

BEFORE THE POLICE BOARD OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO

IN THE MATTERS OF CHARGES FILED AGAINST)
)
POLICE OFFICER JOHN ADREANI,) No. 14 PB 2879
STAR No. 6621, DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,)
CITY OF CHICAGO,)
)
AND)
)
SERGEANT ROBERT BONDI,) No. 14 PB 2880
STAR No. 2498, DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,)
CITY OF CHICAGO,)
) (CR No. 1034248)
RESPONDENTS.)

FINDINGS AND DECISIONS

On December 10, 2014, the Superintendent of Police filed with the Police Board of the City of Chicago charges against Police Officer John Adreani, Star No. 6621, and Sergeant Robert Bondi, Star No. 2498, (hereinafter sometimes referred to as “Respondents”), recommending that each Respondent be discharged from the Chicago Police Department for violating the following Rules of Conduct:

- Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department’s efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.
- Rule 6: Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.

On June 9, 2015, Police Board Hearing Officer Thomas E. Johnson ordered the cases consolidated for a hearing. Neither party objected to this consolidation. The Police Board caused a hearing on these charges against the Respondents to be had before Hearing Officer Johnson on June 29, June 30, and July 22, 2015.

Following the hearing, the members of the Police Board read and reviewed the record of the proceedings and viewed the video-recording of the testimony of the witnesses. Hearing

Officer Johnson 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. Each Respondent was at all times mentioned herein employed as a sworn officer by the Department of Police of the City of Chicago.
2. The written charges, and a Notice stating when and where a hearing on the charges was to be held, were personally served upon each Respondent more than five (5) days prior to the hearing on the charges.
3. Throughout the hearing on the charges each Respondent appeared in person and was represented by legal counsel.
4. The Respondent, Police Officer John Adreani, Star No. 6621, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,

in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charge:

Count I: On or about February 27, 2010, at approximately 1335 hours, you had a telephone conversation with Dorian Luzaj, an individual involved in and subsequently convicted of cannabis trafficking, during which conversation Luzaj told you "some fucking cops ... took everything from me," and/or "they took the fucking thing and just left," and/or that the cops took "600" "add some zeroes behind it my friend," or words to that effect. Luzaj further stated that he wanted advice or something to that effect. You then suggested that Luzaj talk to "Bob," a/k/a Sergeant Robert Bondi, and/or you stated "Bob's smart, he's like me, he will understand" and/or that you were going to tell "Bob" to call Luzaj, or words to that effect.

It is undisputed that on February 26, 2010, at 10:05 p.m., police officers working with the

U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (“DEA”) and the DuPage Metropolitan Enforcement Group (“DUMEG”) stopped a vehicle in which Dorian Luzaj and two other individuals were riding near 87th Street and Roberts Road, in Bridgeview, Illinois. DEA Special Agents Jay Borns and Timothy Oko testified that Luzaj had been the subject of an extensive narcotics investigation that included wiretapping. The traffic stop was part of the Luzaj investigation. It is also undisputed that the officers who stopped Luzaj, including Naperville police officer Jeffrey Lizik, found \$571,010 in cash, located in two duffle bags in the car. The cash and duffle bags were seized. Luzaj and his two companions were not arrested. They were permitted to leave at 10:20 p.m.

Eleven minutes later, Dorian Luzaj called Chicago police officer John Adreani, who was at a strip club in Florida. The call was recorded by the DEA-DUMEG officers. Saying Officer Adreani sounded like he was already “fucked up,” Luzaj did not pursue the conversation further. The next day, however, Luzaj spoke again with Officer Adreani on a call that was also recorded. Luzaj complained that “some fucking cops last night ... took everything from me.” He said they “just took the fuckin’ thing and they just left.” The transcript of the call is telling, as Officer Adreani apparently knows the “thing” is money. He does not ask what was taken but rather he says: “How much did you—how many, uh, a lot?” Luzaj tells him it is “Six hundred...yeah, add those zeroes behind them, my friend,” later saying it was in a duffle bag. Officer Adreani says Chicago [police] wouldn’t do that, and then asks Luzaj “what do you need?” Luzaj says he needs advice. He says “do something.” Officer Adreani says: “I understand,” apparently knowing what had happened. Adreani then tells Luzaj that he should talk to “Bob,” meaning Sergeant Robert Bondi. In Officer Adreani’s words: “Bob’s a smart—Bob’s like me. He’ll understand,” and Adreani promises that Sergeant Bondi will call Luzaj.

Officer Adreani is an experienced Chicago police officer, who has served on the force for twenty-two years, and worked on tactical teams. Officer Adreani testified during the hearing that as a tactical team officer, he participated in investigations involving gangs and drugs. He admits that after his February 27, 2010, call with Luzaj, he “figured [Luzaj] had to be doing something wrong to be involved—to have, to have \$600,000 cash. That doesn't make sense.” (Hearing transcript, p. 256). The Board finds that Officer Adreani had at that point a responsibility, under Rule 2 and otherwise as a police officer, to not associate with Luzaj, and certainly not to aid and assist Luzaj any further with any of Luzaj’s activities. Nonetheless, Officer Adreani admits calling Sergeant Bondi right away and asking him to have a conversation with Luzaj to see if Bondi “can help him out” (Hearing transcript, p. 256). Sergeant Bondi corroborates this call and proceeded to meet with Luzaj about the confiscation of Luzaj’s cash (see paragraph no. 10 below).

Thereafter, Officer Adreani continued to associate with Luzaj by playing cards, drinking, and gambling with him. This association is confirmed by a wiretapped conversation from April 24, 2010, in which Luzaj tells Officer Adreani that Luzaj has \$9,500 on Adreani’s gambling account, and Luzaj lets Adreani keep \$200 out of it “for credit.” While Adreani sought to explain that various people played online poker tournaments on his account, the conversation establishes that Officer Adreani gambled with and exchanged money with a man he knew by at least that time was engaged in criminal activity. In addition to continuing his gambling relationship with Luzaj, Officer Adreani had thirty to thirty-five additional phone calls with Luzaj, over a two-month period, after learning Luzaj was engaged in criminal activity, where they discuss various properties that Luzaj may purchase and other issues related to the purchase and renovation of real estate. These calls were all recorded during the DEA-DUMEG wiretaps

and therefore are not in dispute. It is quite clear that for more than two months after Officer Adreani knew he was dealing with a criminal, he continued his friendship, socializing with Luzaj and assisting him with his real estate business.

Luzaj was arrested on May 19, 2010. According to the undisputed testimony of DEA Special Agent Borns, he was part of a criminal organization, consisting of 12-13 people, engaged in the interstate transportation and sale of high-grade marijuana. He was convicted of felony cannabis trafficking, and sentenced to twenty years in prison.

The Board finds that officer Adreani's quite deliberate decision to continue his social and professional association with Luzaj after he was well aware of Luzaj's criminal conduct brings discredit on the Department. Having learned that Luzaj was likely engaged in a criminal enterprise, it was incumbent upon Officer Adreani to break off all contact with Luzaj. Certainly, it was entirely improper for Officer Adreani to ask a colleague (Sergeant Bondi) to try to help out Luzaj after the police seized Luzaj's cash. Furthermore, Officer Adreani's decision to continue gambling, drinking, and socializing with Luzaj, and his repeated and continuous efforts to assist him with real estate issues, brings discredit on the Department. This is an intentional and extended course of conduct by officer Adreani that the Board condemns as entirely improper and a violation of Police Department rules.

5. The Respondent, Police Officer John Adreani, Star No. 6621, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,

in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charge:

Count II: On or about February 27 or 28, 2010, while you were out of town, you called Sergeant Robert Bondi and told him to meet with Dorian Luzaj, an individual involved in and subsequently convicted of cannabis trafficking, because Luzaj had a problem and you were out of town, or you stated words to that effect.

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

6. The Respondent, Police Officer John Adreani, Star No. 6621, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,

in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charge:

Count III: Based on Counts I and/or II above, you assisted, facilitated or aided Dorian Luzaj's criminal activities, although you knew or should have known that Luzaj was involved in criminal conduct.

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

7. The Respondent, Police Officer John Adreani, Star No. 6621, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,

in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charge:

Count IV: On or about April 24, 2010, your on-line gambling account was credited \$9,500 (nine thousand and five hundred dollars) by Dorian Luzaj, an individual involved in and subsequently convicted of cannabis trafficking.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 4 above, which are incorporated here by

reference.

8. The Respondent, Police Officer John Adreani, Star No. 6621, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,

in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charge:

Count V: From sometime in or about May 2009, through in or about May 2010, or on one or more dates therein, you associated with Dorian Luzaj, an individual involved in and subsequently convicted of cannabis trafficking, in that you had multiple phone conversations with Luzaj; you referred Luzaj to people who sell real estate or vice versa; you discussed matters relating to real estate with Luzaj; you referred an individual(s) to Luzaj to do work on property; you played cards, gambled, had lunch and/or had drinks with Luzaj.

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

9. The Respondent, Police Officer John Adreani, Star No. 6621, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 6: Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral,

in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charge:

From sometime in or about May 2009, through in or about May 2010, or on one or more dates therein, you associated with a member of a criminal organization, in that you had multiple phone conversations with Dorian Luzaj, an individual involved in and subsequently convicted of cannabis trafficking, a felony, and/or a member/leader of a criminal organization that distributed cannabis throughout the Chicago area; you referred Luzaj to people who sell real estate or vice versa; you discussed matters relating to real estate with Luzaj; you referred an individual(s) to Luzaj to do work on property; you played cards, gambled, had lunch and/or had drinks with Luzaj; you had an on-line gambling account to which Luzaj had access; you suggested that Luzaj talk to Bob/Sergeant Robert Bondi when Luzaj told you the police had confiscated his \$600,000, and/or you told Sergeant Bondi to meet with Luzaj; thereby violating General Order 97-1 or its successor General Order G08-

03.

General Order 97-1 prohibits Chicago police officers from associating with a member of a criminal organization. “Criminal organization” is defined as: “any ongoing organization, association in fact, or group of three or more persons, whether formal or informal, having as one of its substantial activities the commission of criminal activity, and whose members individually or collectively engage in or have engaged in a pattern of criminal activity.” There is no question that Dorian Luzaj was involved in a “criminal organization,” as that term is used in General Order 97-1. This was clearly established by the testimony of DEA Special Agents Jay Borns and Timothy Oko, as well as the testimony of Naperville police officer Jeffrey Lizik, and Luzaj's criminal conviction. The evidence also clearly established that Officer Adreani “associated” with Luzaj, as that term is used in General Order 97-1. Officer Adreani not only sought to assist Luzaj after police seized nearly \$600,000 in cash from him, but also regularly associated with Luzaj in gambling and social activities, as well as assisting him with real estate issues.

Officer Adreani admits that after learning police had seized about \$600,000 in cash from Luzaj, he knew that Luzaj was likely engaged in criminal activity. He insists, however, that he did not know Luzaj was part of a “criminal organization.” General Order 97-1 does not, however, require actual knowledge on the part of Officer Adreani. It is enough if he “knew or should have known” Luzaj was a member of a criminal organization. As an experienced Chicago police officer, and tactical officer skilled in investigating drug crimes, the Board finds that officer Adreani “should have known” that when the police seized nearly \$600,000 in cash from Luzaj’s duffle bags, Luzaj was engaged in a “criminal organization.” It is not reasonable to assume that a person carrying cash in this amount which was seized in the circumstances

described by Luzaj to Adreani and subsequently Officer Bondi, that Luzaj was engaged in criminal activity by himself. Moreover, Officer Adreani admitted knowing that Luzaj was a younger man who “seem[ed] like he had a lot of money,” (Tr., p. 268), and who liked to gamble. The totality of the information known to Adreani clearly establishes that Adreani knew or should have known that Luzaj was involved in a criminal organization.

10. The Respondent, Sergeant Robert Bondi, Star No. 2498, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department’s efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,

in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charge:

Count I: On or about February 28, 2010, you had a telephone conversation with Dorian Luzaj, an individual involved in and subsequently convicted of cannabis trafficking, arranged to meet with him and/or subsequently met with him at approximately 1305 hours in the vicinity of 383 East Quincy Street in Riverside, Illinois. During your meeting with Luzaj, he told you that police took \$600,000 of his money and/or that he wanted you to find out which law enforcement agency had taken his money, or stated words to that effect. At approximately 1417 hours the same day, you had another phone conversation with Luzaj during which Luzaj told you that he remembers the name of one of the police officers and tells you that name, or words to that effect. You respond by saying, “Alright, okay, I’ll let you know,” or words to that effect.

Like Officer Adreani, Sergeant Bondi regularly gambled with Luzaj prior to February of 2010. Sergeant Bondi confirmed that on February 27, 2010—one day after the police seized Luzaj’s money—Adreani asked Bondi to meet with Luzaj, and Bondi promptly called Luzaj that day to say he would meet with him. The call was recorded. The next day, February 28, 2010, Sergeant Bondi called Luzaj and arranged the meeting in Riverside on Harlem Avenue. Luzaj was under surveillance, and so the DEA-DUMEG group observed the meeting. Sergeant Bondi testified that Luzaj told him an unmarked squad car had pulled him over at a location in

Bridgeview and “took a duffle bag full of money” (Hearing transcript, p. 38). Sergeant Bondi admitted further that Luzaj told him \$600,000 had been seized. In response, Sergeant Bondi told Luzaj he would try to determine who took his money. Later that day, Luzaj calls Sergeant Bondi to report the name of one of the men who took his money. The next day, March 1, 2010, Sergeant Bondi calls Luzaj to ask about the make, model and color of the car Luzaj was driving, how the officers obtained the duffle bags of cash, and what role each officer played during the encounter. All of these calls were recorded.

On March 6, 2010, Sergeant Bondi called Luzaj yet again, to report that the officers who seized Luzaj's money were not Bridgeview police officers. Bondi then wishes Luzaj “good luck” and says: “let me know if you need anything else.” In response, Luzaj tells Bondi to “forget about those things—the thing that you owe over there, forget about it, okay?” Luzaj goes on to emphasize “that's from me.” Again, the call is recorded and there is no dispute about what is said. Sergeant Bondi admitted during his testimony this last exchange involved Luzaj forgiving a gambling debt Bondi owed him. Bondi estimated the debt was \$300 to \$400.

In his testimony, Sergeant Bondi repeatedly admitted that after Luzaj told him about the seizure of cash, Bondi knew Luzaj was involved in something that was not legitimate, if Luzaj was telling the truth about the seizure. Sergeant Bondi testified that he never intended to help Luzaj, and never took any steps to determine who took his cash. Instead, he testified that he was trying to extricate himself from the situation, without Luzaj knowing that Sergeant Bondi was not actually helping him.

Sergeant Bondi provided false testimony before this Board. His words on the tape condemn him, as he spoke to Luzaj on five separate occasions after he was aware police seized Luzaj's money, including twice in which he affirmatively sought additional details regarding the

seizure. Like Officer Adreani, Sergeant Bondi is an experienced Chicago police officer with twenty-four years on the job, including extensive work on drug investigations while working for tactical teams, and sixteen years as a sergeant of police. There is no question that Sergeant Bondi knew Luzaj was involved in criminal activity. Sergeant Bondi had an obligation, at that point, not to help or further associate with Luzaj. Nonetheless, Sergeant Bondi quite deliberately chose to continue associating with Luzaj over the next eight days. His actions as captured on the taped conversations belie any suggestion that Bondi was trying to distance himself from Luzaj.

For these reasons, the Board finds that Sergeant Bondi's explanation for his continued contact to be incredible. He claimed he did not assist Luzaj, but did not want Luzaj to know he was not assisting. There is no reason why a sergeant of police should need to curry favor from a known criminal, unless he is working undercover or otherwise obtaining information from the criminal, which was not the case here. Sergeant Bondi's obligation was to walk away from Luzaj, not to try to cover his tracks. In fact, the evidence shows that when Sergeant Bondi agreed to look into which police officers seized Luzaj's money, he owed Luzaj a gambling debt. More importantly, in exchange for his help, Luzaj forgave this debt, and the evidence suggests that Sergeant Bondi accepted this favor from the man he knew by that point or certainly should have known was a criminal.

The Board finds that Sergeant Bondi's conduct is entirely unacceptable, particularly from a police supervisor. He has undermined the public's confidence in the Department, as well as the confidence of the other law enforcement officers who worked on the Luzaj investigation. As such, he has brought discredit to the Department, by associating with and appearing to assist a known drug dealer.

11. The Respondent, Sergeant Robert Bondi, Star No. 2498, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,

in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charge:

Count II: On or about March 1, 2010, at approximately 1703 hours, you had a telephone conversation with Dorian Luzaj, an individual involved in and subsequently convicted of cannabis trafficking, during which conversation you asked Luzaj about the make, model and color of the car he was driving when the police took his money and/or for details about the police officers and what they did, or words to that effect. After Luzaj gives you the information, you respond by saying "Alright, alright, I'll call you back in a couple of days," or words to that effect.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 10 above, which are incorporated here by reference.

12. The Respondent, Sergeant Robert Bondi, Star No. 2498, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,

in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charge:

Count III: On or about March 6, 2010, at approximately 1228 hours, you had a telephone conversation with Dorian Luzaj, an individual involved in and subsequently convicted of cannabis trafficking, during which conversation you told Luzaj that you found out that the police who took his money were not Bridgeview police and/or that you knew of no other police that would be over there, especially given what was said to Luzaj, or you stated words to that effect. You further stated to Luzaj, "Good luck, let me know if you need anything else," or words to that effect. After you provided this information, Luzaj said, "Bob, forget about the thing, the thing that you owe, owe over there. Forget about it, ok," or words to that effect, and you replied, "Alright, now," or with words to that effect.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 10 above, which are incorporated here by reference.

13. The Respondent, Sergeant Robert Bondi, Star No. 2498, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,

in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charge:

Count IV: Based on Counts I through III above, or on one or more counts therein, you assisted, facilitated or aided Dorian Luzaj's criminal activities, although you knew or should have known that Luzaj was involved in criminal conduct.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 10 above, which are incorporated here by reference.

14. The Respondent, Sergeant Robert Bondi, Star No. 2498, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,

in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charge:

Count V: From sometime in or about May 2009, through in or about May 2010, or on one or more dates therein, you associated with Dorian Luzaj, an individual involved in and subsequently convicted of cannabis trafficking, in that you had phone conversations with Dorian Luzaj, you provided information to Luzaj, and/or you played cards with Luzaj.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 10 above, which are incorporated here by reference.

15. The Respondent, Sergeant Robert Bondi, Star No. 2498, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 6: Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral,

in that the Superintendent proved by a preponderance of the evidence the following charge:

From sometime in or about May 2009, through in or about May 2010, or on one or more dates therein, you associated with a member of a criminal organization, in that you had phone conversations with Dorian Luzaj, an individual involved in and subsequently convicted of cannabis trafficking, and/or a member/leader of a criminal organization that distributed cannabis throughout the Chicago area; you provided information to Luzaj; and/or you played cards with Luzaj; thereby violating General Order 97-1 or its successor General Order G08-03.

General Order 97-1 prohibits Chicago police officers from associating with a member of a criminal organization. “Criminal organization” is defined as: “any ongoing organization, association in fact, or group of three or more persons, whether formal or informal, having as one of its substantial activities the commission of criminal activity, and whose members individually or collectively engage in or have engaged in a pattern of criminal activity.” There is no question that Dorian Luzaj headed a “criminal organization,” as that term is used in General Order 97-1. This was clearly established by the testimony of DEA Special Agents Jay Borns and Timothy Oko, as well as the testimony of Naperville police officer Jeffrey Lizik, and Luzaj’s criminal conviction. The evidence also clearly established that Sergeant Bondi “associated” with Luzaj, as that term is used in General Order 97-1. Sergeant Bondi gambled and socialized with Luzaj, and spoke to him on five occasions after the February 26, 2010, police seizure of Luzaj’s money.

Sergeant Bondi admits that after learning police had seized about \$600,000 in cash from Luzaj, he knew that Luzaj was engaged in criminal activity, if what he said about the seizure to Sergeant Bondi was true. Bondi insists, however, that he did not know Luzaj was part of a “criminal organization.” General Order 97-1 does not, however, require actual knowledge on the part of Sergeant Bondi. It is enough if he “knew or should have known” Luzaj was a member of a criminal organization. As an experienced Chicago police officer and supervising sergeant, and tactical officer skilled in investigating drug crimes, the Board finds that Sergeant Bondi “should

have known” that when the police seized nearly \$600,000 in cash from Luzaj’s duffle bags, Luzaj was engaged in a “criminal organization.” It is not reasonable to assume that a person carrying cash in this amount is engaged in criminal activity by himself. The facts and circumstances surrounding seizure alone should have alerted Sergeant Bondi to the fact that Luzaj was involved in a “criminal organization.”

16. The Police Board has considered the facts and circumstances of the Respondents’ conduct, and the evidence presented in defense and mitigation. The Board determines that the Respondents must be discharged from the Chicago Police Department due to the serious nature of the misconduct of which it has found them guilty.

The Respondents each offered evidence in mitigation that the Board has carefully considered. Officer Adreani has a complimentary history of 52 total awards, including two Department commendations, 36 honorable mentions, and eight complimentary letters; Sergeant Bondi has 59 total awards, including a Life Saving Award, two Department commendations, 43 honorable mentions, and five complimentary letters. Both Respondents have no disciplinary history. In addition, several witnesses testified regarding the Respondents’ positive reputation and character. However, the Respondents’ reputation, accomplishments on the job, complimentary histories, and the lack of prior disciplinary history do not mitigate the seriousness of their misconduct in this case.

Officer Adreani and Sergeant Bondi, by their actions, brought discredit upon the Chicago Police Department and undermined its mission.¹ Effective law enforcement depends upon a high degree of cooperation between the police department and the public it serves. Conduct such as

¹The Respondents are each charged with violating Rule 2 and Rule 6. The Board finds that the Rule 2 violations are, by themselves, sufficiently serious to warrant a penalty of discharge.

the Respondents fosters public distrust and a lack of confidence in the integrity of the Chicago Police Department, thereby impeding the Department's efforts to achieve the important goals of preventing crime, preserving the public peace, identifying and arresting those who commit crimes, and promoting respect and cooperation of all Chicagoans for the law and those sworn to enforce it.

Moreover, Sergeant Bondi falsely testified about his motives for continued contact with Luzaj after Bondi learned of the \$600,000 seizure and after Bondi admitted that he concluded Luzaj was involved in criminal conduct. That false testimony is additional evidence in aggravation against Bondi. The Board will not tolerate any officer who swears an oath and then proceeds to provide false testimony in any Police Board proceeding. Nonetheless, the Board finds that there was more than sufficient evidence to warrant a penalty of discharge aside from his false testimony on this point.

The Board finds that each Respondent's conduct is sufficiently serious to constitute a substantial shortcoming that renders his continuance in his office detrimental to the discipline and efficiency of the service of the Chicago Police Department, and is something which the law recognizes as good cause for him no longer occupying his office.

POLICE BOARD DECISIONS

The Police Board of the City of Chicago, having read and reviewed the record of proceedings in these cases, having viewed the video-recording of the testimony of the witnesses, having received the oral report of the Hearing Officer, and having conferred with the Hearing Officer on the credibility of the witnesses and the evidence, hereby adopts the findings set forth

Police Board Case Nos. 14 PB 2879 & 2880
Police Officer Adreani & Sergeant Bondi

herein by the following votes:

By votes of 8 in favor (Lightfoot, Foreman, Ballate, Conlon, Eaddy, Fry, Rodriguez, and Sweeney) to 0 opposed, the Board finds Respondent Adreani **guilty** of violating Rule 2 and Rule 6; and

By votes of 8 in favor (Lightfoot, Foreman, Ballate, Conlon, Eaddy, Fry, Rodriguez, and Sweeney) to 0 opposed, the Board finds Respondent Bondi **guilty** of violating Rule 2 and Rule 6.

As a result of the foregoing, the Board, by votes of 8 in favor (Lightfoot, Foreman, Ballate, Conlon, Eaddy, Fry, Rodriguez, and Sweeney) to 0 opposed, hereby determines that cause exists for discharging Respondent Adreani and Respondent Bondi from the Chicago Police Department.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Respondent, Police Officer John Adreani, Star No. 6621, as a result of having been found **guilty** of charges in Police Board Case No. 14 PB 2879, be and hereby is **discharged** from his position as a police officer with the Department of Police, and from the services of the City of Chicago.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Respondent, Sergeant Robert Bondi, Star No. 2498, as a result of having been found **guilty** of charges in Police Board Case No. 14 PB 2880, be and hereby is **discharged** from his position as a sergeant of police with the Department of Police, and from the services of the City of Chicago.

This disciplinary action is adopted and entered by a majority of the members of the Police Board: Lori E. Lightfoot, Ghian Foreman, Melissa M. Ballate, William F. Conlon, Michael Eaddy, Rita A. Fry, Elisa Rodriguez, and Rhoda D. Sweeney.

DATED AT CHICAGO, COUNTY OF COOK, STATE OF ILLINOIS, THIS 17th DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2015.

Police Board Case Nos. 14 PB 2879 & 2880
Police Officer Adreani & Sergeant Bondi

Attested by:

/s/ LORI E. LIGHTFOOT
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 _____, 2015.

GARRY F. McCARTHY
Superintendent of Police