Officer Greb:

I hope this finds you well.

We have a few issues with your incident report #160062887 of 1 Nov 2016. We would like to have a few items corrected/embellished, and hope we can work it out with you.

- 1. The narrative leads the reader to believe that I was the <u>initial</u> call to the Department . . . this is not accurate, and both you and dispatch confirmed that <u>it was Mr. Bouchard that initiated a complaint</u>. This ordering needs to be specified:
 - a. Were it not for this FUNDAMENTAL fact, regarding who called the department first, <u>I would not</u> <u>have called at all</u>. It was in behalf of the roofing crew, Lucian in particular, who had been threatened by Bouchard, that I SUBSEQUENTLY called and requested an officer.
 - b. Item 1a was justified (by me) on the basis that the crew, whom had performed with competence and courtesy ALL DAY, were now victims of Bouchard. Not less than three ADDITIONAL crew members confirmed that Bouchard *"yelled and cursed and threatened (them),"* and then indicated to Lucian that he (Bouchard) was *"going to call the cops,"* and that Lucian and his crew were, *"a bunch of fuckin morons!"* Strong language? No . . . language that breaks the law.
 - c. So, not one, not two, not three, BUT FOUR parties all confirmed that it was Bouchard that had escalated a non-incident (blocking of the easement) to a police matter . . . that it was Bouchard that called initially. Escalation was NOT the doing or motivation of Paul Sheridan. (The four parties: You, dispatch, the crew, and Bouchard himself . . . by virtue of the dispatch record.)
- 2. The narrative fails to accurately document what was actually conveyed to you by the roofing crew, specifically Lucian;
 - a. Your wording, *"The roofing personnel did not wish to report any crime"* is misleading and potentially egregious:

i. As you are fully aware, Lucian indicated to you that abusive treatment and language <u>was</u> endured by the crew from Bouchard. I had confirmed (on November 1) and subsequently this fact with Lucian. <u>Your report fails to state this very important fact. I want this corrected.</u>

ii. As you are fully aware, Lucian indicated to you that he would follow my lead; that he would <u>defer</u> to me regarding your questions whether or not criminal charges would be lodged. As you are also fully aware, I was within earshot when that <u>deference</u> was offered by Lucian.

- 3. Your report ends with, "Both Bouchard and Sheridan mentioned dislike of each other . . ."
 - a. I did no such thing. I did however state facts regarding the Bouchard/Officer Fehan incident, and I also stated facts regarding the prior abuse by Bouchard of the good will of City Council (CC). I also offered you a factual letter that had been sent to Dearborn Counsel Debra Walling by attorney Courtney Morgan regarding the Bouchard abuse of CC.
 - b. I cannot address what Bouchard spoke (to you) in the specific sense. However his ongoing slanderous behaviors are relevant to a very serious, currently developing legal matter.

Conclusion: One of our motivations in this note is to not involve any more of your future time. However, to accomplish that, the above items must be corrected. I will check with Records in five business days.

I am not authorized to give you Lucian's direct line, however his employer will forward any calls you make to him (1-866-766-3112). For your information, and in stark contrast to the portent and wording of Item 2 above, Lucian has already offered his testimony; <u>I encourage you to confirm that point with him</u>.

Please feel free to contact me at any time.

Paul V. Sheridan 313-277-5095

