COOK COUNTY SHERIFF'S MERIT BOARD

Sheriff of Cook County,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	**Docket No. 1889**
	)	
Marquis Beauchamp	)	
Correctional Officer	)	
Star #16264	)	

DECISION

This matter is currently before the Cook County Sheriff's Merit Board on remand, as ordered on September 20, 2023, by Judge Sophia H. Hall, for the purpose of the Merit Board to consider appropriate disciplinary action in light of the Circuit Court reversing the Merit Board's finding that Respondent violated Sheriff's Department Policy 4.1 III (A)(6). The Court further ordered that, on Remand, The Merit Board was to consider an appropriate sanction based only upon its finding that the Respondent violated Sheriff's Policy 3.8 III (B) (18) in that he knowingly associated with persons with known criminal records.

This case has a long procedural history, and this Board assumes the parties' familiarity with the facts and history of this case.

Jurisdiction

Marquis Beauchamp, hereinafter Respondent, was appointed a Correctional Officer for the Cook County Department of Corrections (CCDOC) on November 26, 2007. Respondent's position as a Correctional Officer involves duties and responsibilities to the public; each member of the Cook County Sheriffs Merit Board, hereinafter Board, has been duly appointed to serve as a member of the Board pursuant to confirmation by the Cook County Board of Commissioners, State of Illinois, to sit for a stated term; the Board has jurisdiction of the subject matter of the parties in accordance with 55 ILCS 5/3-7001, *et seq;* and the Respondent was served with a copy of the Complaint and notice of hearing and appeared before the Board with counsel to contest the charges contained in the Complaint.

Background

The Sheriff filed a complaint on April 1, 2016, filed an amended complaint on January 23, 2018, and filed a second amended complaint on February 14, 2019, all against the Respondent requesting termination of the Respondent's employment from the CCSO.

The original complaint alleged, in summary, that in 2011 and 2012, the Respondent associated with [redacted] a person the Respondent knew or should have known had a criminal record, was a convicted felon and member of a gang. That in 2011 and 2012, the Respondent associated with [redacted], a person the Respondent knew or should have known had a criminal record and was a convicted felon. That in 2011, the Respondent associated with [redacted] who was also known as [redacted] a person the Respondent knew or should have known had a criminal record and was a convicted felon. That in 2011, the Respondent associated with [redacted], a person the Respondent knew or should have known had a criminal record, was a registered offender and a convicted felon.

That in 2011, the Respondent accepted and took possession of three unregistered firearms (Winchester rifles serial numbers [redacted] from [redacted] a person the Respondent knew or should have known was a convicted felon and who was not in possession of a valid FOID card. That in 2011, after taking possession of the three firearms, the Respondent failed to comply with Illinois state law that requires documentation for the transfer of firearms. Specifically, the Respondent failed to ensure that the transfer documents were completed for the three firearms he received from [redacted]

On September 19, 2011, while on patrol, a LaGrange Police Department (LPD) officer noticed two males standing by an entrance door at [redacted] LaGrange, IL. One of the two individuals was later identified as [redacted] The second individual stated he was a Cook County Sheriff but was not identified by name. The LPD officer approached the residence and [redacted] ran up to the patrol vehicle and provided the officer with paperwork showing a work order from a bank. Further, [redacted] showed the LPD officer paperwork that indicated he was working for a company called [redacted]. A neighbor noticed two suspicious males at the [redacted] property. On September 21, 2011, LPD units were dispatched to [redacted] for a report of a residential burglary, in which [redacted] filed a report with LPD indicating that several firearms had been removed from his residence located at [redacted] LaGrange, IL. On September 23, 2011, a neighbor contacted LPD after observing two individuals at [redacted] a LPD Sergeant responded to the neighbor's report of two individuals at the address and identified [redacted], with a second subject who identified himself as a Cook County Sheriff. Subsequently, the neighbor identified the Respondent from a photographic lineup as one of tl1e two individuals he observed at [redacted] on September 23,2011. On September 29, 2011, the tl1ree rifles, which were later found in the Respondent's possession (serial numbers [redacted], were placed into LEADS as some of the firearms stolen from Walsh's residence located at [redacted] LaGrange, IL in September of 2011. In November of 2011, the Respondent was the owner of a building located at [redacted] Chicago, IL.

In November of 2011 the Respondent resided on both the first floor and basement of [redacted] Chicago, IL. [redacted] were the Respondent's tenants residing on the second floor of the residence. In November of 2011, the Respondent allowed [redacted] to stay at his residence while the Respondent was at work. On November 17, 2011, the Chicago Police Department (CPD) executed a search warrant at the Respondent's residence, and recovered three Winchester rifles, with serial numbers [redacted] from the Respondent residence. On November 17,2011, the Respondent falsely reported to CPD that he acquired the three rifles when his friend' s grandfather died. Additionally, the Respondent falsely reported to CPD the three rifles were in his friend's grandfather's attic.

On November 17, 2011, the Respondent stated to CPD that he, [redacted] grew up together. The Respondent admitted to CPD officers that he allowed [redacted] to stay at his residence while the Respondent was at work. That on November 17, 2011, CPD discovered that the three rifles confiscated from the Respondent were reported stolen and taken in a burglary in September of 2011 in LaGrange, IL.

On January 5, 2012, the Respondent was interviewed by the LPD and admitted to knowing [redacted] for several years. The Respondent stated that he was at [redacted] only one time in September of 2011. The Respondent denied entering the residence at [redacted] and removing property in September of 2011. The Respondent stated to LPD that he never saw [redacted] enter the residence at [redacted] in September of2011. The Respondent, when asked by LPD about the firearms which he was found to be in possession of by the CPD, stated that he had

been given the three firearms by [redacted] in order to settle a debt owed him by [redacted] in September 2011. The Respondent stated that there was no paperwork completed regarding the transfer of the three firearms. During the January 5, 2012, interview by LPD the Respondent was asked about his previous statements regarding the firearms made to CPD officers, and falsely reported to them that he had never made such statements to the CPD officers.

On October 28, 2015, the Respondent was interviewed and provided an audio recorded statement to investigators from the Cook County Sheriffs Office of Professional Review (OPR). The Respondent stated to OPR that in 2011 he was residing on the first floor and basement at [redacted] The Respondent initially stated to OPR that [redacted] was his second-floor tenant for a year to a year and a half but subsequently, the Respondent stated that he only saw [redacted] *"once in a blue moon."* The Respondent admitted to OPR that had known [redacted] since grammar school. The Respondent admitted to OPR that he knew [redacted] and she was the leaseholder of the second- floor of his residence. The Respondent stated to OPR that in 2011 his residence at [redacted] was the subject of a search warrant executed by CPD. The Respondent stated that CPD was looking for his second-floor tenant, [redacted] The Respondent admitted he knew [redacted] because he knows [redacted] and stated that [redacted] lived across the alley from his grandmother. The Respondent admitted to OPR that he went to [redacted] LaGrange, with [redacted] in September of 2011. The Respondent admitted that while at there, he and [redacted] encountered a neighbor who must have called the police. The Respondent stated to OPR that the three rifles confiscated by CPD in November of 2011 were not stolen. The Respondent falsely reported to OPR that he found the three rifles in a foreclosed house and said he kept them for a couple of months prior to CPD confiscating them.

The Sheriff introduced into evidence the Sheriff's General Order 3.8, Code of Ethics and Suitability of Conduct (Exhibit 1); Sheriff's General Order 4.1, Internal Investigations (Exhibit 2); Sheriff's Order 11.2.20.1, Conduct Policy (Exhibit 3); Article X, Rules and Regulations of the Cook County Sheriffs Merit Board (Exhibit 4); Certified Statement of Conviction for [redacted] Case 00 CR 124630I (Exhibit 5); Certified Statement of Conviction for [redacted] Case 01 CR 1091802 (Exhibit 6); Certified Statement of Conviction for [redacted] Case 02 CR 2643501 (Exhibit 7): Certified Statement of Conviction for [redacted] Case 12 CR 2015501 (Exhibit 8); Certified Statement of Conviction for [redacted] Case 03 CR 195090 I (Exhibit 9); Memorandum of Sgt [redacted] CCSO, OPR, documenting meeting with CPD and LPD regarding the Respondent (Exhibit 1O); Printout of page from the Respondent's Facebook account showing "friends" connection with [redacted] (Exhibit 11); Memorandum of phone call between Sgt [redacted] and the Respondent (Exhibit 12); Criminal History for [redacted] (Exhibit 13); Criminal History for [redacted] (Exhibit 14); Criminal History for [redacted] (Exhibit 15); Criminal History for [redacted] (Exhibit 16); OPR Administrative Proceedings Rights for Respondent (Exhibit 17); OPR Notice to Appear to Respondent (Exhibit 18): OPR Waiver of Legal Counsel by the Respondent (Exhibit 19); OPR Notification of Allegations to Respondent (Exhibit 20); OPR audio recording of interview of the Respondent (Exhibit 21); Photos of rifles owned by [redacted] Exhibit 22); Gun registration for Winchester 94 musket, serial number [redacted] (Exhibit 23); Gun registration form for rifle, serial number [redacted] (Exhibit 24): Gun registration form for rifle, serial number [redacted] (Exhibit 25); Report of Investigator [redacted] LPD (Exhibit 27): Report of Officer [redacted] CPD (Exhibit 28); and Report of Officer [redacted] LPD (Exhibit 29).

The Respondent introduced into evidence a landlord agreement and lease for [redacted] (Exhibit RI); Respondent's Certificates of Accomplishment (Exhibits R2A-H); [redacted] driver's license, firearms identification card and firearm concealed carry license (Exhibits R3A-C); copy of search warrant (Exhibit R4); and a copy of search warrant complaint (Exhibit R4A).

Findings of Fact

[redacted] Cook County Sheriff's Office (CCSO), OPR, testified that his responsibilities are to conduct investigations of both administrative and criminal conduct by Sheriff employees (R. 18), he was assigned to investigate the Respondent and he had known him since approximately 2007 when they went through the academy together (R. 20). He said this case was originated, on about November 18, 2011, when the CPD conducted a search warrant at the Respondent's home, recovered the three firearms (identified earlier in the complaint) during the search warrant and asked for a meeting with OPR (R. 20-22). Officers from the LaGrange Police Department (LPD) and [redacted] CPD, were present at the meeting. CPD provided him with documentation regarding the search warrant, the recovery of the guns and a confidential informant information that illegal guns and drugs had been sold out of the address where the search warrant was executed (R. 22-23). CPD provided information at the meeting informing him that they conducted a search warrant at the Respondent's address, that they had three guns, that they were there based on information from a CI that illegal guns and [redacted] drugs had been sold out of the address, and the focus of the search warrant was [redacted] and two men by the last name [redacted] R. 22).

[redacted] provided a memorandum (Exhibit I0) he prepared of the investigator's report and the meeting with CPD and LPD that contained signatures on the bottom (R. 23). The LPD notified OPR that the three weapons that had been recovered by CPD had been reported stolen from [redacted] LaGrange, IL, and they provided their documentation that on at least one occasion a male subject had identified himself as a Sheriffs employee while having contact with the LPD at the address (R. 24). [redacted] checked social media and the Respondent's name was listed on the Facebook social media site (R. 25). The Respondent's Facebook social media page (Exhibit 1!) listed friends by the name of [redacted] (R. 25). Sgt Fitzgerald testified, after this meeting with CPD and LPD, on about November 22, 2011, he received a call from the Respondent during which the Respondent informed [redacted] that CPD had conducted a search warrant at his house in which CPD was looking for illegal guns and drugs (R. 26). [redacted] said at this point the Respondent's case was reassigned (R. 26). [redacted] said he believes the Respondent reached out to him because they were friends and had gone to the academy together (R. 27). [redacted] prepared a memorandum (Exhibit 12) documenting the phone call he received from the Respondent (R. 29). [redacted] said he did not complete the investigation and made no findings (R. 26-27).

[redacted] OPR, testified that he was one of the investigators for the Confidential and Corrupt Unit of OPR (R. 35). He testified he had significant experience investigating officers who were engaged in conduct unbecoming of employees of the CCSO as well as officers who have alleged to have broken local, state, and federal laws (R. 36). [redacted] said once he received the case on the Respondent, he reviewed all of the documentation for the work which had been done by the previous investigator (R. 38, 39). He reviewed the Chicago Police Citizen Law Enforcement Analysis Reports, or CLEAR reports, regarding several individuals including [redacted] (R. 39, 40). He testified that CLEAR reports are based on arrests or traffic stops and can identify persons as having gang criminal activity ties, arrests, convictions (R. 39). Inv [redacted] testified that [redacted] had a criminal history (Exhibit 13), was a convicted felon and was on parole (R. 40-41); [redacted] had a criminal history (Exhibit 14) that showed numerous arrests and convictions (R. 41); [redacted] had a criminal history (Exhibit 15) which showed a criminal history and conviction (R. 42); and [redacted] had a criminal history (Exhibit 16) that showed numerous arrests and convictions (R. 42-43). [redacted] testified he interviewed the Respondent after providing him

with all of the proper notifications and administrative rights (Exhibits 17- 20) and the Respondent signed off on the forms (R. 43-46). Inv [redacted] testified the interview of the Respondent was recorded and he was provided a copy immediately after the interview (R. 47). The Respondent's interview was played at the hearing. (R. 47) and Inv [redacted] testified it was the Respondent's voice on the audio recording and that was the same Respondent who was present at the trial (R. 49).

Inv [redacted] made a finding that the Respondent had violated General Order 3.8, Ethics and Standards Conduct as well as his compliance with lawful departmental rules, directives and bulletins (R.51). He found that the Respondent violated the subsection prohibiting knowingly associating with persons having known criminal records that would bring discredit to the department, subsection III-B (18).

Inv [redacted] said he was contacted by Officer [redacted] CPD, regarding a search warrant CPD had served in which they recovered three firearms that were part of the stolen property from [redacted] LaGrange (R. 110-111). He attended a meeting with Cook County Sheriff's Department investigators and CPD which later caused him to meet with the Respondent (R. 111). Inv [redacted] said during this meeting the Respondent admitted that he did know [redacted] and had for several years. The Respondent told him that he was working with [redacted] at the [redacted] (R. 112). Inv [redacted] memorialized this meeting with the Respondent in his report (Exhibit 27), which indicates that the Respondent said he had known [redacted] for many years prior to working with him at [redacted] (R. 113). The Respondent told Inv [redacted] he and [redacted] had worked on several homes in the Palos area (R. 114). The Respondent had been working with [redacted] n LaGrange right in the area where the [redacted] home is located (R. 114). Inv [redacted] testified the Respondent told him during the interview that he had obtained the rifles that were the subject of the search warrant as payment from [redacted] for services through [redacted] (R. 114-115). Inv [redacted] asked the Respondent about the statements he made to CPD in which the Respondent claimed to CPD that he obtained the rifles from his grandfather (R. 115). The Respondent denied making statements to CPD that he received the guns from his grandfather (R. 115). Inv [redacted] estified the Respondent told him that he did not have any paperwork regarding the transfer of the firearms (R. 116). The Respondent did not provide any bill of sale for the rifles (R. I 16). CPD provided the Respondent's name to Inv [redacted] pursuant to the guns being recovered from the Respondent's home (R. 123-124).

[redacted] CPD, testified in 201 I he was assigned to Organized Crime, Gang Investigation Division, CPD (R. 128). On November 17, 2011, he conducted a search warrant at [redacted] Chicago, IL (R. 128-129). The property was owned by the Respondent and the search warrant was authorized by a judge (R. 129). Officer [redacted] testified when he entered the apartment with other CPD officers they observed a black male (later identified as the Respondent) in the basement, they announced themselves as the police, the Respondent called out, *"Sheriff, Sheriff,"* and he had a gun in his hand at the time (R. 130, 131). The Respondent identified himself as [redacted] (R. 131). Officer [redacted] testified during the search CPD found three rifles in a bedroom of the Respondent's residence (R. 132). The Respondent admitted that the rifles were not registered (R. 133). The Respondent stated to him that he got the rifles from his buddy's grandfather who had passed (R. 133). The Respondent told Officer [redacted] that there had been six total rifles in the original collection, and he took three rifles (or three guns) and someone else took the other three (R. 133-134). The Respondent told Officer [redacted] he was going to either sell or give the guns to his lieutenant (R. 134). Officer [redacted] said the Respondent did not produce any registration documents or bills of sale for the guns (R. 134). Officer [redacted] said the targets of the search warrant were [redacted] and

[redacted] who were not present at the location at the time (R. 135-136). The Respondent informed Officer [redacted] hat he lets [redacted] stay at his house and [redacted] watches his house for him in the afternoon (R. 136).

Officer [redacted] said he was present during the meeting with the Cook County Sheriff's Office at the LPD regarding this incident (R. 140). Officer [redacted] testified that after CPD found out the rifles were stolen in a burglary, CPD called the Sheriff's Office to advise them the Respondent had been in custody of three stolen weapons from a burglary (R. 140). Officer [redacted] said he recognized the name [redacted] and testified that she lives on the second floor of Respondent's building and [redacted] is the father of her child (R. 142). Officer [redacted] testified the Respondent stated to him that he had known [redacted] since they were young, and they were friends for a long time (R. 142). Officer [redacted] said the Respondent told him [redacted] comes over to [redacted] (R. 142).

On cross examination, Officer [redacted] testified that the large silver revolver with a black handle specifically mentioned in the warrant was not found (R. 144). He testified the respondent fully cooperated with the police during the execution of the warrant (R. 145-146). Officer [redacted] testified the rifles were in three boxes under his bed (R. 146). Officer [redacted] testified the respondent was not arrested for any criminal offense related to the execution of the search warrant at the time and his service weapon was returned to him on scene (R. 147-148). Officer [redacted] said that during the execution of the warrant, [redacted] who lived in the upstairs apartment, arrived at the building (R. 148-149). Officer [redacted] said [redacted] identified herself as the mother of [redacted] children and allowed the police to search for [redacted] in her apartment and he was not there (R. 149).

[redacted] Officer (Officer [redacted] LPD, testified that he was working on September 19, 2011, performing a routine patrol when he came across two males standing at the back door of [redacted] LaGrange, with a green van parked in the driveway (R. 159). He testified that he called out and approached [redacted] initially and then the Respondent (R. 160). Officer [redacted] asked for information from "Mr. Beauchamp" (the Respondent) (R. 160). Officer [redacted] said he was shown a letter indicating [redacted] was there to change the locks and the officer entered the home (R. 161). Officer [redacted] said [redacted] and the Respondent told him they were there to change the locks on the home (R. 161). He said they all entered the house together and did a cursory search of the house, went upstairs and made sure there were no signs of anyone living there (R. 161). Officer [redacted] said he was present for approximately 10 to 15 minutes and left them to do their job (R. 162). Officer [redacted] said he documented his contact with them in a report (Exhibit 29) in which he wrote there were two male blacks standing by an entrance (R. 162-163).

Officer [redacted] said in his report he listed only one offender, [redacted] instead of two because the second person identified himself as law enforcement. (R. 163). Officer [redacted] said as a professional courtesy he took him at his word that he was there to do lawful work with his friend (R. 163).

Conclusion

The Board finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the Respondent violated Sheriff's Policy 3.8 III (B) (18) in that he knowingly associated with persons with known criminal records. The record is clear that the Respondent had longstanding ongoing personal and business relationships with individuals who had criminal records, including felony convictions and who were engaged in ongoing criminal conduct.

The Board further finds that Respondent Marquis Beauchamp, did violate and Article X, Paragraph B3, of the Rules of the Cook County Sheriffs Merit Board.

Order

Wherefore, based on the foregoing, it is hereby ordered that Respondent Marquis Beauchamp, Star Number 16264, be should be terminated from the Cook County Sheriff's Office effective July 20, 2018. In considering appropriate discipline of the Respondent, The Merit Board acknowledges that it has not considered any additional conduct of the Respondent in its determination of a new disciplinary sanction.

Telephone: 312-603-0170
Fax: 312-603-9865
Email: Sheriff.MeritBoard@ccsheriff.org

COOK COUNTY
SHERIFF'S MERIT BOARD
69 West Washington - Suite 1100
Chicago, IL 60602

DOCKET NO. 1889
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER
MARQUIS BEAUCHAMP
STAR # 16264

This Remand Decision is adopted and entered by a majority of the Members of the Merit Board:

Voted Yes:

John J. Dalicandro, Byron Brazier, Vincent T. Winters, Kimberly Pate Godden, Terrence J. Walsh, Marla M. Kaiden and James J. Sexton

Voted No: None

Not Present: Wade Ingram Sr.

DISSENT

The following Members of the Merit Board dissent from the Findings and Decision of the majority of the Board.

[NONE]

DATED AT COUNTY OF COOK, STATE OF ILLINOIS, THIS 18th DAY OF OCTOBER, 2023.

COOK COUNTY SHERIFF'S MERIT BOARD

Sheriff of Cook County	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	**Docket No. 1889**
Marquis Beauchamp	)	
Correctional Officer	)	
Star # 16264	)	

DECISION

This matter coming on to be heard pursuant to notice before Kim R. Widup, Board Member, on February 26 and 27, 2019, the Cook County Sheriff's (CCSO) Merit Board finds as follows:

Jurisdiction

Marquis Beauchamp, hereinafter Respondent, was appointed a Correctional Officer for the Cook County Department of Corrections (CCDOC) on November 26, 2007. Respondent's position as a Correctional Officer involves duties and responsibilities to the public; each member of the Cook County Sheriff's Merit Board, hereinafter Board, has been duly appointed to serve as a member of the Board pursuant to confirmation by the Cook County Board of Commissioners, State of Illinois, to sit for a stated term; the Board has jurisdiction of the subject matter of the parties in accordance with 55 ILCS 5/3-7001, *et seq*; and the Respondent was served with a copy of the Complaint and notice of hearing and appeared before the Board with counsel to contest the charges contained in the Complaint.

As a threshold matter, a proceeding before the Merit Board is initiated at the time the Sheriff files a written charge with the Merit Board, 55 ILCS 5/3-7012. A document is considered filed, in this case with the Merit Board, "when it is deposited with and passes into the exclusive control and custody of the [Merit Board administrative staff], who understandingly receives the same in order that it may become a part of the permanent records of his office." *See Dooley v. James A. Dooley Associates Employees Retirement Plan*, 100 Ill.App.3d 389, 395 (1981) (quoting *Gietl v. Commissioners of Drainage District No. One*, 384 Ill. 499, 501-502 (1943) and *citing Hamilton v. Beardslee*, 51 Ill. 478 (1869)); accord *People ex rel. Pignatelli v. Ward*, 404 Ill. 240, 245 (1949); *in re Annex Certain Terr. To the Village of Lemont*, 2017 IL App (1st) 170941, ¶ 18; *Illinois State Toll Highway Authority v. Marathon Oil Co.*, Ill. App. 3d 836 (1990) ("A 'filing' implies delivery of a document to the appropriate party with the intent of having such document kept on file by that party in the appropriate place." (quoting *Sherman v. Board of Fire & Police Commissioners*, 111 Ill. App. 3d 1001, 1007 (1982)); *Hawkyard v. Suttle*, 188 Ill. App. 168, 171 (1914 ("A paper is considered filed when it is delivered to the clerk for that purpose").

The original Complaint in this matter was filed with the Merit Board's administrative staff on April 1, 2016. Regardless of whether or not Merit Board Members were properly appointed

during a given term, the Merit Board, as a quasi-judicial body and statutorily created legal entity, maintained at all times a clerical staff not unlike the Clerk of the Circuit Court (Administrative Staff). These Administrative Staff members receive and date stamp complaints, open a case file, assign a case number, and perform all of the functions typically handled by the circuit clerk's office. Just as a timely filed complaint would be accepted by the circuit clerk even if there were no properly appointed judges sitting on that particular day, so too was the instant Complaint with the Administrative Staff of the Merit Board. Accordingly, the Complaint filed on April 1, 2016, commenced the instant action, was properly filed, and will be accepted as the controlling document for calculating time in this case.

Background

The Sheriff filed a complaint on April 1, 2016, filed an amended complaint on January 23, 2018 and filed a second amended complaint on February 14, 2019, all against the Respondent requesting termination of the Respondent's employment from the CCSO.

The original complaint alleged, in summary, that in 2011 and 2012, the Respondent associated with [redacted] ([redacted]), a person the Respondent knew or should have known had a criminal record, was a convicted felon and member of a gang. That in 2011 and 2012, the Respondent associated with [redacted] ([redacted] a person the Respondent knew or should have known had a criminal record and was a convicted felon. That in 2011, the Respondent associated with [redacted] ([redacted]), who was also known as [redacted], a person the Respondent knew or should have known had a criminal record and was a convicted felon. That in 2011, the Respondent associated with [redacted] ([redacted]), a person the Respondent knew or should have known had a criminal record, was a registered gun offender and a convicted felon.

That in 2011, the Respondent accepted and took possession of three unregistered firearms (Winchester rifles serial numbers [redacted], [redacted] and [redacted]) from [redacted], a person the Respondent knew or should have known was a convicted felon and who was not in possession of a valid FOID card. That in 2011, after taking possession of the three firearms, the Respondent failed to comply with Illinois state law that requires documentation for the transfer of firearms. Specifically, the Respondent failed to ensure that the transfer documents were completed for the three firearms he received from [redacted].

On September 19, 2011, while on patrol, a LaGrange Police Department (LPD) officer noticed two males standing by an entrance door at [redacted], LaGrange, IL. One of the two individuals was later identified as [redacted]. The second individual stated he was a Cook County Sheriff but was not identified by name. The LPD officer approached the residence and [redacted] ran up to the patrol vehicle and provided the officer with paperwork showing a work order from a bank. Further, [redacted] showed the LPD officer paperwork that indicated he was working for a company called *24/7 Preservation.* A neighbor noticed two suspicious males at the [redacted] property. On September 21, 2011, LPD units were dispatched to [redacted] for a report of a residential burglary, in which [redacted] ([redacted]) filed a report with LPD indicating that several firearms had been removed from his residence located at [redacted], LaGrange, IL. On September 23, 2011, a neighbor contacted LPD after observing two individuals at [redacted], a LPD Sergeant responded to the neighbor's report of two individuals at the

address and identified [redacted], with a second subject who identified himself as a Cook County Sheriff. Subsequently, the neighbor identified the Respondent from a photographic lineup as one of the two individuals he observed at [redacted] on September 23, 2011. On September 29, 2011, the three rifles, which were later found in the Respondent's possession (serial numbers [redacted], [redacted] and [redacted]), were placed into LEADS as some of the firearms stolen from [redacted]'s residence located at [redacted], LaGrange, IL in September of 2011. In November of 2011, the Respondent was the owner of a building located at [redacted] Chicago, IL.

In November of 2011, the Respondent resided on both the first floor and basement of [redacted], Chicago, IL. [redacted] and [redacted] were the Respondent's tenants residing on the second floor of the residence. In November of 2011, the Respondent allowed [redacted] to stay at his residence while the Respondent was at work. On November 17, 2011, the Chicago Police Department (CPD) executed a search warrant at the Respondent's residence, and recovered three Winchester rifles, with serial numbers [redacted], [redacted] and [redacted], from the Respondent residence. On November 17, 2011, the Respondent falsely reported to CPD that he acquired the three rifles when his friend' s grandfather died. Additionally, the Respondent falsely reported to CPD the three rifles were in his friend's grandfather's attic. On November 17, 2011, the Respondent stated to CPD that he, [redacted] and [redacted], grew up together. The Respondent admitted to CPD officers that he allowed [redacted], to stay at his residence while the Respondent was at work. That on November 17, 2011, CPD discovered that the three rifles confiscated from the Respondent were reported stolen and taken in a burglary in September of 2011 in LaGrange, IL.

On January 5, 2012, the Respondent was interviewed by the LPD and admitted to knowing [redacted] for several years. The Respondent stated that he was at [redacted] only one time in September of 2011. The Respondent denied entering the residence at [redacted] and removing property in September of 2011. The Respondent stated to LPD that he never saw [redacted] enter the residence at [redacted] in September of 2011. The Respondent, when asked by LPD about the firearms which he was found to be in possession of by the CPD, the Respondent stated that he had been given the three firearms by [redacted] in order to settle a debt owed him by [redacted] in September 2011. The Respondent stated that there was no paperwork completed regarding the transfer of the three firearms. During the January 5, 2012, interview by LPD the Respondent was asked about his previous statements regarding the firearms made to CPD officers, and the falsely reported to them that he had never made such statements to the CPD officers.

On October 28, 2015, the Respondent was interviewed and provided an audio recorded statement to investigators from the Cook County Sheriff's Office of Professional Review (OPR). The Respondent stated to OPR that in 2011 he was residing in the first floor and basement at [redacted]. The Respondent initially stated to OPR that [redacted] was his second-floor tenant for a year to a year and a half but subsequently, the Respondent stated that he only saw [redacted] *"once in a blue moon."* The Respondent admitted to OPR that had known [redacted] since grammar school. The Respondent admitted to OPR that he knew [redacted] and she was the leaseholder of the second-floor of his residence. The Respondent stated to OPR that in 2011 his residence at [redacted] was the subject of a search warrant executed by CPD. The Respondent stated that CPD was looking for his second-floor tenant, [redacted]. The Respondent admitted he knew [redacted] because he knows [redacted]'s wife and the Respondent stated that [redacted] lived across the alley from his grandmother.

The Respondent admitted to OPR that he went to [redacted] LaGrange, with [redacted] in September of 2011. The Respondent admitted that while at there, he and [redacted] encountered a neighbor who must have called the police. The Respondent stated to OPR that the three rifles confiscated by CPD in November of 2011 were not stolen. The Respondent falsely reported to OPR that he found the three rifles in a foreclosed house and said he kept them for a couple of months prior to CPD confiscating them.

After a series of legal reviews resolving issues regarding the constitution of the Board were completed, this matter was addressed with the parties by the Board through a trial on February 26 and 27, 2019.

The Petitioner (Sheriff) prepared and submitted to the Board their findings of fact as *Petitioner's Proposed Findings of Fact* and further described as *Uncontested Findings of Fact*. On June 20, 2019, the Respondent, after being granted a continuance based upon an administrative difficulty, prepared and submitted their findings of fact to the Board as *Respondent's Proposed Findings of Fact* (the one received by the Board on this date from the Respondent was his second submission to the Board as there was no record located of a previous submission being provided to the Board).

The sheriff introduced into evidence the Sheriff's General Order 3.8, Code of Ethics and Suitability of Conduct (Exhibit 1); Sheriff's General Order 4.1, Internal Investigations (Exhibit 2); Sheriff's Order 11.2.20.1, Conduct Policy (Exhibit 3); Article X, Rules and Regulations of the Cook County Sheriffs Merit Board (Exhibit 4); Certified Statement of Conviction for [redacted] Case 00 CR 1246301 (Exhibit 5); Certified Statement of Conviction for [redacted] Case 01 CR 1091802 (Exhibit 6); Certified Statement of Conviction for [redacted], Case 02 CR 2643501 (Exhibit 7); Certified Statement of Conviction for [redacted], Case 12 CR 2015501 (Exhibit 8); Certified Statement of Conviction for [redacted], Case 03 CR 1950901 (Exhibit 9); Memorandum of Sgt [redacted], CCSO, OPR, documenting meeting with CPD and LPD regarding the Respondent (Exhibit 10); Printout of page from the Respondent's Facebook account showing "friends" connection with [redacted] and [redacted] (Exhibit 11); Memorandum of phone call between Sgt [redacted] and the Respondent (Exhibit 12); Criminal History for [redacted] (Exhibit 13); Criminal History for [redacted] (Exhibit 14); Criminal History for [redacted] (Exhibit 15); Criminal History for [redacted] (Exhibit 16); OPR Administrative Proceedings Rights for Respondent (Exhibit 17); OPR Notice to Appear to Respondent (Exhibit 18); OPR Waiver of Legal Counsel by the Respondent (Exhibit 19); OPR Notification of Allegations to Respondent (Exhibit 20); OPR audio recording of interview of the Respondent (Exhibit 21); Photos of rifles owned by [redacted] (Exhibit 22); Gun registration form for Winchester 94 musket, serial number [redacted] (Exhibit 23); Gun registration form for rifle, serial number [redacted] (Exhibit 24); Gun registration form for rifle, serial number [redacted] (Exhibit 25); Report of Investigator [redacted], LPD (Exhibit 27); Report of Officer [redacted], CPD (Exhibit 28); and Report of Officer [redacted], LPD (Exhibit 29).

The Respondent introduced into evidence a landlord agreement and lease for [redacted] (Exhibit R1); Respondent's Certificates of Accomplishment (Exhibits R2A-H); [redacted]s driver's license, firearms identification card and firearm concealed carry license (Exhibits R3A-C); copy of search warrant (Exhibit R4); and a copy of search warrant complaint (Exhibit R4A).

Findings of Fact

[redacted], Sergeant (Sgt [redacted]), Cook County Sheriff's Office (CCSO), OPR, testified that his responsibilities are to conduct investigations of both administrative and criminal conduct by Sheriff employees (R. 18), he was assigned to investigate the Respondent and he had known him since approximately 2007 when they went through the academy together (R. 20). He said this case was originated, on about November 18, 2011, when the CPD conducted a search warrant at the Respondent's home, recovered the three firearms (identified earlier in the complaint) during the search warrant and asked for a meeting with OPR (R. 20-22). Officers from the LaGrange Police Department (LPD) and Sgt. [redacted], CPD, were present at the meeting. CPD provided him with documentation regarding the search warrant, the recovery of the guns and a confidential informant information that illegal guns and drugs had been sold out of the address where the search warrant was executed (R. 22-23). CPD provided information at the meeting informing him that they conducted a search warrant at the Respondent's address, that they had recovered three guns, that they were there based on information from a CI that illegal guns and drugs had been sold out of the address, and the focus of the search warrant was [redacted] and two men by the last name [redacted] (R. 22).

Sgt [redacted] provided a memorandum (Exhibit 10) he prepared of the investigator's report and the meeting with CPD and LPD that contained signatures on the bottom (R. 23). The LPD notified OPR that the three weapons that had been recovered by CPD had been reported stolen from [redacted] LaGrange, IL, and they provided their documentation that on at least one occasion a male subject had identified himself as a Sheriff's employee while having contact with the LPD at the address (R. 24). Sgt [redacted] checked social media and the Respondent's name was listed on the Facebook social media site (R. 25). The Respondent's Facebook social media page (Exhibit 11) listed friends by the name of [redacted] and [redacted] (R. 25). Sgt [redacted] testified, after this meeting with CPD and LPD, on about November 22, 2011, he received a call from the Respondent during which the Respondent informed Sgt [redacted] that CPD had conducted a search warrant at his house in which CPD was looking for illegal guns and drugs (R. 26). Sgt [redacted] said at this point the Respondent's case was reassigned (R. 26). Sgt [redacted] said he believes the Respondent reached out to him because they were friends and had gone to the academy together (R. 27). Sgt [redacted] prepared a memorandum (Exhibit 12) documenting the phone call he received from the Respondent (R. 29). Sgt [redacted] said he did not complete the investigation and made no findings (R. 26-27).

[redacted], Investigator (Inv [redacted]), OPR, testified that he was one of the investigators for the Confidential and Corrupt Unit of OPR (R. 35). He testified he had significant experience investigating officers who were engaged in conduct unbecoming of employees of the CCSO as well as officers who have alleged to have broken local, state, and federal laws (R. 36). Inv [redacted] said once he received the case on the Respondent, he reviewed all of the documentation for the work which had been done by the previous investigator (R. 38, 39). He reviewed the Chicago Police Citizen Law Enforcement Analysis Reports, or CLEAR reports, regarding several individuals including [redacted], [redacted] [redacted] and [redacted] (R. 39, 40). He testified that CLEAR reports are based on arrests or traffic stops and can identify persons as having gang criminal activity ties, arrests, convictions (R. 39). Inv [redacted] testified that [redacted] had a criminal history (Exhibit 13), was a convicted felon and was on parole (R. 40-41); [redacted] had a criminal history

(Exhibit 14) that showed numerous arrests and convictions (R. 41); [redacted] ([redacted] had a criminal history (Exhibit 15) which showed a criminal history and conviction (R. 42); and [redacted] had a criminal history (Exhibit 16) that showed numerous arrests and convictions (R. 42-43). Inv [redacted] testified he interviewed the Respondent after providing him with all of the proper notifications and administrative rights (Exhibits 17- 20) and the Respondent signed off on the forms (R. 43-46). Inv [redacted] testified the interview of the Respondent was recorded and he was provided a copy immediately after the interview (R. 47). The Respondent's interview was played at the hearing. (R. 47) and Inv [redacted] testified it was the Respondent's voice on the audio recording and that was the same Respondent who was present at the trial (R. 49).

Inv [redacted] made a finding that the Respondent had violated General Order 3.8, Ethics and Standards Conduct as well as his compliance with lawful departmental rules, directives and bulletins (R. 51). He found that the Respondent violated the subsection prohibiting knowingly associating with persons having known criminal records that would bring discredit to the department, subsection III-B (18); he found that the Respondent violated Section III-D(6) regarding professional demeanor and engaging in off duty behavior that would reflect negatively on the Department; he found that the Respondent violated CCDOC General Order 4.1, Internal Investigations; he found the Respondent violated the Sheriff's Rules II-A(6) regarding failure to properly register weapons and the improper use of a weapon; he found that the Respondent violated Cook County Sheriff's Rules regarding engaging in conduct unbecoming of an employee which tends to reflect negatively and discredit the Department; and he found the Respondent violated Sheriff's Order 11.2.20.1, regarding the conduct policy while interfering and obstructing an investigation and destroying, altering, concealing or disguising evidence, planting false evidence or furnishing false information to any lawful authority (R. 51-54).

Inv [redacted] identified in the audio recording (Exhibit 21) of the Respondent's interview with OPR where the Respondent, when asked how he acquired the guns, stated, *"That was stuff I found that I just kept. I thought it was classic I thought I found a treasure like you know. And I kept them"* (R. 56, Track 3, 2:54-3:04). Inv [redacted] obtained CPD reports identifying the gang membership of [redacted] and [redacted] (R. 69). Inv [redacted] testified that the during the execution of the search warrant by CPD three of the rifles from [redacted]'s home were found in Respondent's residence (R. 71-72).

The cross examination of Inv [redacted] was delayed in order to allow an additional witness to testify out of order, [redacted], after which the testimony of Inv [redacted] continued. On cross examination, Inv [redacted] said he did not remember when in 2013 he was assigned to the Respondent's case (R. 68). He testified that by the time he interviewed the Respondent on October 28, 2015, there had been at least two years since he had been assigned the case (R. 70). Inv [redacted] testified when he conducted the interview with the respondent, he did not have with him the lease to the apartment for [redacted] the search warrant, the complaint for the search warrant, or the Bureau of Identification sheets of the four individuals referred to previously (R. 70-71).

Inv. [redacted] said he did not see or read the complaint for the search warrant, did not request a copy of the complaint, and replied "yes" to the question that the purpose of the interview was to find out from the Respondent about the search warrant that was executed on his house (R. 71,83). Inv [redacted] agreed that it was the Respondent who provided him with the search warrant during the October 28, 2015, interview (R. 72). Inv [redacted] was shown a copy of a search warrant (Exhibit

R4), which he stated, "*No, I do not recall this being a copy of the document. I do not recall this being the copy of what Officer Beauchamp (the Respondent) provided during the interview...I believe I took a photocopy of it during the interview, and I provided it in my report as an exhibit*" (R. 73).

Inv [redacted] further testified that upon reviewing the search warrant (Exhibit R4), [redacted] and "[redacted]" were named as the subjects of the warrant (R. 73-74) and the address to be searched was the address of the Respondent. The warrant sought to seize, "a large silver revolver and any other weapons" (R. 74). The Respondent's name was not mentioned in the warrant, rifles were not specifically mentioned in the warrant (but other weapons were), and no large silver revolver with a black handle was seized from the apartment (R. 74-75).

Inv [redacted] testified he did not ask the Respondent if he knew that [redacted] or [redacted] had any convictions (R. 75-76). Inv [redacted] was aware that [redacted] had an extensive criminal history, but he did not ask the respondent if he knew of this history (R. 76-77). The following colloquy occurred:

> *Q. Well, you were aware they were convicted felons, correct?*
> *A. Yes, sir.*
> *Q. You were aware Beauchamp (the Respondent) is an officer, sworn officer of the Cook County Sheriff's Department, correct?*
> *A. Yes, sir.*
> *Q. And your testimony is it was not a purpose of your questioning in order to determine what Officer Beauchamp's relationship was to these individuals and whether he knew they were convicted felons?*
> *A. No, sir. My interview was based on the - - what the administrative forms said the interview was based on* (R. 77).

Inv [redacted] was aware that the three rifles recovered at the Respondent's address on [redacted] were taken from the [redacted] home in LaGrange (R. 77-78). Inv [redacted] said he did not ask the Respondent whether he had entered the [redacted] home, nor did he ask any questions of the Respondent in regard to the first place he actually saw the rifles (R. 78). The Respondent never made any admissions to Inv [redacted] that he believed the rifles were stolen (R. 79). The complaint for the search warrant was provided the following day and added to the record (Exhibit R4A).

[redacted] ([redacted]), testified after Inv [redacted]'s direct examination and before cross examination that he was the owner of [redacted] LaGrange, IL, in September 2011 (R. 57), and he routinely would go to the house. [redacted] testified that in September of 2011, he had just moved out but still had keys to the premises and regularly visited the house (R. 57-58). He did not recall what "state" the house was in when he visited the house. He was in the process of moving out and visited the house on September 19, 2011 (R. 58). On September 21, 2011, he entered the house with police officers, and he found that his property was missing. (R. 59). He reported to the LPD that his lap top computer, leather carrying case, a number of guns as well as some commemorative rifles and a shotgun were all missing (R. 59). He identified photos (Exhibit 22) of some of the rifles that were missing which established them as commemorative rifles (R. 60). [redacted] also identified a copy of the following gun registration forms, signed by him for the City of Chicago: for his Winchester 94 musket (Exhibit 23), serial number [redacted]; gun registration form (Exhibit 24),

for a rifle with serial number [redacted]; and gun registration form (Exhibit 25), for a rifle with serial number [redacted] (R. 63-65). [redacted] testified he did not sell his rifles and did not give anyone permission to take them (R. 63-64). His property has not been returned to him and he was told that the CPD has it in their evidence section (R. 64).

[redacted], Officer (Officer [redacted]), LPD, testified that on September 21, 2011, he was assigned to go to [redacted] LaGrange, regarding a report of a residential burglary (R. 89-90). Officer [redacted] testified that he went with two other officers and met with [redacted] and his wife at the address. They all went inside to check the house, looking for weapons the [redacted]'s had left on top of a refrigerator (R. 91-92). The officers detailed the models and serial numbers of the rifles the [redacted]'s reported were missing (R. 95-97). Officer [redacted] stated he listed in his report [redacted] as a suspect (R. 98-100). Officer [redacted] testified he listed [redacted] as a suspect as his best guess because he had been a suspect in a previous burglary of the same type a few years before and all they had the time of the report was the information from the [redacted]'s (R. 103). Officer [redacted] stated that he had also written in his report that a neighbor, [redacted], reported seeing two suspicious males on the property (R. 103). Officer [redacted]'s report was not introduced into evidence. Additionally, when he went inside, Officer [redacted] said he found a letter sized note in a vestibule, relating that the property was serviced by *LPA Field Services* which left a phone number (R. 101-102).

[redacted], Investigator (Inv [redacted]), LPD, testified that he responded and participated in the investigation of a burglary at [redacted] in LaGrange, IL (R. 106). He said they began by checking local pawn shops around the city to see if any of the stuff had come to them that was stolen. Inv [redacted] said they contacted the Riverside Police Department (RPD) whose agency has access to LEADS online, a warehouse of information for items sold at pawnshops nationally, and pawn shops in the Chicago area (R. 107). He contacted Miss [redacted] at *LPS*, which was the company contracted by the bank regarding security for the property because of the foreclosure. [redacted] informed him that *LPS* contracted the work out to *24/7 Preservation* (R. 108). The paperwork they issued regarding the services for security stated that "*any person that was there to perform work could enter the property, but the paperwork indicated that if there was property within the residence with a value in excess of $300, they were not to enter the residence and just to maintain and secure the property*" (R. 110).

Inv [redacted] said he was contacted by Officer [redacted], CPD, regarding a search warrant CPD had served in which they recovered three firearms that were part of the stolen property from [redacted], LaGrange (R. 110-111). He attended a meeting with Cook County Sheriff's Department investigators and CPD which later caused him to meet with the Respondent (R. 111). Inv [redacted] said during this meeting the Respondent admitted that he did know [redacted] and had for several years. The Respondent told him that he was working with [redacted] at the *24/7 Preservation Company* (R. 112). Inv [redacted] memorialized this meeting with the Respondent in his report (Exhibit 27), which indicates that the Respondent said he had known [redacted] for many years prior to working with him at *24/7 Preservation* (R. 113). The Respondent told Inv [redacted] he and [redacted] had worked on several homes in the Palos area (R. 114). The Respondent had been working with [redacted] in LaGrange right in the area where the [redacted] home is located (R. 114). Inv [redacted] testified the Respondent told him during the interview that he had obtained the rifles that were the subject of the search warrant as payment from [redacted] for services through *24/7*

(R. 114-115). Inv [redacted] asked the Respondent about the statements he made to CPD in which the Respondent claimed to CPD that he obtained the rifles from his grandfather (R. 115). The Respondent denied making statements to CPD that he received the guns from his grandfather (R. 115). Inv [redacted] testified the Respondent told him that he did not have any paperwork regarding the transfer of the firearms (R. 116). The Respondent did not provide any bill of sale for the rifles (R. 116). CPD provided the Respondent's name to Inv [redacted] pursuant to the guns being recovered from the Respondent's home (R. 123-124).

On cross examination, Inv [redacted] testified that respondent cooperated and came to the LPD when contacted (R. 117-118). The Respondent was not asked to sign or write out a statement. Inv [redacted]'s report of his conversation was based on his notes, since destroyed, taken the date of the interview; and he said the report was not written until January 22, 2014, over two years after the conversation (R. 120). Investigator [redacted] requested and the Respondent agreed to submit his fingerprints, in order to compare to any that may have been recovered from the [redacted] residence (R. 121-122). The residence was processed by an evidence technician for fingerprints; these prints were sent to the lab, and no connection was made to the Respondent (R. 121-122). Inv [redacted] testified that in his report, he concluded that, based upon a review of the incident it was determined that sufficient evidence or witnesses in this matter did not exist to support charges (R. 123). Inv [redacted] said this decision was based upon LPD practice of him meeting with Lt [redacted] and as part of their case management they would have meetings to review their cases. Inv [redacted] said during these meetings they would go over the evidence, determine if there were any leads, if there was anything they could follow up on and determine if there was anything further to address in the case. When it's determined that there were not any leads to follow up, then they review the evidence and determine if they could proceed with charges. He said it was basically a team decision that there was nothing that he could present to the state's attorney to charge from LPD's end for the burglary (R. 124). The Respondent was not charged with a criminal offense in relation to the LaGrange matter by the LPD (R. 123).

[redacted], Officer (Officer [redacted]), CPD, testified in 2011 he was assigned to Organized Crime, Gang Investigation Division, CPD (R. 128). On November 17, 2011, he conducted a search warrant at [redacted], Chicago, IL (R. 128-129). The property was owned by the Respondent and the search warrant was authorized by a judge (R. 129). Officer [redacted] testified when he entered the apartment with other CPD officers they observed a black male (later identified as the Respondent) in the basement, they announced themselves as the police, the Respondent called out, "*Sheriff, Sheriff*," and he had a gun in his hand at the time (R. 130, 131). The Respondent identified himself as Marquis Beauchamp (R. 131). Officer [redacted] testified during the search CPD found three rifles in a bedroom of the Respondent's residence (R. 132). The Respondent admitted that the rifles were not registered (R. 133). The Respondent stated to him that he got the rifles from his buddy's grandfather who had passed (R. 133). The Respondent told Officer [redacted] that there had been six total rifles in the original collection, and he took three rifles (or three guns) and someone else took the other three (R. 133-134). The Respondent told Officer [redacted] he was going to either sell or give the guns to his lieutenant (R. 134). Officer [redacted] said the Respondent did not produce any registration documents or bills of sale for the guns (R. 134). Officer [redacted] said the targets of the search warrant were [redacted] and "[redacted]" who were not present at the location at the time (R. 135-136). The Respondent informed Officer [redacted] that he lets [redacted] stay at his house and [redacted]'s brother, watches his house for him in the afternoon (R. 136).

Officer [redacted] prepared a report (Exhibit 28) concerning the activities related to the execution of the search warrant. Officer [redacted] located the serial numbers and inventoried all of the rifles (R. 137). He stated Rifle No. 1 had serial number [redacted], Rifle No. 2 had serial number [redacted], and Rifle No. 3 had serial number [redacted] (R. 137). Officer [redacted] testified it was the CPD practice that whenever they recover rifles, they run them through their gun desk looking for registration and see what the status of the weapon is (R. 139). He testified the conducting of this identification check pulled up the burglary from LaGrange, IL. (R. 139) and he said the guns matched up the identifications with Sheriff's Exhibit 22 as the guns that were stolen (R. 139-140). Officer [redacted] said he was present during the meeting with the Cook County Sheriff's Office at the LPD regarding this incident (R. 140). Officer [redacted] testified that after CPD found out the rifles were stolen in a burglary, CPD called the Sheriff's Office to advise them the Respondent had been in custody of three stolen weapons from a burglary (R. 140). Officer [redacted] said he recognized the name [redacted] and testified that she lives on the second floor of Respondent's building and [redacted] is the father of her child (R. 142). Officer [redacted] testified the Respondent stated to him that he had known [redacted] since they were young, and they were friends for a long time (R. 142). Officer [redacted] said the Respondent told him [redacted] comes over to [redacted] (R. 142).

On cross examination, Officer [redacted] testified that the large silver revolver with a black handle specifically mentioned in the warrant was not found (R. 144). He testified the respondent fully cooperated with the police during the execution of the warrant (R. 145-146). Officer [redacted] testified the rifles were in three boxes under his bed (R. 146). Officer [redacted] testified the respondent was not arrested for any criminal offense related to the execution of the search warrant at the time and his service weapon was returned to him on scene (R. 147-148). Officer [redacted] said that during the execution of the warrant, [redacted] who lived in the upstairs apartment, arrived at the building (R. 148-149). Officer [redacted] said [redacted] identified herself as the mother of [redacted] [redacted]'s children and allowed the police to search for [redacted] in her apartment and he was not there (R. 149).

[redacted], Officer (Officer [redacted]), LPD, testified that he was working on September 19, 2011, performing a routine patrol when he came across two males standing at the back door of [redacted] LaGrange, with a green van parked in the driveway (R. 159). He testified that he called out and was approached [redacted] initially and then the Respondent (R. 160). Officer [redacted] asked for information from "Mr. Beauchamp" (the Respondent) (R. 160). Officer [redacted] said he was shown a letter indicating [redacted] was there to change the locks and the officer entered the home (R. 161). Officer [redacted] said [redacted] and the Respondent told him they were there to change the locks on the home (R. 161). He said they all entered the house together and did a cursory search of the house, went upstairs and made sure there were no signs of anyone living there (R. 161). Officer [redacted] said he was present for approximately 10 to 15 minutes and left them to do their job (R. 162). Officer [redacted] said he documented his contact with them in a report (Exhibit 29) in which he wrote there were two male blacks standing by an entrance (R. 162-163). Officer [redacted] said in his report he listed only one offender, [redacted], instead of two because the second person identified himself as law enforcement. (R. 163). Officer [redacted] said as a professional courtesy he took him at his word that he was there to do lawful work with his friend (R. 163).

On cross examination, Officer [redacted] testified that [redacted] had paperwork with a letterhead, *"from a bank stating that the bank - - the house was - - either bank owned or a foreclosure"* (R. 165). He said it was [redacted] who was removing the lock (R. 165). Officer [redacted] said he did not recall, when in the basement, seeing any rifles on top of a refrigerator (R. 167). Officer [redacted] said his police report was not correct when the he stated that he entered the residence with only [redacted] as he left "the other person" out of the report as a professional courtesy (R. 167-168). Officer [redacted] said days after he was at the address, he looked at a photo lineup and did not identify the Respondent as one of the persons who had been at the home on September 19, 2011 (R. 169).

Conclusion

The Board finds by a preponderance of the evidence through the testimony of the witnesses; the audio tape recording of the Respondent's interview with OPR on October 28, 2015 (Exhibit 21); and the supporting evidence that the Respondent was less then credible in his testimony; that he provided false information to OPR; the Respondent's conflicting and false statements to CPD and LPD; the Respondent's ongoing personal and business relationships with individuals who had criminal records, including felony convictions and who were engaged in ongoing criminal conduct; the respondent's lack of maintaining an appropriate professional demeanor by continuing these relationships with individuals who had a criminal record. Additionally, that in 2011, the Respondent accepted and took possession of three unregistered firearms (Winchester rifles serial numbers [redacted], [redacted] and [redacted]) from [redacted], a person the Respondent knew or should have known was a convicted felon and who was not in possession of a valid FOID card. That in 2011, after taking possession of the three firearms, the Respondent failed to comply with Illinois state law that requires documentation for the transfer of firearms. Specifically, the Respondent failed to ensure that the transfer documents were completed for the three firearms he received from [redacted] and provided three conflicting and different stories as to how he came into possession of these firearms to three different law enforcement agencies.

The Board further finds that Respondent Marquis Beauchamp, did violate Cook County Sheriff's General Order 38, Sections I, II A-B, III A1and 4, B6 and 18, D6, G; General Order 4.1, Sections III A5, 6, 17 and 18; Sheriff's Order 11.2.20.1, Sections II, III, IV, VI 24, 26, 29 and 30; and Article X, Paragraph B3, of the Rules of the Cook County Sheriff's Merit Board.

Order

Wherefore, based on the foregoing, it is hereby ordered that Respondent Marquis Beauchamp, Star Number 16264, be separated from the Cook County Sheriff's Office effective March 29, 2016.

MB1889 Marquis Beauchamp
Correctional Officer

[redacted]
James P. Nally, Chairman

[redacted]
Byron Brazier, Vice-Chairman

[redacted]
John Balicandro, Secretary

[redacted]
Kim R . Widup, Board Member

[redacted]
Vincent T. Winters, Board Member

[redacted]
Juan L. Baltierres, Board Member

[redacted]
Patrick M. Brady , Board Member

[redacted]
Kimberly Pate Godden, Board Member

Date June 27, 2019

Telephone: 312-603-0170
Fax: 312-603-9865
Email: Sherif.MeritBoard@cookcountyil.gov

COOK COUNTY
SHERIFF'S MERIT BOARD
69 West Washington - Suite 1100
Chicago, IL 60602

Marquis Beauchamp
Correctional Officer
Docket No. 1889

This Remand Decision is adopted and entered by a majority of the Members of the Merit Board:

John J. Dalicandro, Byron Brazier, Vincent T. Winters, Kim R. Widup, Juan L. Baltierres, Kimberly Pate Godden and Eleni P. Sianis.

Not Present:

DISSENT

The following Members of the Merit Board dissent from the Findings and Decision of the majority of the Board.

[NONE]

DATED AT COUNTY OF COOK, STATE OF ILLINOIS, THIS 15th DAY OF OCTOBER, 2020.