

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

<b>IN THE MATTER OF CHARGES FILED AGAINST )</b>		
<b>POLICE OFFICER PARRISH SEVIER, )</b>		<b>No. 24 PB 3041</b>
<b>STAR No. 18961, DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, )</b>		
<b>CITY OF CHICAGO, )</b>		
<b>RESPONDENT. )</b>		<b>(CR No. 1091502)</b>

**FINDINGS AND DECISION**

On October 3, 2024, the Superintendent of Police filed with the Police Board of the City of Chicago charges against Police Officer Parrish Sevier, Star No. 18961 (“Respondent”), recommending that Respondent be discharged from the Chicago Police Department (“Department” or “CPD”) for violating CPD’s Rules of Conduct.

A hearing on the charges against Respondent took place before Hearing Officer Michael Panter on April 7, 8, and 10, 2025. Following this evidentiary hearing, the members of the Police Board who participated in deciding this case read and reviewed the record of the proceedings, including the Hearing Officer’s Report and the Superintendent’s response to this report (Respondent did not file a response), and viewed the video recording of the entire evidentiary hearing. The Hearing Officer made an oral report to and conferred with the Board before it rendered its findings and decision.

During the proceedings of this case, from the filing of charges through the evidentiary hearing, the Hearing Officer made rulings and entered orders. None of the Hearing Officer’s rulings and orders is overruled or reversed.

## **POLICE BOARD FINDINGS**

As a result of its review of the record of proceedings, the Police Board finds and determines that:

1. Respondent was at all times mentioned herein a sworn officer of the CPD in the classified civil service of the City of Chicago.

2. A copy of the charges filed, and a notice stating the date, place, and time the initial status hearing would be held, were personally served upon Respondent on October 21, 2024.

3. At the time Respondent was personally served with the charges, he was presented with the options of electing to have a Police Board hearing or have public arbitration. On October 22, 2024, Respondent elected to have a Police Board hearing.

4. Throughout the hearing on the charges Respondent appeared and was represented by legal counsel.

### **Introduction**

5. Respondent is 54 years old and has been a Chicago police officer since 1995. He was born and grew up in Englewood and attended Englewood High School. He married in 1994 and has a son (age 30) with his wife and a daughter (age 32) from a previous relationship. Both children were raised in Englewood and attended Chicago Public Schools. Respondent worked in Englewood as a field training officer. Respondent purchased the house at [redacted] (“[the Chicago address]”) in Englewood in 2000 and he has owned it continuously since. He and the family lived there and then

at two other homes in Englewood before moving back to [the Chicago address] in 2018. There is no dispute that Respondent was a resident of the City of Chicago, while he was an officer, for 23 years from 1995 to 2018.

In 2018, Respondent's wife left him to live at her mother's home at [redacted] in the Village of Matteson, in Cook County, about thirty miles from Chicago, Respondent began to extensively remodel his house at [the Chicago address], and CPD began the investigation that led to the charges against Respondent.

### **Charges Against Respondent**

6. Police Officer Parrish Sevier, Star No. 18961, is **not guilty** of violating Rules 1, 2, and 25 in that the Superintendent did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence the following charges set forth in Specification No. 1:

From at least on or about June 21, 2019, through at least on or about March 28, 2023, or for some period of time therein, Officer Sevier resided at [redacted], Matteson, Illinois. Officer Sevier thereby violated:

- a. Rule 1, which prohibits violation of any law or ordinance, in that he violated the Municipal Code of Chicago, Chapter 2-152, Section 050;
- b. Rule 2, which prohibits any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department; and
- c. Rule 25, which prohibits failure to actually reside within the corporate boundaries of the City of Chicago.

Section 2-152-050 of the Municipal Code of Chicago states "All officers and employees of the city shall be actual residents of the city." The Board must determine

which of the two properties--[redacted] in Chicago or [redacted] in Matteson – was Respondent’s actual residence.

“Residency” is not defined by any rule or statute. Residency is a nuanced determination set out in case law. It is important to note that establishing residency and abandoning residency are two different propositions having differing requirements of proof. *Maksym et al. v. Board of Election Commissioners of the City of Chicago et al.*, an Illinois Supreme Court decision that is the highest and most current authority submitted by the parties, sets forth the following “well-settled” principles:

First, to *establish* residency, two elements are required: (1) physical presence, and (2) an intent to remain in that place as a permanent home [citations omitted]. Second, once residency is established, the test is no longer physical presence but rather abandonment. Indeed, once a person has *established* residence, he or she can be physically absent from that residence for months or even years without having abandoned it[.]<sup>1</sup> *Maksym et al. v. Board of Election Commissioners of the City of Chicago et al.*, 242 Ill.2d 303 at 319 (2011) (all emphasis in the original).

*Maksym* gives examples such as a Chicago resident who winters in Florida or someone working extensively abroad. Regardless of the amount of time spent away, both are still Chicago residents.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Superintendent’s response to the Hearing Officer’s Report included the following text from an 1888 case quoted in *Maksym*:

[T]he shortest absence, if at the time intended as a permanent abandonment, is sufficient, although the party may soon afterwards change his intention; while, on the other hand, an absence for months, or even years, if all the while intended as a mere temporary absence for some temporary purpose, to be followed by a resumption of the former residence, will not be an abandonment. *Kreitz v. Behrensmeyer*, 125 Ill. 141, 195 (1888).

While the Superintendent states that this quote is material to Superintendent’s case, evidence, and closing argument, it does not change *Maksym*’s holding that, once residency is established, the test is not physical presence but rather abandonment.

There is no dispute that Respondent was a resident of the City of Chicago while he was a Chicago police officer from 1995 to 2018. Therefore, in light of *Maksym*, Specification No. 1 above, “From at least on or about June 21, 2019, through at least on or about March 28, 2023, or for some period of time therein, Officer Sevier resided at [redacted], Matteson, Illinois” means the Superintendent must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Respondent abandoned his Chicago residence and changed his residence to Matteson, not merely that he lived in Matteson for some period of time. The Board finds that the Superintendent did not meet this burden.

The Superintendent argues that Respondent’s activities in Matteson are inconsistent with his claim of continued residence at [the Chicago address]. In 2018, the Superintendent undertook this residency investigation. Teams of three cars with up to five officers made daily “ops plans” and covertly surveilled Respondent on twenty-two dates from 2019 through 2023. On eight occasions they saw him or his car leave work and go to or end up at Matteson. They saw him enter the house. After seeing him or his car there, they left between 4:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m., although one night they stayed until 8:30 p.m., and one night they saw his car there at 9:30 p.m. Calling it consistent with their standard operating procedures, which do not require round-the-clock surveillance, the officers cannot say what happened after they left. They cannot say if Respondent stayed in Matteson any of those nights or returned to [the Chicago address].

One night, investigators saw Respondent carrying clothes into the house at Matteson and then go out to dinner with his wife. The investigators left at 7:33 p.m.

Reports also note Respondent was seen going to the mailbox and bringing in the garbage at Matteson. One report notes, "Sevier then gave the unknown young male black [his son] a hug in the middle of the street." No report notes any attempt by Respondent to conceal his activities.

On ten occasions from 2019 through 2023, investigative teams saw Respondent leave Matteson in the early morning and drive himself or get driven to work by his wife. Sometimes Respondent or his wife picked up coffee or gas before going to work. Once they saw his car parked at Matteson at 10:00 p.m. and the next day his car was still there at 9:00 a.m. Once they saw his car parked at Matteson from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. There were months when no surveillance took place at all.

Finally, on February 22, 2023, Respondent was leaving Matteson in the early morning when he was stopped for service of notice of allegations. No surveillance notes any observations of the house or canvass of the neighborhood at [the Chicago address]. One of the surveillance officers testified he was at [the Chicago address] and saw a side door and a front and back window boarded up. There were very tall weeds in the yard and the house looked vacant to him. He did not look under the boards or knock on the door. He made no notes and took no pictures of what he saw. The single observation of Respondent's once entering the Matteson home carrying a box of clothes is the only evidence of any possessions Respondent may have brought there.

In his interview with CPD's Bureau of Internal Affairs (BIA) on March 1, 2023, Respondent admitted to spending time at the Matteson house, saying, at present, "Well,

currently for the past—so, the house has been under rehab, been rehabbing the house.

There has been no heat in the house so I haven't been there on a weekly basis. So, I'll go in, probably twice a week, do work, leave at night, things of that sort. So, I'm like in and out of there. Question: So, you say you just stop by to do work on the property?

Answer: Right now, yes." Prior to that, he went once or twice a week. In the past three or four years, he went maybe twice to three times a week but did not stay over. He said in the past year, fifty per cent of the time he went directly from work to his home in Chicago.

Respondent was asked how many days a week he spends at the suburban address: "Lately, a lot. I—just about every night. Question: Every night since when?

Answer: For the last past six months. Question: Well, you just said three or four months, you've been there on —Answer: I've been there on the regular three to four months, but I—he—I'm just trying to narrow it down. I really just don't know, like I said, I've been trying to rekindle my marriage with my wife. So, approximately the last six months I would say."

Respondent and his wife, [L.], testified that she left him in 2018 and went to live with her mother, [V.F.], at the Matteson house. [V.F.] was the sole owner of that house. [L.] said she needed space to herself. "No one wants to go through the marital things we went through. Being an officer is stressful enough." She also wanted to be with her mother who was older and needed assistance. Whenever Respondent came to Matteson, he went there to visit her and their son. "He had overnight clothes. Like over the years

he would stay the night, and he would have overnight clothes. But nothing that would permanently stay.”

[L.] has lived at Matteson continuously since 2018 through the present. In 2018, her father died of cancer and in 2019, her grandmother passed. [L.] was very close to her mother and wanted to be with her until she passed on December 2, 2024. [L.] testified that Respondent was a great support in those difficult times. [L.] also described how Respondent took care of her when she was bedridden after her surgery in Spring 2022.

Respondent says sometimes he went to Matteson after work and then came home. Sometimes he stayed over on the couch and at some point his wife allowed him to sleep with her. Even though the marriage is rocky, they are still working to resolve their issues. [L.] said that Respondent is a good man, but she is not yet ready to be with him again. She can forgive but not forget. Respondent says, “I hate to admit it, I messed up with my wife, I really did.” Both testified they do not live together.

While the above evidence shows Respondent spent time in Matteson, all documentation supports Respondent’s claim that he never abandoned [the Chicago address] as his residence. Respondent has owned the house at [the Chicago address] continuously since August 2000. The title is and always has been in his name alone. He has always made the mortgage payments. He pays all property taxes and the ComEd, AT&T internet, water, sewer, and refuse bills for [the Chicago address]. He has received mail at [the Chicago address] as well as at PO Box [redacted] in the City of Chicago. His driver’s license and his voter’s ID have always shown his Chicago residence. He has



never owned, leased, or had any property interest outside the City of Chicago.

Respondent has never had a property interest in the house in Matteson. Respondent was born in Englewood, works in Englewood, and has never owned property outside of Englewood.

Respondent testified that he completely gutted and extensively remodeled the entire home at [the Chicago address] since about 2018-2019. He has done much of the work himself, got help from his brother and his son, and has used contractors for specific parts of the work. He says he spent most of his non-work time at [the Chicago address], even while the HVAC was being replaced, using propane and electric space heaters. There was always a working toilet and shower. Some nights he spent with his sister or brother, both residing in Englewood.

Respondent testified his hope is to resolve the marital issues, and have [L.] come back and live with him at [the Chicago address]. He testified he has no plans to sell. Citing reasons similar to those cited by the Superintendent in explaining why CPD's investigation took six years, Respondent said the rehab has taken many years because of COVID and personnel and supply issues.

Respondent testified that a side door and side windows were boarded for a time during construction, but the main door and most of the windows have never been boarded. He put boards to protect new windows after they had been broken. Photographs Respondent took and gave to BIA in March 2023 show the inside of Respondent's house with numerous construction tools and ongoing work inside. They

show a mini fridge, a couch where he says he slept, and tools. Photographs taken in or around 2025 and submitted at the hearing show a finished, fully habitable house and garage and a long new wooden fence. Respondent has always kept his fix-up car, an Impala S/S, in his garage at [the Chicago address].

Respondent showed the separate plastic bins in his bedroom for shoe storage. He has installed mirrored frameless sliding doors, new stone tile, a Jacuzzi, a soaker tub in the basement, cathedral ceiling in the front room, and a fireplace in the front room “something that my wife wanted so if she do come back.” He is installing a hot tub. He showed the closet with his clothes and where he keeps his uniforms.

Respondent produced his next-door neighbor, [T.C.]. She testified that she understood Respondent to live at [the Chicago address]. She saw him quite a bit at different times of the day and met his wife and son and daughter. She saw him do quite a bit of work at the house himself. The neighborhood was “not so good.” She traveled often. She did not converse with her neighbors but when she saw Respondent in uniform and learned he was a police officer, she trusted him, telling him when she was going away, and asking him to watch her house and bring in her mail and packages. The construction noise did not disturb her because she talked with him about the work he was doing at his house and the work she wanted done at her house. Like Respondent, she also had a post office box because the neighborhood was not always reliable.

There is no evidence Respondent moved furniture, personal effects, utensils, his hobby car, his tools, or any substantial belongings to Matteson. There is no evidence he met anyone there, spoke to any neighbor, spent any time in the neighborhood, spent any money on the property, or made any effort to maintain the Matteson house. There is no evidence of any accommodations made for him there, and no documentation that connects him in any way to the Matteson property. Rather, the evidence is he went to Matteson solely to spend time with his wife. The Superintendent did not monitor time Respondent spent in Englewood, did not canvass his Englewood neighborhood, and did nothing to watch [the Chicago address] or track improvements being made there. There is no evidence that BIA spoke to Respondent or his wife prior to the February 2023 notification of allegations.

Deputy Chief Traci Walker testified there are two reasons for the residency rule. First, financially, the City wants the tax and other associated property revenue accruing from residency. Additionally, the City wants the benefit of having officers available to assist the community beyond their shift hours. As to financial benefits, the Superintendent agreed that the City has lost no revenue from Respondent's time in Matteson. As to community support, the testimony is that Respondent did assist his neighbor who trusted him because he is an officer. Additionally, Respondent volunteers as a mentor at IMAN, helping ex-cons in the community.

After reviewing and considering all of the evidence presented in this case, the Board finds that the Superintendent did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence

Police Board Case No. 24 PB 3041  
Police Officer Parrish Sevier  
Findings and Decision

that Respondent ever abandoned his Chicago residence or changed his residence to Matteson. The Board therefore finds Respondent not guilty of violating Rules 1, 2, and 25.

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

### **POLICE BOARD DECISION**

The members of the Police Board who participated in deciding this case hereby certify that they have read and reviewed the record of the proceedings, viewed the video recording of the entire evidentiary hearing, received the oral report of the Hearing Officer, and conferred with the Hearing Officer on the credibility of the witnesses and the evidence. The Police Board hereby adopts the findings set forth herein by the following vote.

The Police Board, by a vote of 8 in favor (Kyle Cooper, Claudia Badillo, Tyler Hall, Kathryn Liss, Arlette Porter, Andreas Safakas, Justin Terry, and Cynthia Velazquez) to 0 opposed, finds Respondent **not guilty** of the charges in Specification No. 1, as set forth above.

**NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Police Officer Parrish Sevier, Star No. 18961, as a result of having been found not guilty of all charges in Police Board Case No. 24 PB 3041, be and hereby is restored to his position as a police officer and to the services of the City of Chicago, with all rights and benefits, effective October 22, 2024 (the date he was suspended upon the filing of charges).

This decision is adopted and entered by a majority of the members of the Police Board: Kyle Cooper, Claudia Badillo, Tyler Hall, Kathryn Liss, Arlette Porter, Andreas Safakas, Justin Terry, and Cynthia Velazquez.

DATED AT CHICAGO, COUNTY OF COOK, STATE OF ILLINOIS, THIS 18<sup>th</sup> DAY OF JUNE 2025.

Police Board Case No. 24 PB 3041  
Police Officer Parrish Sevier  
Findings and Decision

Attested by:

/s/KYLE COOPER  
President

/s/MAX A. CAPRONI  
Executive Director

---

RECEIVED A COPY OF  
THESE FINDINGS AND DECISION  
THIS \_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 2025.

---

LARRY SNELLING  
Superintendent of Police