possible.

In order to be considered for reinstatement, Respondent must tender to the Board the above-referenced fit-for-duty report and information on his sobriety so that the office of the Board receives this material no later than September 23, 2019. The Board will provide a copy of the material to the Superintendent, who may file a response by October 7, 2019. The Board shall reconsider this matter after receiving said material.<sup>1</sup> If Respondent fails to tender said documentation by September 23, 2019, the Board shall enter an Order as it deems appropriate.

[The remainder of this page is left blank intentionally.]

---

<sup>1</sup>If Officer Covarrubias is reinstated to his position and an allegation that he violated Rule 15 after his reinstatement is investigated and sustained, the Superintendent shall immediately notify the Board.

**POLICE BOARD DECISION**

The members of the Police Board of the City of Chicago hereby certify that they have read and reviewed the record of proceedings, viewed the video-recording of the entire evidentiary hearing, received the oral report of the Hearing Officer, and conferred with the Hearing Officer on the credibility of the witnesses and the evidence. The Police Board hereby adopts the findings set forth herein by the following votes.

By votes of 9 in favor (Ghian Foreman, Paula Wolff, Eva-Dina Delgado, Michael Eaddy, Steve Flores, John P. O'Malley Jr., John H. Simpson, Rhoda D. Sweeney, and Andrea L. Zopp) to 0 opposed, the Board finds Respondent Alberto Covarrubias **guilty** of violating Rule 2, Rule 3, Rule 6, Rule 7, Rule 8, Rule 9 and Rule 15, as set forth in paragraph nos. 5 – 11 above. By a vote of 7 in favor (Foreman, Wolff, Delgado, Eaddy, O'Malley, Simpson, and Zopp) to 2 opposed (Flores and Sweeney), the Board finds Respondent Alberto Covarrubias **guilty** of violating Rule 1 as set forth in paragraph no. 6 above. By a vote of 9 in favor (Foreman, Wolff, Delgado, Eaddy, Flores, O'Malley, Simpson, Sweeney, and Zopp) to 0 opposed, the Board finds Respondent Alberto Covarrubias **guilty** of violating Rule 1 as set forth in paragraph no. 7 above.

As a result of the foregoing, the Board, by a vote of 9 in favor (Foreman, Wolff, Delgado, Eaddy, Flores, O'Malley, Simpson, Sweeney, and Zopp) to 0 opposed, hereby determines that cause exists for suspending the Respondent from his position as a police officer with the Department of Police and from the services of the City of Chicago for a period from August 23, 2018, to and including the date the Board enters a further Order, as set forth in paragraph no. 12 above.

**NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Respondent, Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias, Star No. 14343, as a result of having been found **guilty** of all charges in

Police Board Case No. 18 PB 2947  
Police Officer Alberto Covarrubias  
Findings and Decision

Police Board Case No. 18 PB 2947, be and hereby is **suspended** from his position as a police officer with the Department of Police and from the services of the City of Chicago for a period from August 23, 2018, to and including the date the Board enters a further Order, as set forth in paragraph no. 12 above.

This disciplinary action is adopted and entered by a majority of the members of the Police Board: Ghian Foreman, Paula Wolff, Eva-Dina Delgado, Michael Eaddy, Steve Flores, John P. O'Malley Jr., John H. Simpson, Rhoda D. Sweeney, and Andrea L. Zopp.

DATED AT CHICAGO, COUNTY OF COOK, STATE OF ILLINOIS, THIS 22<sup>nd</sup> DAY OF AUGUST, 2019.

Attested by:

/s/ GHIAN FOREMAN  
President

/s/ MAX A. CAPRONI  
Executive Director

**DISSENT**

The following members of the Police Board hereby dissent from the Findings and Decision of the majority of the Board.

[None]

---

RECEIVED A COPY OF

THESE FINDINGS AND DECISIONS

THIS \_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 2019.

---

EDDIE T. JOHNSON  
Superintendent of Police