

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

LaDONNA CRUTCHFIELD,
an individual,
Plaintiff,

Case No.
Hon.

V

CITY OF DETROIT
a municipal corporation,

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

MARC THOMPSON,
City of Detroit Police Detective,
Individually, and in his Official
Capacities, and

ANTHONY WILLIAMS,
City of Detroit Police Officer,
Individually, and in his Official
Capacities, and

DORIAN HARDY,
City of Detroit Police Officer,
Individually, and in his Official
Capacities, and

JEREMY MORROW,
City of Detroit Police Officer,
Individually, and in his Official
Capacities, and

JOSHUA HOLDER,
City of Detroit Police Officer,
Individually, and in his Official
Capacities, and

MATTHEW MCKINNEY
City of Detroit Police Officer,
Individually, and in his Official
Capacities, and

JANE DOE,
City of Detroit Police Officer,
Individually, and in her Official
Capacities.

Defendants.

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

NOW COMES Plaintiff, LaDonna Crutchfield, through her attorneys the Law Offices of Ivan L. Land, P.C., and she states the following for her complaint.

INTRODUCTION

1. Individuals trust that law enforcement officials will be honest when performing their duties because if not, society will lose confidence in this most trusted profession.
2. In the past, the Department of Justice has entered into agreements with police departments large and small across the country to remedy some unlawful police practices over the years.
3. In 2003, there was a consent decree entered between the Detroit Police Department and the Department of Justice to remedy some unlawful practices that were discovered after a two-and-a-half-year investigation.

4. Among the unlawful police practices discovered were unlawful arrest.
5. In August of 2014, the Justice Department announced successful compliance with the consent decree and discontinued their oversight of the Detroit Police.
6. Ten years later, the Detroit Police have reverted back to their old ways of unlawful arrest and another consent decree is needed.
7. On January 9, 2020, Detroit Police went to Farmington Hills, Michigan and arrested Robert Williams in his driveway while his wife and young daughters looked on. The arrest was the result of a faulty facial recognition match where the detective in the case **conducted no investigation.**
8. On February 16, 2023, Porcha Woodruff was arrested at her home while eight months pregnant and the arrest was witnessed by her two young daughters. This arrest was also the result of a faulty facial recognition match where the officer-in-charge of the case **conducted no investigation.**
9. These children will forever have images of their parents being unlawfully arrested by the Detroit Police.
10. That is exactly what happened to LaDonna Crutchfield in this present matter. On January 23, 2024, she was arrested by six Detroit Police Officers at her Detroit home of twelve (12) years while her three children and niece

looked on. The officers did not have a warrant for her arrest but lied and told her that they had a warrant for her arrest.

11. Ms. Crutchfield was arrested because the Detroit Police believed that she was a suspect in an attempted murder case where the victim had been shot in the face. No investigation was conducted to determine if Ms. Crutchfield was the suspect, and a facial recognition database was used to identify her. The detective in charge **conducted no investigation.**
12. Ms. Crutchfield was subsequently released but the damage to her and her children had already been done.
13. The Department of Justice must enter into another consent decree with the Detroit Police before an entire city is traumatized.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14. This action is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 to redress the deprivation under color of law of Plaintiff's rights as secured by the United States Constitution.
15. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331, §1343, and §1367.
16. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b), as the events giving rise to the claims asserted in this complaint occurred within this district.

PARTIES

17. Plaintiff, LaDONNA CRUTCHFIELD, (hereinafter “PLAINTIFF”), is a resident of the County of Wayne, State of Michigan.
18. Defendant, City of Detroit (hereinafter “DEFENDANT DETROIT”), is a municipal corporation located in the County of Wayne, State of Michigan.
19. Defendant, Marc Thompson (hereinafter “DEFENDANT THOMPSON”), was at all relevant times a City of Detroit Police Detective and employed by DEFENDANT DETROIT and acting under color of law and within the scope of his employment.
20. Defendant, ANTHONY WILLIAMS (hereinafter “DEFENDANT WILLIAMS”), was at all relevant times a City of Detroit Police Officer and employed by DEFENDANT DETROIT and acting under color of law and within the scope of his employment.
21. Defendant, DORIAN HARDY (hereinafter “DEFENDANT HARDY”), was at all relevant times a City of Detroit Police Officer and employed by DEFENDANT DETROIT and acting under color of law and within the scope of his employment.
22. Defendant, JEREMY MORROW (hereinafter “DEFENDANT MORROW”), was at all relevant times a City of Detroit Police Officer and

employed by DEFENDANT DETROIT and acting under color of law and within the scope of his employment.

23. Defendant, JOSHUA HOLDER (hereinafter “DEFENDANT HOLDER”), was at all relevant times a City of Detroit Police Officer and employed by DEFENDANT DETROIT and acting under color of law and within the scope of his employment.

24. Defendant, MATTHEW McKINNEY (hereinafter “DEFENDANT McKINNEY”), was at all relevant times a City of Detroit Police Officer and employed by DEFENDANT DETROIT and acting under color of law and within the scope of his employment.

25. Defendant, Jane Doe (hereinafter “DEFENDANT DOE”), was at all relevant times a City of Detroit Police Officer and employed by DEFENDANT DETROIT and acting under color of law and within the scope of her employment.

FACTS

26. PLAINTIFF was 36 years of age, single with three children, and she provides for her niece Brial (Brial’s mother died of COVID in 2021).

27. PLAINTIFF is the sole provider for her three children and her niece Brial.

28. PLAINTIFF is forced to work two jobs to make ends meet.

29. PLAINTIFF works her first job from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. weekdays where she is an assistant to individuals with mental health issues and mental delays.
30. PLAINTIFF works her second job from 9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. weekdays where she manages group homes for Detroit Wayne Integrated Health.
31. On January 23, 2024, at 2:08 p.m., PLAINTIFF was lying in her bed reading to her five-year old daughter prior to going to sleep to get some rest to head off to her second job.
32. Suddenly, PLAINTIFF heard a loud knock at her door.
33. Brial approached the door and noticed six Detroit Police Officers.
34. When Brial asked why they were there, she was told by the Officers that they were looking for LaDonna Crutchfield (PLAINTIFF).
35. Brial went and got PLAINTIFF out of bed, and informed her that there were six Detroit Police Officers at her door looking for her.
36. PLAINTIFF opened her front door and was puzzled by so many officers surrounding her home and asking if she was LaDonna Crutchfield (See Exhibit 1, Officer Williams Body Worn Camera).
37. Once PLAINTIFF told the Officers that she was LaDonna Crutchfield, DEFENDANT WILLIAMS demanded that PLAINTIFF step outside of her home.

38. DEFENDANT WILLIAMS would not tell PLAINTIFF why he wanted her to step outside of her home.
39. PLAINTIFF stepped outside of her home wearing no shoes.
40. Once PLAINTIFF stepped outside, DEFENDANT WILLIAMS informed PLAINTIFF that she was going to jail today, and he didn't want to arrest her in front of her children.
41. PLAINTIFF constantly asked the Officers why she was going to jail, but the officers refused to tell PLAINTIFF why she was going to jail.
42. DEFENDANT HARDY finally stated to PLAINTIFF, "So basically, you had to go to court. They summoned you to court and you didn't show up. I don't know if it got lost in the mail or whatever, but it says that you have a warrant for your arrest. All this means is that you have to come to court."
43. This statement made by DEFENDANT HARDY was not true - PLAINTIFF did not have a warrant for her arrest.
44. PLAINTIFF was not aware that DEFENDANT HARDY was not being truthful when stating that PLAINTIFF had a warrant for her arrest and PLAINTIFF constantly told the Officers that she did not receive anything in the mail.

45. DEFENDANT WILLIAMS told PLAINTIFF to ask her family members for shoes without shoestrings - PLAINTIFF directed her family member to get her Crocs.
46. While on the porch, DEFENDANT DOE searched PLAINTIFF.
47. PLAINTIFF was walked down the street in front of all of her neighbors and at one point almost fell while walking and placed in handcuffs.
48. PLAINTIFF was told to place her hands behind her back, and PLAINTIFF asked if she could be handcuffed in the front because she has asthma and being handcuffed behind her back might affect her breathing.
49. DEFENDANT WILLIAMS informed PLAINTIFF that it was against department policy to handcuff her in the front.
50. PLAINTIFF was handcuffed from the back and placed in the back seat of the police vehicle.
51. While in the police vehicle, DEFENDANT WILLIAMS contacted DEFENDANT THOMPSON, stating, "We have her in custody do you want her phone for evidence." PLAINTIFF was then asked by DEFENDANT WILLIAMS to give her phone number.
52. Once in the police vehicle, PLAINTIFF learned that she was being arrested for assault with attempt to murder because DEFENDANT HOLDER typed the charges into the computer located in the police vehicle, and PLAINTIFF

was able to view what DEFENDANT HOLDER had typed in the vehicle's computer.

53. PLAINTIFF was transported to the Detroit Detention Center and escorted in by DEFENDANT HOLDER to the booking area to be booked (See Exhibit 2, Booking Information).
54. PLAINTIFF was then interviewed by Detective DEFENDANT THOMPSON.
55. PLAINTIFF was shown several photos of a black heavy-set woman (See Exhibit 3 and 4, Photos of the Actual Suspect).
56. PLAINTIFF noticed that the photos contained a heavy-set black woman wearing a bonnet, and DEFENDANT THOMPSON asked PLAINTIFF if that was her.
57. PLAINTIFF immediately stated "no" and explained to DEFENDANT THOMPSON that she does not wear bonnets.
58. DEFENDANT THOMPSON jokingly stated to PLAINTIFF that, "you got to admit it - that looks like you, and PLAINTIFF replied, "Why? Because I am fat and black like her?"
59. DEFENDANT THOMPSON went on to explain to PLAINTIFF that there was a shooting, and he believed that she was involved in the shooting according to his investigation (See Exhibit 5, Investigation Report).

60. PLAINTIFF was identified as a suspect by an unknown facial recognition database (See Exhibit 6, Redacted Report).
61. DEFENDANT THOMPSON gave PLAINTIFF the location, date, and time of the alleged crime.
62. DEFENDANT THOMPSON also gave PLAINTIFF other details about the shooting.
63. **PLAINTIFF told DEFENDANT THOMPSON that she was at work on the date and time of the shooting, and she could prove it.**
64. DEFENDANT THOMPSON turned to his partner – Officer Careema Yopp that was present in the room, and told her that, “I don’t believe Ms. Crutchfield (PLAINTIFF) did the shooting.”
65. Officer Yopp also agreed that she did not believe that Ms. Crutchfield (PLAINTIFF) did the shooting.
66. DEFENDANT THOMPSON told PLAINTIFF that he needed to get back to his office to turn some paperwork in, so that PLAINTIFF could be released immediately.
67. DEFENDANT THOMPSON told PLAINTIFF that if she was not released that night, that he would personally come back to the Detroit Detention Center the next day to take PLAINTIFF home.

68. PLAINTIFF needed to be released as soon as possible because she would have lost her second job if she missed work.
69. PLAINTIFF was told by another female officer that she could be released if she agreed to have her fingerprints taken, and agreed to have a DNA swab performed.
70. PLAINTIFF was forced to get fingerprinted and give her DNA, **although PLAINTIFF was not involved in the alleged crime.**
71. PLAINTIFF was released from lock-up at approximately 8:05 p.m. and was provided a ride home by her mother - where her terrified children and her niece Brieal were there waiting.
72. PLAINTIFF explained to her children that she was fine and that it was a case of mistaken identity.
73. PLAINTIFF's children were still in shock when they learned that their mother (PLAINTIFF) was leaving them again as she had to go to her second job.
74. PLAINTIFF drove to work, and she could not stop crying thinking about her children witnessing her being arrested.
75. PLAINTIFF was also terrified because she had been informed by an unknown officer at the Detroit Detention Center that she could possibly be arrested again for this matter.

76. PLAINTIFF's crying continued while at work and she was of no assistance to the mentally challenged adults that she cared for at her second job.
77. The following day, PLAINTIFF went back to the station and demanded documentation that she was clear.
78. DEFENDANT THOMPSON apologized and explained to PLAINTIFF that his sergeant informed him that PLAINTIFF should have never been arrested. PLAINTIFF was provided a letter that stated, "I am now able to declare Ms. Crutchfield is not the subject involved in this criminal investigation" (See Exhibit 7, Letter from Detective Marc Thompson).

COUNT I
FALSE ARREST AND IMPRISONMENT IN VIOLATION OF THE
FOURTH AMENDMENT AND 42 U.S.C. § 1983
(DEFENDANTS)

79. PLAINTIFF incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.
80. The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees the right of the people "to be secure in their persons ... against unreasonable... seizures" and demands that "no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation."
81. PLAINTIFF was falsely arrested and imprisoned without probable cause.

COUNT II
ASSAULT AND BATTERY
(DEFENDANTS)

82. PLAINTIFF incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.
83. DEFENDANT OFFICERS, acting individually and/or in concert, intentionally and unlawfully threatened PLAINTIFF with imminent harm by forcibly detaining her without justification.
84. DEFENDANT OFFICERS' actions included physically restraining PLAINTIFF, placing her in handcuffs, and ignoring her requests for accommodations despite her medical condition, causing unnecessary physical pain and emotional distress.
85. DEFENDANT OFFICERS had the apparent ability to carry out their threats and acted in a manner that created a reasonable fear of bodily harm to PLAINTIFF.
86. DEFENDANT OFFICERS willfully and intentionally touched PLAINTIFF in a harmful and offensive manner by handcuffing and transporting PLAINTIFF to jail against her will.
87. The actions of DEFENDANT OFFICERS were neither lawful nor privileged.

88. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANT OFFICERS' actions, PLAINTIFF suffered physical pain, emotional distress, humiliation, and other damages.

COUNT III
FALSE LIGHT
(DEFENDANTS)

89. PLAINTIFF incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.

90. DEFENDANT OFFICERS made disclosures to the general public or to a large number of people through their actions, including the public and visible arrest of PLAINTIFF in front of her home, being viewed by neighbors, and family members.

91. These disclosures were highly objectionable to a reasonable person, as they attributed to PLAINTIFF's characteristics, conduct, or beliefs that were false and placed PLAINTIFF in a false light, suggesting she was a violent criminal.

92. DEFENDANT OFFICERS had knowledge of the falsity of the disclosed information or acted in reckless disregard as to the truth of the disclosed information and the false light in which PLAINTIFF would be placed.

93. In the manner described more fully above, DEFENDANT OFFICERS engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct by arresting PLAINTIFF

without probable cause, falsely accusing her of assault with attempt to murder, and misrepresenting the existence of an arrest warrant.

94. DEFENDANT OFFICERS continued the criminal process against PLAINTIFF, despite knowing or having sufficient information to determine that PLAINTIFF was innocent.
95. DEFENDANT OFFICERS knew or should have known that their conduct would cause severe emotional distress to PLAINTIFF, especially in light of the public nature of the arrest and the presence of her children and neighbors.
96. The misconduct described in this Count was undertaken with malice, willfulness, and reckless indifference to the rights of PLAINTIFF.
97. As a proximate result of this misconduct, PLAINTIFF suffered injuries, including but not limited to severe emotional distress, reputational harm, and humiliation.

COUNT IV
MONELL CLAIM 42 U.S.C. §1983
MUNICIPAL/SUPERVISORY LIABILITY
(DEFENDANT DETROIT)

98. PLAINTIFF incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.
99. DEFENDANT DETROIT acted recklessly and/or with deliberate indifference when it practiced and/or permitted customs, policies, and/or practices that resulted in violations to PLAINTIFF.

100. These customs, policies, and/or practices included but were not limited to the following:

- a. Failing to supervise officers to prevent violations of citizens' constitutional rights;
- b. Failing to adequately train and/or supervise officers regarding proper use of force;
- c. Failing to adequately train and/or supervise officers regarding legal search and/or seizures;
- d. Failing to control and/or discipline officers known to harass, intimidate, and/or abuse citizens;
- e. Failing to supervise, review, and/or discipline officers whom DEFENDANT DETROIT knew or should have known were violating or were prone to violate citizens' constitutional rights, thereby permitting and/or encouraging its police officers to engage in such conduct;
- f. Failing to require compliance of its officers and/or employees with established policies and/or procedures and/or rules and discipline or reprimand officers who violate these established policies;

101. PLAINTIFF's injuries in this case were proximately caused by policies and practices of DEFENDANT DETROIT, which, by its deliberate indifference,

allows its police officers to violate the Constitutional rights of citizens without fear or any meaningful investigation or punishment. In this way, DEFENDANT DETROIT violated PLAINTIFF's rights since it created the opportunity for the individually named DEFENDANT OFFICERS to commit the foregoing Constitutional violations.

102. The misconduct described in the preceding paragraphs has become a widespread practice, and so well settled as to constitute de facto policy in the DEFENDANT DETROIT's police department. This policy was able to exist and thrive because government policymakers have exhibited deliberate indifference to the problem, thereby ratifying it.
103. The widespread practices described in preceding paragraphs were allowed to flourish because DEFENDANT DETROIT has declined to implement sufficient hiring, training, and/or legitimate and/or effective mechanisms for oversight and/or punishment of police officers' misconduct.
104. The policies and practices of DEFENDANT DETROIT directly and proximately led to the injuries PLAINTIFF suffered at the hands of DEFENDANT OFFICERS.
105. As a direct and proximate result of said Constitutional violations, PLAINTIFF suffered loss of freedom, mental anguish, pain and suffering, loss of enjoyment

of life, humiliation, degradation and emotional injuries, all past, present, and future.

COUNT V
ELLIOT LARSEN
VIOLATION OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION
OF PUBLIC SERVICE AT MCL 37.2301
(DEFENDANT DETROIT and DETECTIVE THOMPSON)

106. PLAINTIFF incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.
107. PLAINTIFF was denied “full and equal enjoyment of . . . public service because of . . . race . . .” MCL 37.2302.
108. DEFENDANT DETROIT’s Police Department is a place of public accommodation, a public service, and law enforcement agency as defined in Michigan’s Elliot-Larsen Civil Rights Act (the Act), MCL 37.2301.
109. DETECTIVE THOMPSON is a person, as that term is defined in the Act, and is an agent of DEFENDANT DETROIT.
110. DEFENDANT DETROIT allowed DETECTIVE THOMPSON and others to engage in a pattern of racial discrimination of PLAINTIFF and other Black citizens by using facial recognition technology practices proven to misidentify Black citizens at a higher rate than others in violation of the equal protection guaranteed by Elliott-Larsen Act.
111. DEFENDANT DETROIT violated the Act and deprived PLAINTIFF of her civil rights by subjecting PLAINTIFF, because of her race, arresting

PLAINTIFF and other inconvenient acts which had the purpose and effect of denying her the full benefit of public safety of the police department and denying PLAINTIFF full and equal access to the use and privileges of public accommodations, public service, and police protection.

112. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFF has suffered injuries and damages, including but not limited to:
- a. Past and future pain and suffering, embarrassment, humiliation, mortification;
 - b. Economic Damages;
 - c. Past and future emotional distress; and
 - d. Deprivation of equal protection and due process of law.

COUNT VI
FAILURE TO INTERVENE
(DEFENDANTS)

113. PLAINTIFF incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.
114. DEFENDANT OFFICERS were aware that PLAINTIFF was being falsely arrested and imprisoned as they had no warrant for PLAINTIFF's arrest.
115. DEFENDANT OFFICERS had a reasonable opportunity to intervene.
116. DEFENDANT OFFICERS chose not to intervene and allowed PLAINTIFF'S constitutional rights to be violated.

COUNT VII
INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS
(DEFENDANTS)

117. PLAINTIFF incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.
118. In the manner described more fully above, DEFENDANT OFFICERS engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct.
119. DEFENDANT OFFICERS knew that they didn't have an arrest warrant for PLAINTIFF's arrest, or probable cause to arrest PLAINTIFF.
120. DEFENDANT OFFICERS knew that there was a high probability that their conduct would cause severe emotional distress to PLAINTIFF.
121. The misconduct described in this count was undertaken with malice, willfulness, and reckless indifference to the rights of PLAINTIFF.
122. As a proximate cause of this misconduct, PLAINTIFF suffered injuries including but not limited to severe emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for:

- a. Compensatory non-economic and economic damages that may be proven at trial to compensate PLAINTIFF;
- b. Exemplary/Punitive damages as may be proven at trial;
- c. Reasonable attorney fees, costs, and interest pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1988; and,

d. Such other and further relief as appears reasonable and just under the circumstances.

Dated: February 21, 2025

/s/Ivan L. Land
Ivan L. Land (P65879)
Law Offices of Ivan L. Land, P.C.
25900 Greenfield Rd., Suite 210
Oak Park, MI 48237-1267
248.968.4545 / (f) 248.968.4540
ill4law@aol.com
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

LaDONNA CRUTCHFIELD,
an individual,
Plaintiff,

Case No.
Hon.

V

CITY OF DETROIT
a municipal corporation,

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

MARC THOMPSON,
City of Detroit Police Detective,
Individually, and in his Official
Capacities, and

ANTHONY WILLIAMS,
City of Detroit Police Officer,
Individually, and in his Official
Capacities, and

DORIAN HARDY,
City of Detroit Police Officer,
Individually, and in his Official
Capacities, and

JEREMY MORROW,
City of Detroit Police Officer,
Individually, and in his Official
Capacities, and

JOSHUA HOLDER,
City of Detroit Police Officer,
Individually, and in his Official
Capacities, and

MATTHEW MCKINNEY
City of Detroit Police Officer,
Individually, and in his Official
Capacities, and

JANE DOE,
City of Detroit Police Officer,
Individually, and in her Official
Capacities.

Defendants.

LaDONNA CRUTCHFIELD’S INDEX OF EXHIBITS

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
1	Officer Williams’ Body Worn Camera
2	Booking Information
3	Photo of Suspect
4	Photo of Suspect
5	Investigation Report
6	Redacted Report
7	Clearance Letter

EXHIBIT

1

Officer Williams' Body Worn Camera

Detroit Police Department

Mugshot Report

1301 3rd Ave
Detroit, MI 48226
Tel: 313-596-1800 Fax: 313-596-1450

F.S.

CB Number: 121430|150793
Arrest Date: 01-23-2024 :
Report Printed: 01-23-2024 15:25



Name: CRUTCHFIELD, LADONNA

Address: [REDACTED]
DETROIT, MI 48228

S.S.N.: [REDACTED]

D.O.B.: [REDACTED]

Age at Photo: 36

DPD Number: 5319159

CB Number: 121430|150793

Booking Date: 01-23-2024

Release Date:

Hair Color: Black

Eye Color: Brown

Height: 507

Weight: 265

Complexion: Skin Tone Code

Build:

Race: Black

Gender: Female

TCN: DS24221377X







Incident Report Suspect List

Detroit Police Department

OCA: 231228-0005

1	Name (Last, First, Middle) <i>* No name *</i>						Also Known As				Home Address	
	Business Address											
	DOB	Age	Race	Sex	Eth	Hgt	Wgt	Hair	Eye	Skin	Driver's License / State.	
			<i>B</i>	<i>F</i>								
Scars, Marks, Tattoos, or other distinguishing features												

<i>Reported Suspect Detail</i>		Suspect Age		Race	Sex	Eth	Height	Weight	SSN		
				<i>B</i>	<i>F</i>		<i>600</i>	<i>300</i>			
Weapon, Type	Feature	Make	Model		Color	Caliber	Dir of Travel				
							Mode of Travel				
VehYr/Make/Model		Drs	Style		Color	Lic/St		VIN			

Notes

Physical Char

the suspect ("Chew") at the scene with a gray and black handgun in the lobby of the location. She then stated that she observed the suspect fidgeting with the handgun as well. She then left the lobby and went to her apartment, in which she then stated that is when she heard the sound of a gunshot. Suspect description was a "bun hat", lashes, black jacket, purple shirt, "slide ons", approximately 6`0", approximately 300 lbs, along with last seen driving a possible brown camry with an unknown plate number. The witness also stated that their was a child with the suspect. [12/28/2023 10:52, DEWHARTHIGGINS ██████████ 33272, DPD]

SUSPECT IDENTIFIED AS CRUTCHFIELD, LADONNA ANN B/F. NFI [12/29/2023 21:34, MORGANA ██████████, 4733, DPD]

2	Name (Last, First, Middle) CRUTCHFIELD, LADONNA						Also Known As				Home Address ██████████ DETROIT, MI 48228 ██████████	
	Business Address											
	DOB	Age	Race	Sex	Eth	Hgt	Wgt	Hair	Eye	Skin	Driver's License / State.	
		<i>36</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>F</i>		<i>507</i>	<i>265</i>	<i>BLK</i>	<i>BRO</i>	<i>MED</i>	██████████	
Scars, Marks, Tattoos, or other distinguishing features												

<i>Reported Suspect Detail</i>		Suspect Age		Race	Sex	Eth	Height	Weight	SSN		
Weapon, Type	Feature	Make	Model		Color	Caliber	Dir of Travel				
							Mode of Travel				
VehYr/Make/Model		Drs	Style		Color	Lic/St		VIN			

Notes

Physical Char

CASE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

Printed: 01/29/2024 07:21

Detroit Police Department

OCA: **2312280005**

THE INFORMATION BELOW IS CONFIDENTIAL - FOR USE BY AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL ONLY

Case Status: *ACTIVE*

Case Mng Status: *ACTIVE*

Occurred: 12/27/2023

Offense: *NON-FATAL SHOOTING*

Investigator: *JONES, JA`MOND K*

Date / Time: 12/29/2023 17:08:07, Friday

Supervisor: *MIFSUD, PATRICK*

Supervisor Review Date / Time: 12/29/2023 19:08:21, Friday

Contact:

Reference: *Assisting Officer`s Report*

[12/29/2023 17:08 JONES, [REDACTED]

On December 29, 2023 4:00 pm, I, conducted a database search [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Ms. Crutchfield matched the suspected I observed through greenlight with the shooting weapon. I then turned over my findings to detective Thompson.

Investigator Signature

Supervisor Signature



January 24, 2024

Detective Marc Thompson # D-1885
Detroit Police Department
Ninth Precinct
11187 Gratiot, Detroit, MI, 48214

This correspondence is to account for the whereabouts of Ms. LaDonna Crutchfield on case #2312280005. Ms. Crutchfield presence was required as she was a person of interest in this investigation. This matter for which Ms. Crutchfield was required to appear for an interview held at the Detroit Detention Center. However, I am now able to declare Ms. Crutchfield is not the subject involved in this criminal investigation.

Respectfully,

Marc Thompson

Marc Thompson # D-1885
Detective, Detroit Police Department
Cell: 313-407-6479
Direct: 313-596-5958
Thompsonm039@detroitmi.gov