

Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

CIVILIAN REVIEW BOARD (CRB) - COMPLAINT #287

Date of Incident: November 2, 2022

Time of Incident: 10:02 PM

Location of Incident: South Boston, MA 02127

Date of filing: February 1, 2024 **Investigator**: Tastery Reed, Jr.

Date of CRB Decision: May 15, 2025

BOSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT (BPD) EMPLOYEE:

BPD's Employee Name	District	Badge/ Employee #	Sex	Race/ Ethnicity
Officer Richard Anthony Errico	C6	ID #144329	M	White
Officer Tom R. Sullivan	C6	ID #114096	M	Black

CASE PROCEDURAL HISTORY:

This case is associated with case #395 involving the same Complainant.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS:

On February 1, 2024, the Office of Police Accountability and Transparency (OPAT) received a complaint filed by Complainant alleging police misconduct by two Boston Police Officers, Tom R. Sullivan and Richard Anthony Errico. Complainant alleged that on November 2nd, 2022, officers responded to a 911 call regarding a domestic incident at her home with her ex-boyfriend, who is the father of her two minor children. Officers unlawfully arrested her based on her ex-boyfriend falsely accusing her of ripping his sweatshirt. Complainant stated that despite her ex-boyfriend's aggressive behavior, attempting to hit her and forcefully grabbing their 4-year-old daughter in officers' presence, officers failed to arrest her ex-boyfriend. Complainant stated her ex-boyfriend broke the vent and a dinner table and was also aggressive towards her father. Complainant stated that as a result of her arrest, she was placed in a dirty cell for ten hours (from 1:00 AM to 11:00 AM). Complainant stated she did not have the option of bail because officers told her that the bail bondsman wasn't coming since she was the only person in custody and it wasn't worth it. Complainant stated she was not released until noon the following day.

2201 WASHINGTON ST | BOSTON, MA 02119 | BOSTON.GOV | 617-635-4224



Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

APPLICABLE RULES & LAWS:

- 1. **BPD Rule 102§4 (Neglect of Duty)**: "This includes any conduct or omission which is not in accordance with established and ordinary duties or procedures as to such employees or which constitutes use of unreasonable judgment in the exercising of any discretion granted to an employee."
 - a) Officers Errico and Sullivan exercised unreasonable judgment when they arrested Complainant and did not arrest Complainant's ex-boyfriend. Officers had knowledge that Complainant called 911 on her ex-boyfriend, alleging abuse and observed Complainant's ex boyfriend make contradictory statements regarding being on the lease, scream expletives, attempt to assault Complainant, pound on a table, slam his hands on a couch and behave erratically in front of their four year old daughter.
- 2. **BPD Rule 102§9 (Respectful Treatment)**: "Employees shall, on all occasions, be civil and respectful, courteous and considerate toward their supervisors, their subordinates, and all other members of the Department and the general public. No employee shall use epithets or terms that tend to denigrate any person(s) due to their race, color, creed, gender identity, or sexual orientation, except when necessary in police reports or in testimony."
 - a. Complainant alleged that the officers who responded to the scene were disrespectful and rude to her.
- 3. Rule 102§20 (Self Identification): "...requires every officer to carry his identification card with photograph and exhibit this card upon a lawful request for purposes of identification. Any officer, acting in his official capacity, shall give his name, rank, and badge number, in a civil manner, to any person who may inquire unless he is engaged in an undercover police operation and his physical safety or the police operation would be jeopardized by his making such identification..."
 - a. When Complainant requested officers' names and badge numbers, Officer Sullivan remarked, "I already gave you my name." Neither Officer Sullivan or Errico provided the requested information.



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

- 1. On February 8, 2024, Investigator Reed received and reviewed color photographs provided by Complainant. The photos included visible bruises and injuries sustained by Complainant, as well as images of damage to the residence related to the incident. All photographs were time and date stamped, providing contextual support for Complainant's account.
- 2. On February 8, 2024, Investigator Reed interviewed Complainant, who reported the following:
 - a. On November 2, 2022, Complainant was experiencing an ongoing conflict involving her ex-boyfriend and the father of her two children. Complainant alleged that her ex-boyfriend physically assaulted her, resulting in visible bruising. She further stated that he forcefully removed her from her residence and locked her outside her apartment.
 - b. According to Complainant, when Officers Sullivan and Errico arrived on scene, she expressed concerns for her safety, noting that her ex-boyfriend was physically larger than both responding officers. She repeatedly requested additional units be dispatched, but her requests were not accommodated.
 - c. When officers questioned Complainant regarding her ex-boyfriend's torn sweatshirt, Complainant stated that her ex-boyfriend intentionally tore his own shirt and falsely claimed that she had done so. She described his demeanor during the officers' presence as aggressive and asserted that this behavior should have indicated to the officers that he was the primary aggressor.
 - d. Despite Complainant's efforts to explain the incident with her ex-boyfriend that day, Complainant reported she was taken into custody and transported to the South Boston (C-6) precinct, where she was denied bail. She stated that officers at the station informed her it would be a waste of time for a bail bondsman to respond due to her being the only individual in custody.
 - e. Complainant stated the incident was recorded on surveillance cameras managed by Longwood security. She, along with her attorney, encountered challenges in obtaining this footage.

2201 WASHINGTON ST | BOSTON, MA 02119 | BOSTON.GOV | 617-635-4224



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

- f. Complainant also noted that a neighbor may have captured video of the incident, but was unsure how to preserve it.
- g. Complainant further alleged that responding officers did not assess her for injuries or allow her to fully explain the domestic incident that occurred that night.
- 3. On February 8, 2023, Investigator Reed conducted a phone interview with Complainant's father. Complainant's father reported witnessing Complainant's ex-boyfriend acting in an aggressive and abusive manner toward Complainant prior to the officer's arrival. He stated that Complainant's ex-boyfriend's behavior became even more volatile after the police arrived on scene.
 - a. Complainant's father recalled he was holding his granddaughter when Complainant's ex-boyfriend forcefully removed the child from his arms.
 - b. Complainant's father stated that the residence in question belonged to Complainant and Complainant's ex-boyfriend was only a guest; nonetheless, Complainant's ex-boyfriend forced Complainant out of her residence and physically prevented Complainant from re-entering her own home.
 - c. Complainant's father also reported witnessing Complainant's ex-boyfriend deliberately tearing his own sweatshirt before the arrival of police, after which Complainant's ex-boyfriend falsely claimed that Complainant had caused the damage.
 - d. Complainant's father expressed his belief that Complainant's ex-boyfriend should have been the individual arrested, not Complainant.
 - e. According to Complainant's father, the responding officers stated that the decision to arrest Complainant was not made by them but by a supervisor or a lieutenant.
- 4. On February 9, 2024, Investigator Reed reviewed body-worn camera (BWC) footage from Officer Sullivan related to the incident involving Complainant and her ex-boyfriend.



Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

a. Initial Interaction:

The footage showed Officers Sullivan and Errico inside Complainant's residence, speaking with Complainant's ex-boyfriend. Their 4-year-old daughter was present in the footage. Complainant's ex-boyfriend told officers that Complainant grabbed and assaulted him, which prompted him to push her out of the home and lock the door behind her.

b. Behavior Observed:

Throughout the recording, Complainant's ex-boyfriend exhibited aggressive behavior, frequently yelling at both officers. At approximately the 9:15 minute mark, he becomes visibly agitated, shouting about Complainant in the presence of their 4-year-old daughter and forcefully slamming his hands on the kitchen table. Complainant's ex-boyfriend alleged that Complainant tore his sweater and asserted that he is listed on the lease. During this time, Complainant is outside the residence.

c. Arrest and Transport:

At the 25:02 minute mark, Officers Sullivan and Errico arrested Complainant on charges of assault, based on Complainant's ex-boyfriend's claim that she ripped his sweater and the fact that he contacted the police first. At the 28:59 minute mark, while seated in the police cruiser, Complainant is heard speaking with her father on the phone. She tells both officers that she had been assaulted by her ex-boyfriend and forcibly removed from her own home. She also mentioned that she made a call earlier in the day to report her daughter missing. The footage concluded around the 59:07 minute mark as the complainant was transported to booking for processing.

5. On February 8, 2024, Investigator Reed reviewed body-worn camera (BWC) footage from Officer Errico, which further documented the events surrounding November 2, 2022.

a. Officer Errico's Body-Worn Camera Review:

• The footage began with Officer Errico speaking with Complainant. During the conversation, Officer Errico asked Complainant's ex-boyfriend whether he is listed on the lease. Complainant's ex-boyfriend responded that he is on the lease and claimed that he and Complainant are married.



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

- At approximately the 0:37-3:01 minute mark, Officer Errico approached Complainant, who was outside with no shoes on. Complainant explained that earlier that day, her ex-boyfriend had taken their daughter and would not answer the phone. He was not answering calls from his family as well. When Complainant's ex-boyfriend returned to her residence hours later with their daughter, she questioned him, and Complainant's ex-boyfriend just grabbed her and tossed her out of the house and would not let her back in. Complainant stated her ex-boyfriend does not live at the residence. He keeps coming to the residence, and she keeps telling him no. She keeps telling him it's over, and he said, "No, I'm going to stay here for my kids." Complainant also stated "He's mentally gone... He won't get help... told family... they said he would just get angry."
- At approximately the 5:54-minute mark, Officer told Complainant "just hang tight, we are just going to tell him he has to go."
- At approximately the 5:54-6:35 minute mark, Complainant's ex-boyfriend states. "I was just explaining to him she left my daughter upstairs this morning... I took her with me to run errands, take her to my son's birthday party... She texted me from her phone saying, I'm calling the cops if you don't bring my daughter or show me pictures of where she's at..."
- At approximately the 6:41-6:57 minute mark, Officer Errico asked Complainant's ex-boyfriend, "Are you on the lease here?" Complainant's ex-boyfriend responded, "No..."
- At approximately the 7:05-8:30 minute mark-Officer explained to Complainant's ex-boyfriend that Complainant does not want him there...Officer stated, "She is saying you grabbed her and threw her outside"...Complainant's ex-boyfriend replied, "I just came here..."
- At the 7:38 minute mark, Complainant's ex-boyfriend stated he's on the lease but does not show proof. Complainant's ex-boyfriend further stated Complainant "has the lease." Officer stated to Complainant's ex-boyfriend that he contradicted himself"...Officer also stated, "you don't have to rip someone's clothes to assault her, my man..." Complainant's ex-boyfriend is near their four year old daughter screaming, "If y'all not going to do nothing, I'm going to grab her now..."



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

- At approximately the 9:14-minute mark, Complainant's ex-boyfriend becomes increasingly aggressive, yelling in the presence of his daughter while Officer Errico attempts to de-escalate the situation.
- At approximately the 9:38-10:49 minute mark, Complainant's ex-boyfriend threw his arms aggressively, striking a couch, and then walked to the kitchen table, where he forcefully pounded the table with his hands.
- At the 15:03-20:52 minute mark, Officer Errico called his Sergeant, who was heard asking several questions related to the incident to determine the appropriate course of action. Officer Errico stated "...Sarge, we are at a domestic and they are both claiming assault on each other...yeah, he is a pretty big boy too, and he has already been pretty excited, but they're both claiming mutual. Um, she's claiming he's not on the lease, he's claiming he is on the lease. We don't have proof of the lease yet, she's trying to find the lease now, so it's kinda where we are at. Yes, he does have a ripped shirt...um, and then she said that he grabbed her and threw her outside, but she didn't say she was thrown to the ground, but she was outside when we got there, and he was inside with the kid...Sgt replied over the phone, "We don't really know who started it, and Officer Errico responded, "Yeah, we don't really know who started it, I think they're both stating they started it...but you know she is stating he started he is stating she started it..."What are you thinking?" Officer Errico stated, "umm he does have the ripped shirt..." Sgt asks did he call first Officer Errico stated let me check with Tom I think he did Sgt. asked, "how old is the kid?" Officer Errico replied, "there is a 4 ½ year old daughter and 15-year-old upstairs..."I haven't even spoken to the 15-year-old yet because he is upstairs, I just found out...before I got on the phone with you." Sgt asked Officer Errico if he ran Complainant's ex-boyfriend for warrants... Officer Errico responded, "I didn't run them yet and asked Sgt, "Do you want me to run them and I'll call you back. Sgt replied, "Yeah, run them ... If he called first...sounds good,"... says it's mutual, whoever called first... If he doesn't have warrants..." Officer Errico heads back to the residence, and Complainant's ex-boyfriend is yelling "You're going to sit hear and listen to this? Come on...this is bullshit..."
- At approximately 23:07... Officer Errico is going through the database to see if Complainant's ex-boyfriend has any warrants.



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

- At approximately the 23:37 minute mark officer stated he's got no warrants
- At approximately 23:57-24 Officer Sullivan stated to Complainant's ex-boyfriend, "...don't be screaming around your daughter "
- At approximately the 24:01 minute mark, Officer Errico stated to Complainant's ex-boyfriend. "Are you good to watch your daughter right now? Are you good to watch your daughter"
- At 25:27, Officers Errico and Sullivan informed Complainant that she is under arrest. He stated the basis for the arrest is that Complainant's ex-boyfriend was the individual who called 9-1-1, and that visible damage to his shirt was consistent with his claims. By the 28:00-minute mark, Officer Errico escorted Complainant to the police cruiser.
- At approximately the 26:02 minute mark, Complainant stated her ex-boyfriend is lying, "he is mentally ill, look at his rage, he hit me... test his alcohol level."
- At approximately the 27:13 minute mark, Complainant stated, "He threw me out of my home."
- At approximately the 27:41 minute mark, Complainant stated, "You didn't see him? he just went off on me, you saw how aggressive he was..."
- At approximately the 28:12 minute mark, officers learned that there was also a baby upstairs, and Complainant's ex-boyfriend's sister, who arrived on scene, stated, "Somebody needs to check on the baby, because the baby is in the room."
- At approximately the 29:13 minute mark, Officer Errico told Complainant's ex-boyfriend, "She is getting arrested tonight because you called first and claimed assault; she also claimed to be assaulted, but because you called first and claimed..."
- At the 30:00 minute mark, Officer Errico and Complainant's ex-boyfriend's sister went upstairs to check on Complainant's two children (15-year old-son and 2-year-old son). Officer Errico informed the 15-year-old son that he cannot remain at the residence alone and must be placed under the supervision of a guardian.
- At approximately the 32:08 minute mark, Complainant's ex-boyfriend's sister was observed in the corridor upstairs making arm gestures, seemingly indicating to Officer Errico not to speak/question Complainant's 15-year-old son.



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

- At approximately the 34:02 minute mark, Complainant's ex-boyfriend stated he attempted to obtain five restraining orders. Of those, three were instead granted to Complainant, as the judges reportedly believed that, due to his size and strength, she could not pose a threat to him.
- At approximately the 37:00 minute mark, Complainant was observed telling the officers that the kids cannot go to Complainant's ex-boyfriend's mother's house because he is not on the children's birth certificate. Complainant also asked Officer Errico to test her ex-boyfriend for alcohol, to which the Officer said, "We can't just test for alcohol."
- At approximately the 39:14 minute mark, Officer Errico stated, "We are going to do this the hard way..." When Complainant requested Officer's name and badge number, Officer Sullivan remarked, "I already gave you my name."
- At approximately the 39:27 minute mark, Complainant said, "I called you for help and you arrested the wrong person," to which the officers responded that the call had been made by the supervisor and that they had already spoken with him.
- At the 40:28 minute mark, Officer Sullivan is seen placing handcuffs on Complainant as her father arrived and began speaking with the officers.
- At approximately the 40:44 minute mark, Complainant's father and 15-year-old stated that she (Complainant) had called the police first. Officer Errico responded that he had spoken with the supervisor, the decision was final, and that the incident constituted mutual assault, Complainant ripped her ex-boyfriend's shirt. Complainant's father then asked Officer Errico why, if the incident was considered mutual, Complainant's ex-boyfriend was not also arrested, and that it was her house, not his. Officer Errico replied that his supervisor told them to.
- At approximately the 40:29 minute mark, the ex-boyfriend's sister stated Complainant's father (children's paternal grandfather) should take all three children.
- At approximately the 44:57 minute mark, Complainant's father is heard telling Complainant's ex-boyfriend's sister that he has advised Complainant's ex-boyfriend not to go to Complainant's residence.



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

- At 44:44, Complainant's ex-boyfriend forcefully took their 4-year-old daughter from the arms of Complainant's father in an aggressive manner in front of both officers.
- At approximately the 44:57 minute mark, Officer Errico stated, "You can't do that, you can't do that. Complainant's father stated, "You see how aggressive he is all the time?"
- At approximately the 45:16 minute mark, Complainant's ex-boyfriend's sister tells him, "Don't do that in front of police."
- At approximately the 46:09 minute mark, Complainant's father stated to officers, "Did you see how he pushed her?" Complainant's ex-boyfriend's sister responded, "If he's doing something wrong, he's an officer; I am licensed as a social worker to report too."
- At approximately the 49:12 minute mark, Complainant's father said to the officer, "You are creating a situation." Then in regard to locking the door to the residence before leaving, the Complainant's ex-boyfriend stated "That's not my business. I'm not on the lease..."
- At approximately the 52:00 minute mark, Officer Errico stated, "He made a call, we followed our supervisor's call. I have a boss like everyone else. Complainant's ex-boyfriend is heard yelling.
- At approximately the 54:27 minute mark, Complainant told officers her ex-boyfriend has a history of assaulting her in the past, and to check the cameras.
- At approximately the 55:00-57:50 minute mark, Complainant asked Officer Sullivan whether he had reviewed Complainant's ex-boyfriend's records. Officer Sullivan responded, "All those things can still happen; you can't hold them your entire life." Complainant then stated, "No, these are my kids, I have the right to be here, and he forces himself." Officer Sullivan replied, "You need to stop letting him in there." Officer Errico added, "That has nothing to do with what happened today," in response to Complainant's assertion that Complainant's ex-boyfriend has a mental illness. Officer Errico further stated, "He went off on all of you, and he almost attacked me again in the street. I literally had to run away from him." Officer Errico acknowledged hearing both sides of the story and mentioned that they had spoken with a supervisor by phone. In response, Complainant stated that the supervisor was not a witness to the incident. Complainant further stated, "You didn't arrest him because you were scared of him. You should have called for



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

backup..."Complainant also stated that she had contacted the police first because her daughter was missing. She reported that her ex-boyfriend had not answered his phone all day, and no one was able to confirm the child's whereabouts. Officers were subsequently dispatched to Complainant's ex-boyfriend's mother's residence to conduct a welfare check on the child.

- At approximately the 58:00-minute mark, Complainant stated, "And you watched him for the third time in front of the camera, and you had to tell him to go back to the house. It happened in front of your eyes. If you guys weren't there, he could have attacked me again..."
- At approximately the 58:27-minute mark, Officer Sullivan stated, "Yes, he definitely has some anger issues."
- At approximately the 59:01-minute mark, Officer Errico commented, "Anger issues are not a crime." Complainant replied, "Anger issues are a crime, because when a man has anger issues, what happens?..." Officer Sullivan responded, "We can't just not believe someone..."
- At approximately the 59:38-minute mark, Complainant stated, "He has no mental issues or problems, and you had to tell this man to get away from me. Didn't you have to tell him to get away from me?" To this, officer replied, "Yes, we separated you guys." Complainant then stated, "You didn't see him almost attack me on the street, right? You saw him chasing me and almost attacking me on the street, and you had to tell him to get away from me..."
- 6. On February 15, 2024, Investigator Reed reviewed a landlord agreement submitted by Complainant. The document confirmed that four individuals were listed on the lease: Complainant and her three children. Complaint's ex-boyfriend is not listed as a tenant on the lease.

7. Interview with Minor Witness:

On February 20, 2024, Investigators Reed and Vergara conducted an interview with Complainant's now 5-year-old daughter at the Office of Police Accountability and Transparency, located at 2201 Washington Street, Boston, Massachusetts. The interview was conducted in the presence of Complainant, who also signed a parental consent form prior to the start of the interview. The session began at 3:30 PM and concluded at 4:00 PM. During the interview, Complainant's 5-year-old daughter stated that her father tore his own sweater prior to the arrival of the police.



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

She further reported witnessing her father push both Complainant and herself. She also stated that, following the incident, her father took her to his residence.

8. Interview with Minor Witness:

On February 26, 2024, Investigator Reed conducted a telephone interview with Complainant's 15-year-old son regarding the February 8, 2024, incident. Prior to the interview, a parental consent form was signed to authorize the conversation. Complainant's son stated he was upstairs during the incident but could hear the events unfolding downstairs. He reported hearing Complaint's ex-boyfriend being very aggressive, specifically yelling and screaming in the presence of the two responding officers. Complainant's son further stated that he observed property damage, including a broken vent and a damaged leg on the kitchen table, both allegedly caused by Complainant's ex-boyfriend. He noted that both officers appeared visibly nervous, which he attributed to Complainant's ex-boyfriend being physically larger than both of them. Complainant's son also stated that he overheard Complainant's ex-boyfriend tear his own sweater, then push Complainant outside and lock the door. At the time, his (4 years old) younger sister was downstairs while the police were present. Complainant's son recalled after Complainant was placed in the police cruiser, he was instructed to leave with his grandfather, while his younger sister left the scene with Complainant's ex-boyfriend.

- 9. On February 26, 2024, Complainant submitted a criminal complaint form from the Boston Municipal Court (BMC) **South Boston Division**. The case was identified under docket number **2203CRXXXXXXX**. According to the complaint, Complainant is listed as the aggressor in the incident and is accused of assaulting her ex-boyfriend. An additional court document, dated November 3, 2022, indicated that Officer Errico filed the criminal complaint with the BMC.
- 10. The corresponding arrest **booking sheet** confirmed that Complainant was processed at the South Boston Police Station. It also noted that no visible injuries were documented on Complainant at the time of booking.
- 11. On June 10 and July 30, 2024, Investigator Reed sent email requests to Officer Errico to schedule an interview regarding the incident. As of the date of this report, **Officer Errico** has not responded to any of the requests.
- 12. On June 21, June 24, and July 15, 2024, Investigator Reed sent interview requests via email to **Officer Sullivan**. As of the date of this report, Officer Sullivan has not responded to any of the requests.

2201 WASHINGTON ST | BOSTON, MA 02119 | BOSTON.GOV | 617-635-4224



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

- 13. On June 12, 2024, Investigators Reed and Vergara visited the South Boston Division of Boston Municipal Court to get a copy of docket number 2203CRXXXXXXX. Court records indicate that the case was dismissed on December 18, 2023. The docket also listed a cross-complaint case docket number 2203CRXXXXXXXX.
 - a. Complaint's ex-boyfriend was listed as the defendant in docket **2203CRXXXXXXX** which stemmed from the same incident
 - b. Investigator Reed had the opportunity to review docket 2203CRXXXXXXX and noted that it was not until March 3rd, 2023, four months after the date of incident, when Complainant's ex-boyfriend was arraigned in South Boston Division of Boston Municipal Court for Assault and Battery of Complainant and Malicious Destruction of Property under \$250 on November 2nd, 2022.
- 14. On June 12, 2024, Investigator Reed received and reviewed the **911 dispatch** audio and **turret recordings** provided by the Boston Police Department (BPD), along with the Incident History Report (CAD sheet). The CAD sheet indicated that the initial call was categorized as a Domestic Violence In-Progress (DVIP). According to the records, Complainant's ex-boyfriend contacted 911 and reported that Complainant was yelling at him and pulling on his clothing, and that she was outside the residence. Shortly afterward, Complainant also called 911, stating that her ex-boyfriend was intoxicated and had forcibly removed her from her home. She informed the dispatcher that she was the legal resident and owner of the property.

EVIDENCE REQUESTED/REVIEWED:

Evidence	Description	Availability Status	File Name
OPAT Complainant Form/Intake Forms	Complainant's statements on OPAT Intake form	Available	N/A
Complainant's Interview	Complainant's interview on February 8, 2024	Available	N/A
Witness statement from Complainant's Father	Phone call interview on 2/8/24	Available	N/A
Signed Parental Consent Forms for Complainant's	Signed parental form of Complainant's two children	Available	N/A



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Children's Statement			
Witness Statement from Complainant's 5-year-old Daughter	In-person interview on February 20, 2024	Available	N/A
Witness statement from Complainant's son	Telephone interview on February 26, 2024	Available	N/A
911 Call	Oral statements from the Operator to Complainant.	Available	N/A
CAD Sheet	Summary of 911 call and dispatchers' conversations	Not available	N/A
Turret Tape	The officer's radio communication to the dispatcher	Not available	N/A
Arrest Booking Sheet of Complainant	Description of the arrest dated 11/2/22	Available	N/A
Police Report (I#222084964) Police Report (I#222085754)	Police report #222084964 (Dated 11/2/22) Police report #222085754 (Dated 11/5/22)	Available	N/A
Body Worn Camera of Officer(s) Errico and Sullivan	Footage of Officer Errico and Sullivan's interaction with Complainant.	Available	N/A
Interview letters- Officer Sullivan, ID#114096	On June 21, June 24, and July 15, 2024	Unavailable. No response from Officer(s) Sullivan	N/A
Interview letters- Officer Errico, ID#144329	On June 10 and July 30, 2024	Unavailable. No response from Officer(s) Errico	N/A
Landlord Agreement	Description of who is on the landlord's lease	Available	N/A



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

South Boston docket number 2203CRXXXXXXX.	Court documents related to Docket#223CRXXXXXX	Available	N/A
Photos of Complainant's Injuries with Time/Date Stamp	Photos of Complainant's injuries	Available	N/A

CRB DECISION:

Officer Tom Sullivan

The Civilian Review Board reached a unanimous decision (6-0), Not Sustained regarding allegations against Officer Tom Sullivan's violation of Rule 102§9 (Respectful Treatment).

The Civilian Review Board reached a unanimous decision (6-0), Sustained regarding allegations against Officer Tom Sullivan's violation of Rule 102§4 (Neglect of Duty).

The Civilian Review Board reached a **unanimous decision (6-0), Sustained** regarding allegations against Officer Tom Sullivan's violation of **Rule 102§20-(Self Identification)**.

Officer Richard A. Errico

The Civilian Review Board reached a unanimous decision (6-0), Not Sustained regarding allegations against Officer Richard A. Errico's violation of Rule 102§9 (Respectful Treatment).

The Civilian Review Board reached a unanimous decision (6-0), Sustained regarding allegations against Officer Richard A. Errico's violation of Rule 102§4 (Neglect of Duty).

The Civilian Review Board reached a unanimous decision (6-0), Sustained regarding allegations against Officer Richard A. Errico's violation of Rule 102§20-(Self Identification).

The Civilian Review Board reached a **unanimous decision (6-0), Sustained** regarding allegations against Officer Richard A. Errico's violation of Rule BPD Rule 102§8 (Directives and Orders).



Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

Officer's Name	Applicable Rule	Finding/Recommendation	
Officer Tom Sullivan	Rule 102§9 (Respectful Treatment)	Not Sustained	
Officer Tom Sullivan	Rule 102§4-(Neglect of Duty)	Sustained	
Officer Tom Sullivan	Rule 102§20-(Self Identification)	Sustained	
Officer Richard A. Errico	Rule 102§9 (Respectful Treatment)	Not Sustained	
Officer Richard A. Errico	Rule 102§4-(Neglect of Duty)	Sustained	
Officer Richard A. Errico	Rule 102§20-(Self Identification)	Sustained	
Officer Richard A. Errico	BPD Rule 102§ 8 (Directives and Orders)	Sustained	

CRB reviewed the evidence and examined the circumstances surrounding Complainant's allegations, finding that the evidence did not support the violation of **BPD Rule 102§9** (**Respectful Treatment**) against Officers Tom R. Sullivan and Richard A. Errico, as there is no evidence that Officer Sullivan or Officer Richard A. Errico exhibited disrespectful behavior toward Complainant.

CRB reviewed the evidence and examined the circumstances surrounding Complainant's allegations, finding that the evidence did support the violation of **BPD Rule 102§4** (**Neglect of Duty**) against Officers Tom R. Sullivan and Richard A. Errico. Officers Sullivan and Errico failed to fulfill their responsibilities upon arrival at Complainant's home on the day of the incident based on the totality of the circumstances and their observations on scene.

At the scene, the officers neglected to check Complainant for visible injuries and failed to conduct a thorough sweep of the residence until prompted by Complainant's ex-boyfriend's



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

sister, who informed them that two of Complainant's three children were upstairs. For a significant amount of time while officers were on scene, they were unaware that Complainant's and Complainant's ex-boyfriend's two-year-old son was sleeping in an upstairs bedroom.

According to BWC, Officers explained to Complainant that they were arresting her because Complainant's ex-boyfriend called 9-1-1 first, and observation of Complainant's ex-boyfriend's ripped sweatshirt.

Officers disregarded that both Complainant and Complainant's ex-boyfriend made allegations of assault against each other. Officers disregarded finding Complainant outside of her apartment with no shoes on. Officers disregarded Complainant's ex-boyfriend stating that Complainant had texted him prior to Complainant's ex-boyfriend calling 911 that she was going to call 911 if he did not disclose his whereabouts with their four year old daughter. Officers disregarded Complainant's similar statements to officers that she called 911 twice that day: first when she wanted to find the whereabouts of her 4 year old daughter and a second time to report Complainant's ex-boyfriend's assault and kicking her out of her residence. Officers disregarded Complainant's ex-boyfriend's admission to assaulting Complainant when he told officers that Complainant grabbed and assaulted him, which prompted him to push her out of the home and lock the door behind her.

Officers did not take into account Complainant's ex-boyfriend's contradictory claims about being on the lease and failure to provide documentation.

Complainant requested that her ex-boyfriend be tested for alcohol, based on erratic and aggressive behavior. Officers dismissed the request without explanation or documentation.

Complainant repeatedly stated that her ex-boyfriend had a history of assaulting her and was mentally unstable. Officers did not take into account Complainant's statements of prior assault despite having seen Complainant's ex-boyfriend's CJIS record.

Officers disregarded having observed Complainant's ex-boyfriend acting aggressively multiple times, such as pounding tables, yelling expletives, and pounding on the couch while his four-year-old daughter was less than 5 feet away from him. Officers also disregarded Complainant's ex-boyfriend forcefully grabbing his four-year-old daughter from Complainant's father.

Complainant's ex-boyfriend, described as larger, aggressive, and with a history of violent behavior, was treated more leniently than Complainant, despite officers' observation on scene and conflicting accounts.



Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

CRB reviewed the evidence and examined the circumstances surrounding Complainant's allegations, finding that the evidence did support the violation of **BPD Rule 102§20 (Self Identification)** against Officers Tom R. Sullivan and Richard A. Errico.

Complainant requested officers' names and badge numbers. Officer Sullivan responded, "I already gave you my name." Neither Officer Sullivan or Errico provided the requested information.

CRB reviewed the evidence and examined the circumstances surrounding Complainant's allegations, finding that the evidence did support the violation of **BPD Rule 102§8** (**Directives and Orders**) against Officer Richard A. Errico.

During Officer Errico's call to the Supervisor, he simply referred to Complainant's ex-boyfriend as being excited and did not give a full account of the aggressive behavior that he and Officer Sullican witnessed that night. The supervisor was not present and did not witness the events, relying on Officer Errico's statements, yet the Supervisor's directives were provided to all on scene as an explanation and justification of Complainant's arrest.

The supervisor requested that Officer Errico speak with Complainant's 15-year old, check to see if there were warrants in the system for Complainant's ex-boyfriend and make an assessment of who to arrest based on all of the observations made by the Officers on scene. Officer Errico briefly spoke with Complainant's son on logistics surrounding leaving the home but failed to interview Complainant's 15-year-old son despite being told to do so during a phone call with his Supervisor. Officer Errico relayed to Officer Sullivan that their Supervisor said to arrest whoever called first so long as Complainant's ex-boyfriend did not have any outstanding warrants. Despite stating to his Supervisor that he was going to call him back, Officer Errico never called his Supervisor back to inform him of the escalated temperament of Complainant's ex-boyfriend as well as the statements made from witnesses on scene after his initial conversation with his Supervisor.

CRB RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE:

According to the Discipline Matrix established by the Boston Police Department, CRB has recommended the following discipline for Boston Police Officer Tom R. Sullivan:



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro Carvalho, Executive Director

- 1. BPD Rule 102 § 4 (Neglect of Duty): 15-Day Suspension
- 2. BPD Rule 102 § 20 (Self Identification) Training and **5 Day Suspension** concurrent with 15 Day Suspension for violation of Rule 102 § 4 (Neglect of Duty)

According to the Discipline Matrix established by the Boston Police Department, CRB has recommended the following discipline for Boston Police Officer Richard Anthony Errico:

- 1. BPD Rule 10 §4 (Neglect of Duty): 15-Day Suspension
- 2. BPD Rule 102§20 (Self Identification) Training and **5 Day Suspension concurrent** with 15 Day Suspension for violation of Rule 102 § 4 (Neglect of Duty)
- 3. BPD Rule 102§8 (Directives and Orders): **5 Day Suspension from and after 15 Day Suspension** for violation of Rule 102 § 4 (Neglect of Duty)