



## U. S. Department of Justice

United States Attorney  
Northern District of Illinois

Patrick J. Fitzgerald  
United States Attorney

Federal Building  
219 South Dearborn Street, Fifth Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 353-5300

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
WEDNESDAY SEPTEMBER 26, 2007  
[www.usdoj.gov/usao/iln](http://www.usdoj.gov/usao/iln)

PRESS CONTACTS:  
AUSA Brian Netols (312)353-4128  
AUSA John Blakey (312)353-5320  
Randall Samborn (312)353-5318

### **SUSPENDED CHICAGO POLICE OFFICER ARRESTED ON FEDERAL CHARGE OF PLANNING MURDER-FOR-HIRE OF FELLOW OFFICER**

CHICAGO – A suspended Chicago Police officer assigned to the elite Special Operations Section (SOS) was arrested today on federal charges for allegedly planning the murder-for-hire of a former fellow police officer. The defendant, **Jerome Finnigan**, was charged in a criminal complaint with using a telephone with intent to commit murder-for-hire of a former Chicago Police officer who is a potential witness against him in an ongoing federal investigation as well as a pending state criminal prosecution.

Finnigan, 44, who was suspended from duty in 2006, was arrested early this morning outside his home on the city's Southwest Side by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. FBI and Internal Revenue Service agents then began executing a search warrant at his home. Finnigan was scheduled to appear at 2 p.m. today before U.S. Magistrate Judge Jeffrey Cole in U.S. District Court. The charges were announced by Patrick J. Fitzgerald, United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois; Richard A. Devine, Cook County State's Attorney; Robert D. Grant, Special Agent-in-Charge of the Chicago Office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and Alvin Patton, Special Agent-in-Charge of the IRS Criminal Investigation Division.

“The complaint charges that in the face of serious pending state charges and a federal investigation that could result in additional charges, the defendant solicited the murder of a fellow police officer who he believed would be a witness against him. The gravity of this conduct speaks for itself,” Mr. Fitzgerald said

According to the FBI’s detailed complaint affidavit, Finnigan first discussed the subject of commissioning the murder of his former fellow officer, identified as CW-1, in July 2007 with another police officer, identified as CW-2, who subsequently began cooperating with law enforcement unbeknownst to Finnigan. Finnigan and CW-2 discussed hiring street gang members who would kill CW-1 for \$5,000, using the term “paint job” as a code to refer to the murder. Finnigan asked CW-2 for money to pay for the murder of CW-1, the complaint alleges.

On September 18, while CW-2 was with federal agents, Finnigan and CW-2 had a telephone conversation to arrange a meeting that evening at Finnigan’s house. Finnigan allegedly told CW-2 that he was looking for a different hitman who would be more professional and less risky than the gang members he had originally intended to hire to kill CW-1. At the same time, Finnigan allegedly encouraged CW-2 to find someone to kill CW-1.

On September 21, with CW-2 again accompanied by agents, Finnigan and CW-2 had a phone conversation to arrange a meeting that evening in Finnigan’s car in a parking lot near Harlem and Archer avenues in Chicago. During a recorded conversation, CW-2 told Finnigan that he had found someone to kill CW-1 and needed a photograph of CW-1 that Finnigan had previously told CW-2 he had. Finnigan allegedly handed the photo of CW-1 – cut from a larger group photo of other members of their SOS team – to CW-2 wrapped in a page of a map that Finnigan had ripped out of a map book in his car. Finnigan expressed concern that CW-2 wipe fingerprints off the photograph

of CW-1 and handle it carefully to avoid leaving additional prints, the complaint alleges. Finnigan also agreed to retrieve CW-1's current address from his home the next day and provide it to CW-2 so CW-2 could give it, along with a description of CW-1's car, to the person who would be paid to kill CW-1. Finnigan later agreed to pay half of the fee for the hitman that he believed CW-2 was going to hire to kill CW-1, according to the affidavit.

After this meeting ended and CW-2 was driving away, CW-2 and Finnigan talked again by phone and Finnigan agreed that CW-2 could come to his house immediately, rather than the next day, to obtain CW-1's address. The exchange did not occur then, however, as a result of Finnigan's concern that federal agents were surveilling his residence and he warned CW-2 to hide the photo of CW-1, the complaint states.

On September 23, Finnigan allegedly called CW-2 from outside CW-2's residence and then went inside to speak to him. Finnigan asked CW-2 to return the photo of CW-1, and CW-2 falsely told Finnigan that he had burned the photo, when, in fact, he had provided it to federal agents after his meeting with Finnigan on September 21. Finnigan allegedly dismissed his concern about being surveilled by federal agents and asked CW-2 for a piece of paper on which he wrote the initials of CW-1 and CW-3, another fellow officer whom Finnigan speculated might be cooperating with law enforcement, according to the complaint. Finnigan allegedly discussed getting both CW-1 and CW-3 "taken care of," and also wrote the initials of two other officers whom Finnigan correctly believed were also cooperating, CW-4 and CW-5. CW-2 asked Finnigan what he meant and Finnigan allegedly told CW-2 that they might as well take care of all the witnesses against them.

The government is being represented in this joint investigation and prosecution by Assistant U.S. Attorneys John Blakey and Brian Netols and Assistant Cook County State's Attorney's David Navarro and Lynn McCarthy.

If convicted, using a telephone to commit murder-for-hire, where no death or injury occurs, carries a maximum penalty of 10 years in prison and a \$250,000 fine. The Court, however, would determine the appropriate sentence to be imposed under the advisory United States Sentencing Guidelines.

The public is reminded that a complaint contains only charges and is not evidence of guilt. The defendant is presumed innocent and is entitled to a fair trial at which the government has the burden of proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

###