September 16, 2026

Daniel K. Strang
c/o Elder Granger
Granger Law Group
1 Court Place Suite 100
Rockford, IL 61101
Via Hearing Portal Delivery

NOTICE OF FINAL DECISION OF THE BOARD

Case #2025-D-3 (ILETSB v. Strang)

On September 10, 2026, the Illinois Law Enforcement Training & Standards Board reviewed Case #2025-D-3 at their regularly scheduled meeting. At that meeting, the Board voted unanimously to adopt the attached recommendation of the Panel to DECERTIFY Daniel K. Strang (PTB ID # 65094286).

Regards,

[redacted]

Keith Calloway
Executive Director

CC: Rockford Metro Centre Police Dept
Certification Review Panel

STATE OF ILLINOIS
BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING STANDARDS BOARD

Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board Complainant,	)	
v.	)	Case No. 25-D-000003
Daniel K. Strang Respondent.	)	

SUMMARY REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE ILLINOIS LAW ENFORCEMENT CERTIFICATION REVIEW PANEL'S AUGUST 27, 2026, MEETING

I. INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This matter came before the Illinois Law Enforcement Certification Review Panel ("Panel") pursuant to Section 6.3 of the Illinois Police Training Act (50 ILCS 705/6.3). On August 26, 2025, the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board ("Board") filed a Formal Complaint against Daniel K. Strang for discretionary decertification.

II. HEARING OFFICER'S FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION

The Administrative Law Judge's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommended Disposition are incorporated herein and attached. The judge concluded as follows: "Based upon the above Finding of Facts and Conclusions of Law, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge recommends to the Illinois Law Enforcement Certification Review Panel that Respondent Daniel K. Strang (#65094286) be DECERTIFIED as an Illinois Law Enforcement Officer."

III. RECOMMENDATION & ORDER OF THE PANEL

The Panel reviewed the above-mentioned case on August 27, 2026, at their regularly scheduled meeting, including duly reviewing and discussing the administrative law judge's decision and evidence testified to and submitted at the administrative hearing, and finds that the testimony and evidence presented at the administrative hearing prove by clear and convincing evidence the allegations against Daniel K. Strang. Therefore, the Panel recommends that the Board DECERTIFY Respondent Daniel K. Strang.

[redacted]
Katie Hill
Certification Review Panel Chair

STATE OF ILLINOIS
CMS BUREAU OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
FOR
ILLINOIS LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING AND STANDARDS BOARD

Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board Complainant, v. Daniel K. Strang Respondent.	))))))))	 Case No. 25-D-000003

FINDING OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND RECOMMENDED DECISION

THIS MATTER comes for issuance of Finding of Facts, Conclusions of Law and Recommended Decision regarding the Complaint issued by Complainant, the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board ("ILETSB") against Respondent seeking the decertification of Respondent as a Law Enforcement Official pursuant to 50 ILCS 705/6.3.

For the reasons discussed below, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge recommends to the Board's Certification Review Panel that the prayer of the Complaint be allowed and that Respondent be DECERTIFIED as an Illinois Law Enforcement Officer.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On August 26, 2025, Complainant, ILETSB, filed a Complaint for Decertification against Respondent, Daniel K. Strang. Respondent was served with this Complaint on October 7, 2025. Attorney Elder Granger II entered his appearance on Respondent's behalf on March 18, 2026. This cause was referred to the Illinois Bureau of Administrative Hearings and was assigned to Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Jaimee L. Ward.

On August 26, 2025, Complainant filed a Complaint for Decertification alleging that Respondent violated the Illinois Police Training and Standards Act (50 ILCS 705/6.3) in that he committed perjury by making a false statement, under oath or affirmation, on the Illinois Retired

Officer Concealed Carry (IROCC) application and that he engaged in deceptive behavior by doing the same. The Complainant alleges that Respondent provided false information as to the total number of years he served as a law enforcement officer.

After Prehearing Conferences on March 18, 2026, and April 22, 2026, the Hearing commenced on June 10, 2026, in person, at the ILETSB facility at 2020 West Roosevelt Road, Chicago, Illinois. Complainant was present by its counsel, Patrick Hahn and Jae Kwon. Respondent was present personally and with his counsel, Elder Granger II. The Hearing concluded that same day.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

At the administrative hearing, both parties had an opportunity to call and examine witnesses, and introduce documentary evidence, and present arguments. A record of the hearing was made by court reporter, which is in the custody of the Bureau of Administrative Hearings. An audio recording was also captured, the original of which is in the custody of ILETSB.

Exhibits

The following exhibits were admitted into evidence on behalf of the Complainant:

A. Notice of Appointment dated June 6, 1995, appointing Daniel K. Strang into position of Sergeant and indicating the date of appointment of November 29, 1993, to Rockford Metro Centre Police Department (redacted).
B. Notice of Appointment dated October 17, 1994, appointing Daniel Kelvin Strang into position of Patrolman and indicating the date of appointment of September 1, 1994, Rockford Metro Centre Police Department (redacted).
C. Illinois Retired Officer Concealed Carry Application of Daniel K. Strang dated August 6, 2022 (redacted).
D. Certificate of Authenticity dated May 26, 2026, by Porcia Sledge, Executive II, FOIA Officer & Records Retention Manager for the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board for Exhibits E, F, G, and H.
E. Group Exhibit
    1. Rosters of Law Enforcement Personnel for Rockford Metro Centre Police Department date January 30, 1990, through September 3, 2009.
    2. Letter from ILETSB to Chief Steven Randel of Rockford Metro Centre Police Department dated March 7, 1996, granting waiver for Officer Daniel K. Strang.
    3. Letter from ILETSB to Chief Steven Randel of Rockford Metro Centre Police Department dated February 6, 1996, acknowledging receipt of application for waiver for Officer Daniel K. Strang.
    4. Part Time Waiver checklist dated December 29, 1995.
    5. Waiver Request for Part-Time Officer Daniel K. Strang dated November 27, 1995.
    6. Notice of Appointment/Separation dated October 31, 1996, for Daniel K. Strang, signed by Chief Kenneth Long, indicating the reason for separation as Resigned

and the last date of employment listed as September 12, 1996.

F. Employment History screen printout from ILETSB website for Daniel K. Strang.
G. ILETSB Training History Report for Daniel K. Strang.
H. Notice of Appointment/Separation dated October 31, 1996, for Daniel K. Strang, signed by Chief Kenneth Long, indicating the reason for separation as Resigned and the last date of employment listed as September 12, 1996[1].

The following exhibits were admitted on behalf of the Respondent:

The Respondent did not admit any exhibits.

The following exhibits were not offered on behalf of the Complainant:

I. Affidavit of Kim Overby dated May 21, 2026.
J. Separation Agreement from Rockford Park District Police Department.

Witnesses

The Complainant called the following witnesses:

1. Kim Overby, Assistant Program Director at the Executive Institute;
2. **Daniel Strang, the Respondent;
3. **Jan Noble, Investigator for ILETSB;
4. **Kenneth Long, former Chief of Rockford Metro Centre Police Department;

** Witness was disclosed by both parties and questioned directly by both parties.

The Respondent called the following witnesses:

1. David Hooks, former Detective and Sergeant for Rockford Police Department;
2. William "Randy" Smith, former Chief of Rockford Metro Centre Police Department.

Relevant Witness Testimony Summarized

Complainant's Case in Chief

Kim Overby:

After being sworn, Ms. Overby testified that she is the Assistant Program Director for the Executive Institute. She testified that her duties include helping to manage the Illinois Retired

[1] The Notice of Appointment/Separation was included as both the last page of Complainant's Group Exhibit E and as Complainant's Exhibit H.

Officer Concealed Carry (IROCC) program, overseeing the K-9 certification program and Illinois Department of Corrections ("IDOC"), and training for the state agencies. She testified that the IROCC program came about due to federal law that gave retired officers the ability to become certified and to carry a concealed weapon. She testified that the minimum employment requirement for the federal law is ten years.

Ms. Overby testified that to receive the IROCC, one must fill out an application, answer questions, affirm those answers, and have the department from which they retired fill out a form affirming the time of employment with the department. She testified that the application asks directly if the applicant has been employed for at least ten years and that the applicant answers the question under penalty of perjury.

Ms. Overby testified that she has been employed in her position since 2024, and since that time the IROCC program has relied on the honesty of the applicants in issuing the IROCC cards. She testified that "jail guards" and private security guards do not qualify for the IROCC program.

On cross-examination, Ms. Overby testified that she did not work at IROCC in 2022 and does not know what procedures were in place in 2022. She also testified that there are other ways for retired officers to obtain concealed carry permits; one way requires an annual process and another way is for the officer to go through their department.

Daniel Strang:

After being sworn, the Respondent testified that he is currently a part-time peace officer for Metro Centre Police Department[2] and a juvenile booking officer at the Winnebago County Juvenile Assessment Center ("JAC"). He testified that both positions are part-time, that all the positions including the position of Chief at the Metro Centre are part-time. He testified that he has been with the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department since 2023.

The Respondent testified that the Rockford Metro Centre is a 7,500-seat venue that typically hosts sporting events, such as the American Hockey League (AHL), a division of the Chicago Blackhawks. The venue also has concerts, community events, high school graduations, and is also available for private rental. He testified that this Center is also called "BMO", due to the naming rights held by the Bank of Montreal.

[2] The testimony and documents alternately refer to the Rockford Metrocentre Police Department, Rockford Metro Centre Police Department, Metro Centre Police Department, and Metro but are referencing the same police department.

The Respondent testified that the jurisdiction of the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department (hereinafter "Metro") is the BMO. He testified that Metro currently has 10 part-time police officers, after the Chief stepped down at the end of April. He testified that Metro has no full-time officers. He testified that officers at Metro "do not act as traditional law enforcement officers", "performing such duties as running radar or patrol" and that "the patrol car is used for traffic direction." He testified that officers at Metro are more community oriented and focused. He testified that there has not been an arrest there in a decade or more and that officers are not there as enforcement per se. He testified that officers are the protectors and guardians of the community.

The Respondent testified that BMO does sell alcohol and at times they had to deal with disorderly conduct, but that Metro officers' primary function was crowd control. He testified that officers rarely had to escort anyone out of the building and that a verbal warning usually solved the problem. He testified to having made an arrest while employed to Metro years ago, and that he has testified in a criminal matter before as a police officer.

When asked about his work schedule, the Respondent testified that each month a schedule is sent out to the officers and they respond as to their availability, on a volunteer basis. He testified that BMO also has its own security, referred to as "event staff" but that he has never worked at BMO as event staff. He would later testify to having worked as a security guard at BMO in 1992. He testified that it was common for Metro officers to have part-time security jobs, and that there was quite a bit of overlap between the duties performed by Metro officers and that of security officers. He testified that he worked at Allied[3] as an unarmed uniformed contract security officer for Central Management Services ("CMS") for the State of Illinois for 12 years at state buildings. He testified that his duties included screening all visitors to the building, issuing visitor passes, and maintaining order. He also testified that he worked at Stewart & Associates, a private security company, as an unarmed uniformed security guard.

The Respondent testified that he has been with Metro since January 25, 2023, and that he also works for Metro Enforcement, a local security company, where he is stationed at the JAC in Winnebago County 32 hours per week as an armed uniformed security officer. He testified that he is a booking officer at the JAC where his duties include securing the newly arrived juvenile to a bench, photographing and fingerprinting them, providing bathroom breaks, and providing them with water to drink. He testified that he was "essentially a babysitter". He testified that the booking process takes 25 to 30 minutes to complete.

---

[3] Allied refers to Allied Universal, previously known as Allied Protection Services, and as A&R Security prior to that.

The Respondent testified that all the security jobs he has worked have uniforms with insignia on the sleeve and a constantly visible ID on a lanyard. He testified that both the police officer uniform and the security guard uniform are similar and that if someone did not take a close look they would be confused as both uniforms have stars on them.

When shown Exhibit B, the Respondent identified it as an appointment form sent to the board (ILETSB) indicating that his hire date was September 1, 1994, which he testified was correct. He testified that he was 24 years old at the time of hire. He testified that it was not a requirement to go to the part-time law enforcement academy in 1994, but that it was in 1995. [4] He testified to having received department agency training and firearms training through Mobile Training Unit No. 2 ("MTU2"), District 16 State Police Headquarters in October of 1994. He testified that the firearms course was 40 hours long, or one week.

The Respondent testified that he was promoted to Sergeant in 1995 at Metro, as referenced by Exhibit A, which is a handwritten appointment form. He testified that the appointment date of November 29, 1993, is shown on Exhibit A. Respondent could not explain why that date was used. He further testified that he did not fill out the form, he merely signed it. He testified that at that time he was also working at the Rockford Park District Police Department, at which he had been hired in 1995. He testified that he left the Rockford Park District Police Department after a few years, but said the records showed otherwise. He testified that the separation form from the Rockford Park District Police Department listed his reason for separation as "Other", but that he "was not sure what that even meant" and that the time did not match with the dates he was there.

The Respondent testified that when he was promoted to Sergeant at Metro, he was working full-time hours. He testified that BMO was effectively shut down for the summer that year and that was when he worked for the park district because he had time available.

The Respondent testified that he separated from Metro the first time in October of 2004, and that between October 2004 until 2023 he did not work for Metro. He testified that around 2022 he decided to apply for the Illinois Retired Officer Concealed Carry permit, which he learned about from David Hooks. He testified to being familiar with the permit requirements, specifically the requirement of ten years of law enforcement employment.

---

[4] 20 Ill.Admin.Code1770.212(a) states: "Each participating law enforcement agency shall specifically inform each part-time officer appointed after January 1, 1996 that, as a condition of permanent employment, the officer must successfully complete the Minimum Standards Basic Law Enforcement Training Course within the first 18 months after employment, and must complete a POWER test and be registered for the course within the first 6 months of employment."

The Respondent was shown Exhibit C, which he identified as the IROCC application. He testified that David Hooks filled out the upper portion which the Respondent then signed, Respondent's chief signed it, then the Respondent mailed it. He testified that on page 2 of the application, where the application asks to confirm the applicant having been employed as a law enforcement officer for ten or more years aggregate, he believed that it was his chief that checked that box. He testified to having read the application before signing it but testified that David Hooks filled out the application. When asked whether he provided the information to David Hooks to fill in the application, the Respondent denied providing the information. When asked about his employment history on the first page of the application, the Respondent testified that he had worked for Metro from 1994 to 2004 as shown on the application. He testified that he included the Winnebago County Sheriff Reserve Deputy position because he applied for the position, was contacted by Human Resources, and had "a 99.98 percent certitude" that he was hired but in fact was not hired.

When he was shown Exhibit H, the Respondent testified that he did not recognize the document and had only seen it for the first time a few days prior the administrative hearing. When asked if he was familiar with Ken Long, he testified that Ken Long was the chief for about two years at Metro. He testified that he had never seen Ken Long's signature and had no knowledge that Chief Long submitted a separation form for him in 1996.

The Respondent testified that the MTU2 is where he took his 40-hour training class and that Metro is a paid member of MTU2. He testified that officers were paid to complete training at the MTU2, as the training was mandatory. He testified that he returned to the MTU2 to complete his firearms training in 2023 and that he continues to take classes there. He testified that between 1994 and 2004, he completed the 40-hour firearms training course. He testified that he took other training through the agencies he worked, Metro and Rockford Park District Police Department, but not the MTU2. He also testified to having received the basic waiver of law enforcement, equivalent to 400 hours of basic training and confirmed that he had never been through the law enforcement basic academy.

The Respondent testified to having spoken with Jan Noble, an ILETSB Investigator, wherein he was asked to provide any proof of payment, pay stubs, or tax forms from Metro between 1994 and 2004 but he said he did not have any. He admitted understanding the importance of the penalty of perjury portion of the IROCC application but said his chief had signed off on all his time, so he was confused. He testified he understood that it is a "big deal" that ILETSB has no record of him being employed for the period he says he was employed.

On cross-examination, the Respondent confirmed that his chief, William "Randy" Smith, signed off on his IROCC application. He testified that Chief Smith signed the application before he did, that he watched the Chief sign it, then he signed it. He testified that he worked along Officer David Hooks and many other officers. He testified that when he started at Metro the chief was Steven Randel, then James Rathke, then Ken Long, then he became interim chief prior to leaving. He testified that David Hooks filled out the IROCC application and that Respondent provided Hooks with no information, including his FOID card number. He testified that the only location he works at with his Metro Enforcement position is at the JAC but that Metro Enforcement does enforcement in other areas throughout Rockford.

On re-direct, the Respondent said he left Metro after being dismissed by the Operations Manager, Michael Walsh, who only told him that "it just wasn't working out." He testified that Metro is a unique agency in that it is overseen by a civilian.

Jan Noble:

Investigator Noble testified that he has been an investigator for ILETSB, since 2018. He testified that he is assigned cases typically out of Springfield, Illinois, investigating police officer misconduct. He testified that he checks to make sure local police chiefs and sheriffs are adhering to the SAFE-T Act and that all mandates are met by officers in Northwest Illinois. He testified that in 2016 and 2022 the Illinois General Assembly mandated training for all police officers in Illinois.

Investigator Noble testified that his law enforcement career began in 1974 as a Boone County Sheriff's Officer. He testified he then moved to Cherry Valley, just outside Rockford, in 1976 where he became a sworn officer and later chief of that department in 1980. He was the Chief of Cherry Valley until 1995, when he applied for and became the police chief for the city of Belvidere, Illinois. He testified that he was the Chief of Police in Belvidere for 23 years, until he became an investigator for ILETSB.

He testified that twice a year, as a former chief, one of his duties was to submit a roster of all his full-time and part-time police officers to ILETSB. He testified that as a chief it was his responsibility to keep track of mandated training of officers at his department and he was also required, by state law, to submit a firearms roster that all officers qualify with their firearms on an annual basis. He testified that the completion of the rosters was a routine part of his job as a chief. He testified that in more than 30 years of experience as a chief, he never forgot to include an officer on a roster that was submitted to ILETSB. He testified that there were checks and balances built into the system where any chief or sheriff who failed to submit either a firearms roster and/or annual roster of employee officers would receive a notice from ILETSB asking for the roster.

Investigator Noble testified that in early 2023, he was assigned an investigation regarding a complaint ILETSB received alleging that the Respondent had obtained an IROCC card and that it may have been under false information relating to the Respondent's years of service as a police officer. He testified that upon receiving the investigation he arranged to interview the Respondent. He testified that in May 2023, they met in a conference room at the Village of Cherry Valley and that the Winnebago County State's Attorney Chief Investigator, Mark Jimenez, was also present.

Investigator Noble testified that he explained to the Respondent the reason for the meeting was that on his IROCC form he claimed he worked for Metro from 1994 to 2004. Investigator Noble testified that the Respondent told him that he did work at Metro during that time. Investigator Noble testified he asked the Respondent if he could produce any tax forms, or any other verification of employment to support his claim. He testified that he gave the Respondent time to gather the information, but that the Respondent told him that his family had thrown out police memorabilia and police training records. He testified to telling the Respondent that he was simply there to verify the information and that if he could provide some information that would support his claim the investigation would most likely come to an end. He testified that he gave the Respondent five to six weeks to provide him with any supporting documentation. He testified that he received no documentation as of the writing of his investigation report on June 23, 2023.

Investigator Noble testified that he asked the Respondent about the IROCC application. He testified that while the Respondent confirmed signing the application, the Respondent said he did not fill out the application. He testified that the Respondent told him that the IROCC application was filled out by a retired Rockford Police Department Sergeant Hooks.

Investigator Noble testified that the Respondent told him that retired Sergeant Hooks also filled out the Respondent's application for the Winnebago County Reserve Deputy. He testified that the Respondent confirmed he was not hired as a Winnebago County Reserve Deputy, despite his application. He testified that he asked the Respondent why he signed a document that claimed he was a Metro part-time police officer when all the other information did not support his claim. He testified that the Respondent told him that he did it because he thought he could get an IROCC card and that he deserved an IROCC card.

Investigator Noble testified that he was able to double check the Respondent's employment in the ILETSB database that maintains records on the appointment and separation dates for all 37,000 police officers that live and work in Illinois. He testified that when looking at the Respondent's records in the ILETSB database he found that the Respondent was originally hired by Metro in 1993, promoted to Sergeant in 1995, and the last record was a signed separation form by Chief Ken Long in August 1996. He testified there were no other records for the Respondent until he returned to Metro in 2023.

Investigator Noble testified that he investigated the Respondent's training history first by checking the ILETSB database to show all training taken by the Respondent between the years of 1994 and 2004. He testified that he also contacted the MTU2 in Rockford and asked them to provide any documentation for the years 1994 to 2004. He testified he received one training document which was from the 40-hour firearms training course. He testified that when he asked the Respondent about the lack of training he received during that 10-year period, the Respondent told him "that was how it was done at the Metro Centre Police Department." He testified that the Respondent never told him that he had received any additional training other than what ILETSB was aware that he received.

On cross-examination, Investigator Noble confirmed that he asked the Respondent for any records to prove his employment from 1994 to 2004 including W-2's, tax forms, and/or training records. He testified that ILETSB keeps officer records about when they are hired and when they separate. He testified that the way for Chiefs and Sheriffs to notify ILETSB is by using Form E, which they then send to ILETSB in Springfield. He testified that whenever a police officer attends training, they sign in with their name and PTB[5] ID number on the roster and the name of the class, date of the class, and the number of hours are all archived and maintained at ILETSB headquarters in Springfield.

Investigator Noble testified that when he asked the Chief of Metro, Chief Smith, for any records he was told they could produce no records. He testified he was informed that this was due to a flood in the archive area which damaged or destroyed the records making them unavailable to even view.

On re-direct, Investigator Noble acknowledged that the records he requested of the Respondent were old, however the MTU2 had records dating back to 1994, which is where the firearms training record for the Respondent originated. Investigator Noble was then shown Group Exhibit E, which he identified as rosters of agency personnel on ILETSB forms. He testified that first page of Group Exhibit E was a roster dated January 30, 1990.

[5] PTB is short for Police Training Board, which is the same entity as ILETSB.

Upon questioning from this ALJ, Investigator Noble testified that while not all training available to an officer is certified, there are "copious" amounts of training certified through ILETSB and the local MTU2. He testified that prior to 2016, there was required training in the vehicle code and annual firearms training that was due in the month of July and agency rosters were due in January and July. He testified that as a former chief, when completing agency rosters, he would compare the list from six months prior to the new list and consider if there were any new hires to be added or officers who were released.

On re-direct, Investigator Noble confirmed that firearms training was required every year prior to 2016 as well as today. On re-cross, Investigator Noble clarified that while the basic training class can be waived for an officer who leaves one department to join another, no other waivers are allowed.

Kenneth Long:

Chief Long testified that he currently works for the Rockford School District but that he was previously a law enforcement officer from 1988 to 2003 or 2007. He testified that he was a law enforcement officer for the Rockford Park District and the Rockford Metro Centre. He testified he was a law enforcement officer for 18 years and started working at Rockford Metro Centre in 1993.

Chief Long testified that the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department is a very small department where he basically worked the desk as it is in an arena and there are some outside events as well. He testified that the arena is now called BMO. He testified that when he started in 1993 he was a Patrol Officer. He testified that he handled any situation that would come up, like someone drinking.

Chief Long testified that in 1993, BMO had a security "force" as well as the police department and that their security was internal. He testified that for big events there were multiple security agencies hired, some of which could have been local as well as from Chicago. He testified that he was at Metro until 2003 or 2005, it was his last job in law enforcement.

Chief Long testified that he started as chief in 1995, that all the officers were part-time. He testified that his duties were anything internal on the police end and he was also in charge of security and EMS for the building, as well as administrative duties. He testified that for large events there were emergency medical technicians on site that were internal and that EMTs or security were sometimes at the front desk. He testified that when he first started it was only police at the front desk but as time when on security would handle that position.

Chief Long testified that submitting rosters to ILETSB was part of his duties as the chief. He testified that they had to be completed every six months and that he was the chief for seven or eight years. He identified Group Exhibit E as the type of rosters he was referring. He testified that while he could not recall completing an individual roster, he does recall completing rosters as part of his duties.

When shown Group Exhibit E pages Strang 94-105 he confirmed that those were rosters he completed and that was his signature on the bottom. He testified that when he completed rosters he would go through the roster and add someone who was missing or fill out the form to remove someone who should have been "dismissed." He testified that after making sure everyone that should be on the roster was there and everyone who should have been removed was removed he would double check for accuracy. He testified that there were some employees that would only work two times a year, but he still knew who they were and he still made sure to include them on the roster. When asked if he had ever forgotten to add someone to the roster he testified that if he did it would only be one time and he would catch it on the next roster. When asked the likelihood that he would forget to put someone on the roster for eight consecutive years, he testified "slim to none."

Chief Long testified that the Form E is a document submitted when someone was hired, promoted, and separated. When shown Exhibit H, he identified his signature on the bottom and said it was a separation form dated September 12, 1996, and signed by him on October 31, 1996. He testified that it is a form that is filled out after someone is separated from the agency. He testified that he did not specifically recall submitting the Form E in Exhibit H, but he did acknowledge that it contained his signature. He testified that if he forgot to submit a Form E when someone separated, he would catch it next time he completed a roster and would submit it at that time.

On cross-examination, Chief Long confirmed that the Respondent would not have signed it and there was nothing attached to it, such as a resignation letter. He testified that he completed the forms himself and did not have a computer database as everything was on paper.

Respondent's Case in Chief

David Hooks:

Sergeant David Hooks testified that in 1994 he was a police officer for the city of Rockford. He testified that he was a Detective and had just been promoted to Sergeant. He testified that he got to know the Respondent professionally as he was assigned to the Metro Centre. He testified that the Metro Centre hosts events "from bands to graduations, all types of events," and is now referred to as BMO.

Sgt. Hooks testified that between 1994 through 2000 he was working at Rockford Police Department and was at and around the Metro Centre and supervised six to eight officers. He testified that the Rockford Police Department would collaborate with the Metro Centre Police Department. He testified that his contact at Metro from 1994 to 2000 was the Respondent. He testified that the Respondent would call him to let him know when to send his officers when the event was letting out. He testified he would supervise traffic control and help pedestrians get out of the arena due to large numbers of people leaving the arena. He testified that he could not recall an occasion where he did not see the Respondent working one of these events during that time.

Sgt. Hooks testified that he did fill out the top half of the first page of IROCC form for the Respondent. He testified that the Respondent told him what information to fill in. He said after the application was filled out, the Respondent took it to Randy Smith[6].

Sgt. Hooks testified that while he was working at the Rockford Police Department between 1994 and 2000 there were a lot of events at the Metro Centre. He testified there were hockey games, basketball games, concerts, and graduations during that time. He testified that he also worked on the street with the Respondent for various events that went past midnight. He testified that the Respondent also worked with him at events on the waterfront. Sgt. Hooks testified that in 2000, he went to the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia, and he graduated in March 2000.

On cross-examination, Sgt. Hooks testified that he filled out the top portion of the IROCC application contained in Exhibit C, and that he filled it out based on what the Respondent told him to write. He testified that his only suggestion to the Respondent was to include the Winnebago County Reserve Deputy position because he had been informed that the Respondent had been hired and later learned that he was not. Sgt. Hooks testified that he did not fill out page 2 of the IROCC application because that is where the attestation is and since he was not the person signing the attestation it would not be appropriate for him to fill out that portion of the application. He testified that he did not know what happened to the application after he filled out the top portion of page 1 and that he did not take the application to the Respondent's chief.

Sgt. Hooks testified that he would contact the Respondent when events were letting out. He clarified that he contacted Rockford Metro Centre Police Department, but also said he did

[6] William "Randy" Smith and Randy Smith are the same person. He is a former Chief of the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department.

not work at all the events, and that he or his team would contact the security office or would make contact by radio. He testified that he was not always there in person because he was supervising other officers. He testified that after he returned from the FBI Academy he was placed in charge as shift commander and was behind a desk. He testified that other sergeants were doing what he used to do and he told them to contact the Respondent.

Sgt. Hooks testified that after 2000 he would continue to see the Respondent at major events and on the waterfront. He testified that private security would also be at those events. He testified that he did not independently verify the Respondent's employment status and that he never looked him up on the ILETSB website. He testified that he did not independently confirm the Respondent's firearms qualification, nor did he speak with any of the various chiefs at the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department regarding the Respondent's employment.

On redirect examination, Sgt. Hooks confirmed that he also submitted the Respondent's application for Reserve Deputy and was the person who informed the Respondent that he had gotten the job and was only waiting on the background check. He testified that between 2000 and 2004 he did not recall a time when one of his sergeants was unable to contact the Respondent at the Metro Centre.

Upon questioning from this ALJ, Sgt. Hooks testified that he was not sure how contact was made with the Respondent, whether it was through dispatch to the security desk at the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department, who then responded to the dispatcher who passed along the information to him or his officers. He testified that he did recall seeing the Respondent in his uniform at events and that he did personally contact the Respondent by phone.

On re-cross examination, Sgt. Hooks confirmed that when he asked dispatch to contact the Respondent, he had no confirmation that the response was from the Respondent and not some other person who responded to the request of dispatch.

William "Randy" Smith:

Chief Smith testified that he started at the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department on January 31, 1991, doing security and that he is still employed there. He testified that he became chief in March of 1996 and stepped down as chief on May 30, 2024. He testified that he worked with the Respondent from the time Chief Smith started as a police officer until sometime in 2004 or 2005. He testified that Metro police officers enforced ordinances and state statutes and that they also coordinated with Rockford Police Department for events.

Chief Smith testified that between 1994 and 2004 he saw the Respondent working as a police officer, in uniform. When shown the Respondent's IROCC application, page 3, Chief Smith testified that that was his signature and confirmed the Respondent's dates of employment listed on the application as April 1994 to October 2004. He testified that he could not recall whether he received the application from the Respondent or Sergeant Hooks.

On cross-examination, Chief Smith testified that while he signed page 3 of the IROCC application, he did not fill out any part of page 2, containing the Concealed Carry Affidavit. When shown pages Strang 119-121 of Group Exhibit E, Chief Smith recognized his signature at the bottom of those pages that contained personnel rosters from June of 2003 through December of 2004 and that the Respondent's name was not on any of the rosters.

On re-direct examination, Chief Smith confirmed that on page 3 of the IROCC application, above his signature, there is an attestation indicating the person signed under penalty of perjury. On re-cross examination, Chief Smith admitted that the dates of employment on page 3 of the IROCC were provided to him by the Respondent and that he did not independently verify the information.

Respondent's Rebuttal:

Daniel Strang:

The Respondent testified that he had never seen the Form E separation form that was Exhibit H. He further testified that he never submitted a letter of resignation to Chief Long.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Complainant is the State of Illinois agency authorized to certify, decertify, recertify and conduct emergency suspensions of certification of Law Enforcement Officers in the State of Illinois pursuant to 50 ILCS 705 and 710 as well as pursuant to 20 IAC 1790, et. seq.
2. Respondent was a duly certified Law Enforcement Officer under the Complainant's authority at all times relevant to these proceedings.
3. Respondent was certified as a part-time police officer in or around February 1996.
4. Respondent was hired by the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department on September 1, 1994.
5. Respondent completed his initial mandatory 40-hour firearms training course on October 1, 1994.

6. Respondent was hired as a Ranger for the Rockford Park District Police Department on January 25, 1995.
7. Respondent was promoted to Sergeant for the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department on June 6, 1995.
8. Respondent received a Part-Time Basic Training Waiver on March 25, 1996.
9. Respondent separated from the Rockford Park District Police Department on July 1, 1996.
10. Respondent separated from the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department on September 12, 1996.
11. Respondent was re-hired by the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department on January 25, 2023.
12. Between October 1, 1994, and February 22, 2023, the Respondent did not complete any certified law enforcement training.
13. Respondent applied for an Illinois Retired Officer Concealed Carry permit on August 6, 2022, attesting that he was employed as a law enforcement officer for ten (10) or more years aggregate.
14. Respondent provided the information contained in the IROCC application, the Concealed Carry Affidavit, and the Employment Verification.
15. Respondent was not aware that he was not hired at the Winnebago County Sheriff Reserve at the time the IROCC application was completed.
16. Respondent has not provided any documentation to support his claim of having been employed at Rockford Metro Centre Police Department from 1994 to 2004 or as a law enforcement officer for ten or more years aggregate.
17. Respondent was not listed on any Rockford Metro Centre Police Department Roster of Agency Personnel after the roster dated July 18, 1996.
18. There were fifteen Rosters of Agency Personnel filed with ILETSB by the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department between December 20, 1996, and August 21, 2004, and the Respondent's name is not on any of them.
19. Respondent has worked as both an armed and unarmed security guard since at least 1992.
20. Private security guards and correctional officers are not eligible for the IROCC permit.

ANALYSIS

The question in dispute is whether the Respondent knowingly made a false statement on his IROCC application when he checked the box indicating that he had been "employed as a law enforcement officer for ten or more years aggregate" and then signed the bottom affirming this under penalty of perjury. The Respondent asserts that Sgt. Hooks filled out the entire first page of the application without any input from him, that Chief Smith must have checked the box about the Respondent having been employed as a law enforcement officer for ten or more years aggregate, and that all he did was sign his name because he relied on Sgt. Hooks and Chief Smith to complete the application correctly.

The Respondent testified repeatedly that all he did was sign documents that were prepared by others and assumed the information was correct. Investigator Noble testified that he asked the Respondent why he would sign an application that contained information that was not correct and the Respondent responded that he did it because he thought he could get an IROCC card and that he deserved the IROCC card. When the Respondent was shown Exhibit A, the Form E for his promotion to Sergeant, the Respondent said he did not write the information on the form, he only signed it. That form listed a hire date of November 29, 1993, and was handwritten in handwriting that appears to match that of the Respondent.

Throughout the testimony in this case, five of the admitted exhibits listed a hire date, but none of those hire dates match one another. As mentioned above, Exhibit A, the Form E for the Respondent's promotion to Sergeant listed his hire date as November 29, 1993. The waiver request in Group Exhibit E, page Strang 140, lists a hire date of December 2, 1993. Exhibit B, the Form E for the Respondent's initial appointment lists his hire date as September 1, 1994, which is the date the Respondent testified was his actual hire date. Exhibit H, the Form E for the Respondent's separation lists his hire date as January 2, 1995. Exhibit C, the IROCC form, lists the Respondent's hire date as April 1994.

Based upon the time the Appointment form (Exhibit B) was created and filed, along with the dates the Respondent completed his firearms training course, and the testimony of the Respondent, the Tribunal finds that his actual hire date was September 1, 1994. He then went on to complete his firearms training during the week of September 24, 1994, completing the course on October 1, 1994. The individual who created and filed the original Appointment form was Chief Randel, the Chief who hired the Respondent, and that form was completed on October 17, 1994.

The Respondent testified that he did not provide any information to Sgt. Hooks while Sgt. Hooks filled out his IROCC application (Exhibit C), explaining that Sgt. Hooks knew all his information. The first page of the application is the name, address, phone number, e-mail address, FOID number, date of birth, email address, firearm type and employment history. Sgt. Hooks testified that he knew the Respondent professionally and he was helping him fill out the application but the Respondent provided the information. It is not credible that Sgt. Hooks, who only knows the Respondent professionally, would know all the details asked for in the application. Sgt. Hooks testified that he did not independently verify the information the Respondent provided regarding his employment history and on cross-examination, he testified that he had never looked up the Respondent on the ILETSB website or otherwise sought out the Respondent's employment status.

The Respondent testified that he did not fill out any portion of the first page of the IROCC application, but he clearly wrote in his e-mail address as it is in an entirely different style of handwriting that does not match that of Sgt. Hooks or Chief Smith but was consistent with that of the Respondent in his signature below it on the page. The Respondent also testified that he did not check the boxes on page 2 of the application, including the box that he had been "employed as a law enforcement officer for ten or more years aggregate," saying that Chief Smith may have checked that box. This is simply not believable. The Respondent said that maybe Chief Smith checked the box on page 2, but he also testified that he watched Chief Smith sign the application before he signed his own name to the application. If this is to be believed, when would Chief Smith have had the time to check the box on page 2 without the Respondent seeing him do so?

Sgt. Hooks testified that he was sure that the Respondent worked as a Metro police officer until 2004 because the Respondent was his contact at Metro. He testified that he, and later his subordinates, would contact the Metro Police by phone or by dispatch and ask for the Respondent to provide them with information and they would hear back from dispatch with information that allegedly came from the Respondent. He also testified that the information was provided but that he could not be certain that the information came from the Respondent or someone else at Metro. Sgt. Hooks did not appear to intentionally provide false information, however given the time since the events occurred, he may have seen the Respondent in a different capacity or at an earlier timeframe than he believes.

Chief Long was the Chief at Metro from 1995 to 2003 according to both his testimony and the Rosters of Agency Personnel (Group Exhibit E). Of the agency rosters included, the Respondent's name appears on only one roster, the roster covering the period from January 1996 to June 1996 and signed by Chief Long on July 18, 1996. The Respondent testified that he was employed at Metro from 1994 to 2004, that Chief Long was only a chief for two years, and that he himself served as interim chief after Chief Long "was dismissed". Of the fifteen (15) rosters that cover the period between July 1996 to June 2004, the Respondent's name does not appear on a single one. Investigator Noble testified that if an officer's name was inadvertently left off a roster, the chief would correct it on the next roster.

Chief Long also testified that when preparing the rosters, which he did himself, he would compare it to the prior roster and make sure that everyone who was supposed to be on the roster was included and anyone who was not, was removed. Chief Long filled out and signed the

Respondent's Form E Separation form (Exhibit H) dated October 31, 1996, indicating that the Respondent resigned and his last date of employment was September 12, 1996.

The Respondent would have one believe that he was still employed at Metro but that Chief Long did not add him back on any of the eleven subsequent rosters. It is also noteworthy that Chief Long testified to having started as chief of Metro in 1995 until 2003, while the Respondent's testimony was that Chief Long was only chief for two years, which almost exactly matches the number of years Chief Long would have been chief while the Respondent is documented as having worked at Metro, all of 1995 and most of 1996.

It is simply unbelievable that an officer that was so memorable to Sgt. Hooks and Chief Smith would be left off fifteen consecutive rosters by accident, unless that officer was no longer an employee of the agency. It is also not plausible that that same officer would be left off rosters by successive chiefs, including Chief Smith, who was the Respondent's own witness, in error. According to Sgt. Hooks, the Respondent was always there, at most every event, so it seems inconceivable that he was somehow forgotten when it came time to submit the agency personnel roster. The Respondent testified that he worked at BMO as a security guard in 1992 and after becoming a police officer, continued working as a security guard at various security companies to this day. Chief Long testified that it was common for EMS or security to sit at the front desk of the Metro and even answer phones. This raises the possibility that one of those security guards, wearing a uniform similar enough to confuse someone if they were not paying close enough attention, and answering phones, was the Respondent.

After Chief Long left Metro, there were two subsequent people who completed the other four rosters that also did not have the Respondent's name included on them. Susan Campbell prepared the roster dated September 25, 2003. The Respondent's name was not listed on this roster. The roster dated February 23, 2004, was prepared and signed by then Deputy Chief William "Randy" Smith, and it did not list the Respondent's name. The roster dated August 2, 2004, was also prepared and signed by Deputy Chief William "Randy" Smith, and it did not list the Respondent's name. The roster dated February 13, 2005, was prepared and signed by Chief William "Randy" Smith, and it did not list the Respondent's name. When Chief Smith testified, he was shown the three roster pages referenced above that he prepared and signed and he noted that the Respondent's name was not included but offered no explanation as to why. He testified that the Respondent was employed at Metro during that time, yet he himself did not include the Respondent on the roster. Chief Smith testified that the Respondent provided him with his dates of employment to fill in on page 3 of the IROCC application. It was noteworthy that on cross-examination, Chief Smith acknowledged that his own attestation to the employment verification on page 3 of IROCC application, that the Respondent was employed at Metro from April 1994 to October 2004, was also under penalty of perjury.

Investigator Noble testified the Respondent told him his family had thrown out police memorabilia and training records, so he did not have documentation showing his employment at Metro from 1994 to 2004. Investigator Noble said he would have been willing to accept just about any documentation from the Respondent that proved his employment, but the Respondent did not provide him any documentation then and has not provided this Tribunal with any documentation now. The Respondent testified that Investigator Noble asked him for W-2s or tax records and that he did not have them, but he does not appear to have made any effort to obtain them in the three years since the investigation began. The Respondent has not provided a name tag, an ID, photos of himself in uniform from that period, or photos of himself with other officers at some of the big events he worked.

This is a case where there is a mountain of documents that tell one story and 30-plus year-old memories that tell another. On one hand, the Complainant has provided ILETSB forms showing when the Respondent was hired at Metro, when he was promoted at Metro, and when he separated from Metro. They have also provided agency rosters for Metro dating back as far as July 1989 until December 2009. While there are some missing rosters, there are no missing rosters for the relevant period of January 1996 through December 2004. They have also provided the application for waiver, and the most pertinent document, the IROCC application. There are discrepancies regarding the Respondent's hire date across the documents, with some of those discrepancies coming from the Respondent. The Respondent filled out and signed the Form E promotion form containing an erroneous hire date. Chief Smith testified that the Respondent provided him with his dates of employment at Metro and that he did not verify the information.

On the other hand, we have the testimony of the Respondent, who still claims to have worked as a police officer at Metro from 1994 to 2004. He claims to have lost all his training documents and police memorabilia due to his family throwing them out. He claims to have no tax records, W-2s, pay stubs, or any other documentation from the ten years he claims to have worked at Metro. He claims that his time was miscalculated when he worked at the Rockford Park District Police Department as well but provides no proof. Sgt. Hooks testified for the Respondent but contradicted the Respondent's testimony that all the Respondent did was sign the application and that Sgt. Hooks filled it all out with no input from him. According to Sgt. Hooks, the information contained in the application came directly from the Respondent except for including the Winnebago County Sheriff Reserve Deputy position that he recommended the Respondent include. Sgt. Hooks maintained that the Respondent was a Metro police officer until 2004 but his testimony against the agency records from the same time do not match. Chief Smith also testified on behalf of the Respondent, however his recollection of the Respondent's employment at Metro fell apart when the agency rosters showed that he also failed to include the Respondent on three consecutive rosters in direct opposition to his testimony.

In order to believe the version of events presented by the Respondent and his witnesses, one would need to believe that the memories of people approximately 30 years after events are more accurate than contemporaneously created documents to the contrary. The documentation provided by the Complainant was not perfect and there do appear to be some troubling errors in the records kept by Rockford Metro Centre Police Department, however that does not negate the consistency in the documentation overall. There is no doubt that the Respondent's name does not appear on any of the fifteen relevant rosters of the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department after the roster dated July 18, 1996. It is uncontroverted that the Respondent did not complete any mandated firearms training courses beyond the initial course completed on October 1, 1994, until he began completing training courses again in February 2023 upon being re-hired by Rockford Metro Centre Police Department despite annual firearms training being mandatory. It is unbelievable that the Respondent did not assist Sgt. Hooks in completing his IROCC application by providing the necessary information for Sgt. Hooks to fill in. The Respondent has been dishonest in the testimony he provided in this hearing relating to his denial of completing any part of page 1 of the IROCC application, his denial of completing the Form E promotion form that he wrote by hand, and that he was interim chief of Metro after Chief Long was dismissed when he was not even included on the agency roster after Chief Long left.

The Respondent's argument that he did not provide false information on his IROCC application and perjure himself in his attestation is two-fold. First, he maintained that he was a police officer at the Rockford Metro Centre Police Department from 1994 to 2004, and second, that he had no reason to lie because he could have simply obtained a concealed carry permit through other means. The problem with the Respondent's arguments is that there is not a single piece of documentary evidence submitted in this case that supports the claim that he was a police officer at Rockford Metro Centre Police Department after September 1996 to 2004. Second, while it is possible the Respondent could have otherwise obtained a concealed carry permit (CCP), the IROCC offers additional concealed carry privileges not afforded with a standard concealed carry permit. Some of those additional privileges include the ability to concealed carry outside of Illinois, regardless of state or local concealed carry laws, and for concealed carry where standard CCP is banned. Arguably, the reason for the extra privileges afforded by IROCC is due to the prior service requirement to obtain the permit. The Respondent wanted the extra privilege afforded by the IROCC and was willing to misrepresent his employment information on the application to get it because he did not think anyone would check.

Rules and laws are in place for several reasons, some to promote order and efficiency, some to protect the public from others, and some to protect people from themselves. Law Enforcement Officers are tasked with great responsibility in carrying out their duties, which can include life or death, so meeting the highest standards in their own moral, ethical, and legal obligations is imperative. There is an argument that being dishonest on an application for a concealed carry permit is not that serious of an offense and that there is no harm in exaggerating years of service by someone who has worked in and around law enforcement for his entire career, but there is harm. If the state or federal legislature wanted to allow anyone who had ever held a position as a law enforcement officer for any amount of time access to the IROCC permit, they would have allowed it. There are qualifications that must be met and the Respondent did not meet those qualifications. If the Respondent cannot be trusted to be honest on a concealed carry application, that he acknowledged knowing he signed under oath or affirmation, under penalty of perjury, that contained false information, he cannot be trusted with enforcing the laws and rules he refuses to follow.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. This Tribunal has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter as set forth in 20 IAC 1790, et. seq.
2. That the burden of proof in this cause is on Complainant and that the standard of proof is clear and convincing evidence as set forth in 20 IAC 1790.130.
3. That Complainant has proven by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent is eligible for discretionary decertification as a Law Enforcement Officer under 20 IAC 1790.250.
4. That the Complainant has proven by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed decertifiable misconduct in violation of 50 ILCS 705/6.3(b)(1) when Respondent committed the offense of perjury in violation of 720 ILCS 5/32-2 when he, under oath or affirmation, made a false statement on the Illinois Retired Officer Concealed Carry (IROCC) application, in that he knowingly checked the box indicating that "Before retirement/separation, I was employed as a law enforcement officer for ten or more years aggregate", knowing the statement to be false and signing the affirmation of said statement under penalty of perjury.
5. That the Complainant has proven by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed decertifiable misconduct in violation of 50 ILCS 705/6.3(b)(6) when Respondent, under oath or affirmation, made a false statement on the Illinois Retired Officer Concealed Carry (IROCC) application, that he "was employed as a law enforcement officer for ten or more years aggregate", knowing the statement to be false.
6. That these acts of decertifiable misconduct are harmful to the public.

RECOMMENDED DECISION

Based upon the above Finding of Facts and Conclusions of Law, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge recommends to the Illinois Law Enforcement Certification Review Panel that Respondent Daniel K. Strang (#65094286) be DECERTIFIED as an Illinois Law Enforcement Officer.

NOTICE

This recommended decision of the Administrative Law Judge will be reviewed by the Illinois Law Enforcement Certification Review Panel., who will make the final decision as to whether Respondent will be decertified. (See 20 IAC 1790.630 and 20 IAC 1790.645)

Pursuant to 50 ILCS 705/6.6(a) and (b), all final administrative decisions regarding discretionary decertification of the Board (ILETSB) are subject to judicial review under the Administrative Review Law and its rules.

Entered: July 13, 2026

[redacted]

Jaimee L.Ward
Administrative Law Judge