EXHIBIT G
Request for PAC review

Source document: 7. Request for Review — Fairfield Police Department FPD26-00643.pdf

Description and provenance: The supplied two-page request for review attributed to Kathy Sands.

What this exhibit establishes or supports: Documents the challenge to the October 7 denial and the detention-based statutory argument, including the full qualifying wording of Koker's response.

Context and evidentiary limits: The request itself does not establish receipt by the PAC, a PAC-assigned number, or a ruling. References to attachments within that source are preserved; this consolidated packet contains the seven PDFs listed here.

Requested investigative follow-up: Obtain the submission acknowledgment and any PAC correspondence, maintain the preservation hold, and keep complaint findings distinct from the PAC's disclosure determination.

Original pages: 2
Integrity: The supplied PDF pages follow this cover sheet without substantive editing. Packet pagination is added in the lower margin.

SHA-256 of source PDF:

7b302a0e6c9e0b87e965057ac0e9fd6f259beb497a101a8cd7641c3b0370bb89

PUBLIC COPY - IDENTIFYING DETAILS REDACTED

Public Access Counselor
Office of the Illinois Attorney General
500 S. 2nd Street
Springfield, IL 62701
Email: public.access@ilag.gov

Request for Review

Fairfield Police Department body-camera denial, Case FPD26-00643

I request review of the Fairfield Police Department's October 7, 2026 denial of Request #2 of my FOIA request, seeking body-camera recordings of the September 15, 2026 encounter involving [redacted] at the Wayne County Housing Authority.

The department relied on 5 ILCS 140/7.5(cc), stating that Mr. [redacted] received a notice to appear rather than being arrested, that he was not taken into custody or restrained, and that the footage was not flagged.

The issue is whether the encounter resulted in detention, thereby satisfying the statutory flagging criterion, regardless of whether department personnel entered an administrative flag.

Under 50 ILCS 706/10-20(a)(7)(B)(iv), an encounter is "deemed to be flagged" when "the encounter resulted in a detention or an arrest," subject to the specified traffic-stop exclusion. Detention is a separate qualifying event; a custodial arrest is not required.

The following evidence directly challenges the department's stated basis:

1. Lieutenant Cates expressly told [redacted] "Yes, you are being detained."
2. Detective Koker's incident report states: "Lieutenant Cates remained with [redacted] while I returned to my patrol vehicle to issue the notice to appear citation."
3. Koker explained that Cates was posted "Just to make sure that we could still make contact with you."
4. In the subsequent exchange about detention, Koker stated: "I don't know. I mean, at the moment? Yeah, we were, to give you that citation."

Taken together, these statements support that [redacted] was detained during the encounter while Koker prepared and issued the citation. Issuing a notice to appear instead of making a custodial arrest does not resolve whether detention occurred.

The statute's "deemed to be flagged" language makes the qualifying event—not merely an employee's classification entry—the relevant criterion. I therefore dispute the department's position that the absence of an administrative flag establishes that the recordings are exempt.

PUBLIC COPY - IDENTIFYING DETAILS REDACTED

I ask the PAC to obtain and examine the complete recordings and relevant classification records, determine whether the encounter met the detention-based flagging criterion, and review the withholding under section 10-20(b)(2). The department bears the burden of establishing an asserted FOIA exemption by clear and convincing evidence.

If the department asserts a separate privacy restriction or another exemption, I request review of that specific justification and disclosure of any portions that may lawfully be released. The present denial should not be sustained merely because the department issued a notice to appear or failed to classify the encounter as a detention.

Attachments and scope

Attach:

- Original FOIA request.
- October 7 Denial.
- Complete Denial Response
- Koker's Complete Incident Report.
- Relevant Timestamped Transcript
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5IC5VsFpYhw&t=4s

Kathy Sands

PUBLIC COPY - IDENTIFYING DETAILS REDACTED