

Office of Police Accountability and Transparency Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

CIVILIAN REVIEW BOARD (CRB) - COMPLAINT #511

Date of Incident: June 21, 2025 **Time of Incident:** 3:00 AM

Location of Incident: Dorchester, MA 02124

Date of Filing: June 21, 2021

Date of CRB Decision: November 13, 2025

BOSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT (BPD) EMPLOYEE(S):

Employee Name	District	Employee ID #	Sex	Race
Officer Carmen Sarai Padron	C-11	ID #144311	F	Hispanic
Officer Patrick Welch	C-11	ID #012606	M	White
Officer Cody Thomas Antonino	C-11	ID #168350	M	White

CASE PROCEDURAL HISTORY:

This is the first time this case has been brought before the CRB.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS:

On June 21, 2025, Complainant filed a complaint with the Office of Police Accountability and Transparency (OPAT) regarding officers **Carmen Sarai Padron**, **ID** #144311, **Patrick Welch**, **ID** #012606, and **Cody Thomas Antonino**, **ID** #168350. Complainant alleged she had an active restraining order on her brother. Complainant alleged C-11 officers referenced above ignored this restraining order by bringing her brother to her residence at 3:00 AM on 06/21/2025. Complainant alleged that C-11 officers indicated they could not locate the restraining order and, therefore, were not aware of it on 06/21/2025. Complainant alleged that C-11 officers target victims, refuse to do their jobs, and there is a lack of competence. Complainant alleged that C-11 officers have woken her up at night and constantly come to her residence with a transport vehicle. Complainant alleged their behavior is retaliation for Complainant having filed formal complaints against them.



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

APPLICABLE RULES & LAWS:

- BPD Rule 102§4(Neglect of Duty/Unreasonable Judgment): This includes any conduct or omission that is not in accordance with established and ordinary duties or procedures as to such employees or which constitutes the use of unreasonable judgment in the exercising of any discretion granted
 - a. Allegations of Misconduct: Complainant had an active restraining order against her brother on the date of the incident, 06/21/2025. This restraining order mandated that Complainant's brother stay away from "XX XXXX XXX Boston, MA 02124" (the residence of Complainant). The restraining order also mandated that Complainant's brother stay within 150 yards of Complainant. By failing to determine if Complainant's brother had a restraining order prior to responding, the officers failed to abide by the BPD's expected duties. The officers also showed unreasonable judgment by escorting Complainant's brother to the residence of Complainant at 3:00 AM on 06/21/2025, thus jeopardizing her safety.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

- 1. On July 16, 2025, OPAT Investigator conducted a telephone interview with **Complainant.** During the interview, she recounted an incident on June 21, 2025, when officers arrived at her house in a transport vehicle to arrest her at around 3:00 AM. Complainant stated the following:
 - a. The C-11 officers brought Complainant's brother with them. The police flashed their lights as if they were preparing for a legitimate arrest, but they left when no one opened the door.
 - b. Complainant believed the BPD had no reason to come to her house with someone against whom she had a restraining order.
 - c. She expressed frustration with C-11 for not taking citizen complaints seriously and for showing disrespect to minorities.
 - d. Complainant wants the officers involved in her situation to face reprimand.
- 2. On November 5, 2025, OPAT Investigator reviewed the **ring camera footage** provided by Complainant. The video captured two white male officers interacting with Complainant's brother. One officer instructed the black male, identified as Complainant's brother, to try the keys on the door and ring the bell to see if anyone would respond. The footage also revealed that it was dark outside, prompting the officers to use their flashlights. One officer advised, "Your best bet is to come back in the morning with another escort." The officers then walked away from the property.



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

- 3. On November 5, 2025, OPAT Investigator received and reviewed the police report *I# XXXXXX*. The police report showed the following:
 - a. On Saturday, June 21, 2025, at 1:39 AM, the victim stated that his sister/suspect/Complainant changed the locks of the first-floor apartment where he resides at the location mentioned above. The victim stated he left home on 6/20/2025 at approximately 1:00 PM to go to work, and when he returned on 6/21/25 at about 11:50 PM, he was unable to gain entry because the locks to the home were changed. The victim was escorted to the residence in order to make contact with the suspect's oldest son, who lives on the second floor, to no avail."
- 4. On November 5 and November 6, 2025, BPD informed OPAT Investigator that there was no Body-Worn Camera (BWC) footage. BPD explained, "This was taken in person at the district, the officers do not have BWC, and there is no BWC footage on that date for either officer."
- 5. On November 6, 2025, OPAT Investigator reviewed several **restraining orders** naming Complainant and her brother. Among them was the restraining order at issue.
 - a. <u>Docket No.: XXXXRO-XXXX:</u> Plaintiff listed as Complainant; Defendant listed as Complainant's brother. A restraining order was issued by the Dorchester Division of the Boston Municipal Court (BMC) on 06/14/2018 at 4:15 PM. Complainant's brother was ordered not to abuse the Plaintiff, stating a substantial likelihood of immediate danger of abuse. This order was terminated on 7/20/2018.
 - b. <u>Docket No.: XXXXRO-XXXX</u>: Plaintiff listed as Complainant; Defendant listed as Complainant's brother. A restraining order was issued by the Dorchester Division of the BMC on 06/20/2025 at 1:08 PM. The order was made without any advance notice because the Court determined that there was a substantial likelihood of immediate danger of abuse. Defendant was ordered not to abuse the Plaintiff. Defendant was ordered not to contact the Plaintiff in person and to stay at least 150 yards away from the Plaintiff. The Defendant was ordered to immediately leave and stay away from the Plaintiff's residence, located at XX XXXXXX, Boston, MA 02124. This restraining order expired on 07/07/2025 at 9:00 AM.
 - c. <u>Docket No.: XXXXRO-XXXX</u>: Plaintiff listed as Complainant's brother; Defendant listed as Complainant. A restraining order was issued by the Dorchester Division of the BMC on 06/23/2025 at 12:26 PM. The order was issued without any advance notice because the Court determined that there was a substantial likelihood of immediate danger of abuse. Defendant was ordered not to abuse the Plaintiff. Defendant was ordered not to contact the Plaintiff in person and to stay at least 100 yards away from the Plaintiff. The



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

Defendant was ordered to immediately leave and stay away from the Plaintiff's residence, located at XX XXXXXX, Boston, MA, Unit X 02124. This restraining order expired on 07/07/2025 at 9:00 AM. On 07/07/2025, this order was extended by the Court to 10/07/2025.

- 6. On November 7, 2025, OPAT Investigator obtained additional information from the Dorchester Division of BMC via a telephone call with Clerk Ms. Antonia Aquino. Ms. Aquino clarified (from information from her database with the Dorchester Division of BMC) that on 07/07/2025, the Court took no action in extending or modifying the restraining order (Docket No.: XXXXRO-XXXX) and therefore that order expired on 07/07/2025. Additionally, on November 7, 2025, Ms. Antonia Aquino sent via email a fax transmittal sheet. This fax transmittal sheet showed the successful transmission of the restraining order (*Docket No.: XXXXRO-XXXX*) to BPD C-11, attention Deputy Supervisor at fax number 617-343-5314 on 06/20/2025 at 15:02 and referenced Docket No. XXXXRO-XXXX.
- 7. On November 7, 2025, November 10, 2025, and November 11, 2025, OPAT Investigator sent multiple emails attempting to schedule an interview with Police Officer Carmen Sarai Padron, ID #144311, via email to schedule an interview. Despite these efforts, Officer Padron did not respond.
- 8. On November 7, 2025, November 10, 2025, and November 11, 2025, OPAT Investigator sent multiple emails attempting to schedule an interview with Police Officer **Patrick Welch, ID** #012606, via email to schedule an interview. Despite these efforts, Officer Welch did not respond.
- 9. On November 7, 2025, November 10, 2025, and November 11, 2025, OPAT Investigator sent multiple emails attempting to schedule an interview with Police Officer Cody Thomas Antonino, ID #168350, via email to schedule an interview. Despite these efforts, Officer Antonino did not respond.
- 10. On November 7, 2025, BPD informed OPAT Investigator that Complainant had over 50 reports in the system.



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

EVIDENCE REQUESTED/REVIEWED:

Evidence	Description	Availability Status
Complainant's Interview	Phone interview on July 16, 2025	Available
OPAT Complainant Form/Intake Forms	Complainant's statements on OPAT Intake form	Available
Police report	Police report I# XXXXXXX	Available
Restaining Orders	Three restraining orders naming Complainant and Complainant's brother.	Available
Copy of Fax Transmittal Sheet from BMC	Fax transmittal sheet shows successful transmission of the restraining order to BPD on 06/20/2025	Available



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

CRB DECISION:

The CRB reached a unanimous decision (6-0), Sustained regarding allegations against Officer Carmen Sarai Padron, ID #144311, for violation of Rule 102§4(Neglect of Duty/Unreasonable Judgment).

The CRB reached a unanimous decision (6-0), Sustained regarding allegations against Officer Patrick Welch, ID #012606, for violation of Rule 102§4(Neglect of Duty/Unreasonable Judgment).

The CRB reached a unanimous decision (6-0), Sustained regarding allegations against Cody Thomas Antonino, ID #168350, for violation of Rule 102§4(Neglect of Duty/Unreasonable Judgment).

BPD Employee Name	Applicable Rule	CRB Ruling
Officer Carmen Sarai Padron, ID #144311	Rule 102§4(Neglect of Duty/Unreasonable Judgment)	Sustained
Officer Patrick Welch, ID #012606	Rule 102§4(Neglect of Duty/Unreasonable Judgment)	Sustained
Officer Cody Thomas Antonino, ID #168350	Rule 102§4(Neglect of Duty/Unreasonable Judgment)	Sustained

After reviewing all the evidence and the circumstances surrounding Complainant's allegations, CRB sustains the allegations against officers Carmen Sarai Padron, Patrick Welch and Cody Thomas Antonino in violation of Rule 102§4(Neglect of Duty/Unreasonable Judgment).

An active restraining order was in place against Complainant's brother on the date of the incident. This order was effective until July 7, 2025, and mandated that Complainant's brother stay away from the entire residence and maintain a distance of 150 yards from Complainant, as well as from Complainant's workplace.

Officers displayed unreasonable judgement by escorting Complainant's brother to the residence of Complainant at 3:00 AM (the wee hours of the morning) on 06/21/2025, thus jeopardizing her safety. Officers disregarded or failed to check the history of restraining orders and incidents at that location between Complainant and her brother, and tried to assist Complainant's brother in getting inside the residence when he admitted he was locked out.



Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

The footage from the Ring camera also indicated that it was dark outside, prompting the officers to utilize their flashlights.

CRB RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE:

According to the Discipline Matrix established by the Boston Police Department, CRB has recommended the following discipline for the following Boston Police Officers:

BPD Employee Name	Applicable BPD Rule	Recommended Discipline
Officer Carmen Sarai Padron	Rule 102§4(Neglect of Duty/Unreasonable Judgment)	Oral Reprimand
Officer Patrick Welch	Rule 102§4(Neglect of Duty/Unreasonable Judgment)	Oral Reprimand
Officer Cody Thomas Antonino	Rule 102§4(Neglect of Duty/Unreasonable Judgment)	Oral Reprimand