To: Lieutenant Manmeet Colon  
From: Sergeant Christopher J. Fennessy  
Date: January 20, 2022  
Re: Internal Affairs Case # 21C-053

Complainant: Virginia Hawthorne
Date of Incident: July 7, 2021
General Order Violations: Rules of Conduct General Order 1.03, Body Worn Cameras
General Order 7.10, Traffic Stop Statistics, General Order 12.01, Department Mission
and Values, General Order 1.04
Subject Officers(s): Sergeant S. Kendall

**Summary:**

On July 8, 2021, the Office of Internal Affairs received a civilian complaint form authored by Virginia Hawthorne.

On page one of her civilian complaint form under the section titled “Employee Complained about,” Hawthorne documented, “Name and badge number never provided by officer. Car was an Arcadia SUV, tinted (dark) windows, lights in the grill. No identifying marks that this was a police vehicle.” On page one of her civilian complaint form after the question “Are you afraid for your safety, or that of any other person, for any reason as a result of making this complaint” Hawthorne checked the “Yes” box. Hawthorne documented, “In my response to question 2, this officer clearly exhibited road rage. In her civilian complaint form under question one “To your knowledge, was all or any part of the Incident complained of video or audio taped by anyone?” Hawthorne documented, “In my response to question 1 I contacted SCSU Police. Officer Cordero stated they might have surveillance video available. Case number 21-9739. Officer Cordero’s phone # [redacted]”
Hawthorne documented on the first page of her Civilian Complaint form that the incident in which Sergeant Kendall stopped her vehicle was July 7, 2021. Hawthorne did not identify any New Haven police officer on the civilian complaint form she submitted to Internal Affairs.

Under the “details of the incident” section on the civilian complaint form, Hawthorne documented the following:

“I was driving down Crescent St at about 0707. I stopped for a red light there was a silver SUV in front of me. The light turned green. The silver SUV did not move. I waited a few seconds and tapped my horn. The SUV continued straight. I made right hand turn on to Ella Grasso. I then noticed the SUV making a U-turn and following me. Then I saw flashing lights from the SUV. I hesitated in pulling over as many cars in New Have have novelty lights installed. I did nothing wrong. The car was tailing me to where I no longer saw the grill. I hesitated and pulled over. The SUV then pulled beside me. I was unable to see inside because of the dark tints. The passenger side window was then pulled down and this women began asking me where I was going. She then stated she was a police officer. No name, wasn’t sure if it was New Haven, Hamden, or SCSU officer.”

On page three of her civilian complaint form Hawthorne documented:

“When I first saw the passenger window go down, I was afraid someone was about to shoot me for beeping my horn. She then asked, “Where are you going?” I responded to work. Then stated “You didn’t realize it was a police officer in front of you.” I said no, you remained stopped at a greenlight. She stated, “There is construction on the road.” I said there was no sign alluding to that. The road was prepared to be resurfaced, She then stated, “You are not the only person on the road you know.” I get that. Just tapped my horn in in case she was distracted. I apologized several times. She stated now I was detained from getting to work on time. Thank her, apologized again and waited for her to pull off. She did not move her
vehicle to allow me to continue to drive the remainder of my way to work, very upset at a police officer exhibiting road rage and, abusing her power. I was harassed and detained."

After accepting this civilian complaint form from Hawthorne, I conducted several preliminary checks into the incident. I conducted a search in evidence.com for any body-worn camera footage associated with Hawthorne for the incident she described in her civilian complaint form. I was met with negative results. I also conducted an in-house database check via RMS for any documentation of the incident involving Hawthorne and was met with negative results. I was also unable to locate any police radio transmissions for this incident described by Hawthorne. The alleged actions of the officer, according to Hawthorne, are listed as serious misconduct and shall be investigated by the Office of Internal Affairs according to General Order 2.08 Civilian Complaints

**Verint Records:**

On July 8, 2021, I conducted a search of the Verint Records System for the date of July 7, 2021, between the time frame of 07:00 AM to 08:00 AM. This search revealed no audio records for the motor vehicle stop involving Hawthorne. It would appear that the motor vehicle stop involving Hawthorne was never communicated to New Haven Public Safety Answering Point.

**SCSU Police Department Officer Cordero:**

On July 8, 2021, at approximately 1:56 PM, I sent an email to SCSU Police Officer Cordero. In the email I identified myself and documented that I was investigating a civilian complaint which occurred near the SCSU campus. In the email I referenced SCSU police case number 21-9739 and asked if Officer Cordero would contact me regarding possible video footage pertinent to my investigation. On July 9, 2021 I received an email from SCSU Officer Cordero which contained still pictures. Officer Cordero documented in this email that the video was too large of a file to be sent via email. Officer Cordero documented that a copy of
this video file should be available to pick up the following week from SCSU Police Department.

On July 16, 2021, I retrieved the video surveillance footage from the SCSU Police Department. Ofc. Cordero provided me with a USB drive with the surveillance footage. I reviewed the footage (one video was 1 minute and 4 seconds in length and the other 10 seconds in length) and was able to identify Hawthorne’s vehicle. I was unable to locate the silver Acadia described by Hawthorne in the footage. A copy of this surveillance footage and email shall be maintained in this investigative case file.

**GPS Coordinates for New Haven Police Marker Plate CT 587NH —

Sergeant Shayna Kendall’s Department Issued Vehicle:**

On July 9, 2021, I sent an email to G. Oliwa, the Project Leader for the New Haven Web Site and Application Support, requesting the GPS coordinates for CT 587NH for the date of July 7, 2021. I also inquired with Oliwa if any other GMC Acadia’s were assigned to the New Haven Police Department and active on July 7, 2021. It is common knowledge among sworn members of the New Haven Police Department of Police Service that the silver GMC Acadia bearing marker plate CT 587NH is assigned to sworn members of the NHPD who are assigned to work at the New Haven Police Academy. I also know this from having worked at the New Haven Police Academy in my sworn capacity. Lt. Maturo confirmed the GMC Acadia bearing CT marker 587NH is a take-home Dept vehicle currently issued to Sgt. Shayna Kendall, who is assigned to the New Haven Police Academy as Deputy Commander of Training. Lt. Maturo confirmed this information in an email he sent on July 9, 2021, at 11:46 AM.

On July 14, 2021, I received the GPS coordinates back from Oliwa for CT 587NH. Oliwa documented that marker plate CT 587NH was the only GMC Acadia in the New Haven police fleet and that it was active on the date of July 7, 2021 between the hours of 05:00 AM and 11:00 AM. The GPS coordinates revealed the following:
On July 7th, 2021 at 07:07:11 AM the GPS coordinates for the Silver Acadia bearing marker plate CT 587NH showed that the vehicle was at 83 Wintergreen Ave., New Haven, CT and listed the Max MPH at 37. The next available GPS coordinates showed that the vehicle was at 476 Crescent St. New Haven, CT at 07:08:11 AM and listed the Max MPH at 36. The next available GPS coordinates showed that the vehicle was at 1768 Ella T Grasso Blvd., New Haven, CT at 07:09:12 AM and listed the Max MPH at 56. The next available GPS coordinates showed that the vehicle was at 1702 Ella T Grasso Blvd, New Haven, CT at 07:10:13 AM and listed the Max MPH at 45. The next available GPS coordinates showed that the vehicle was at 1807 Ella T Grasso Blvd, New Haven, CT at 07:11:14 AM and listed the Max MPH at 35. The next available GPS coordinates showed that the vehicle was at 295 Colony Rd, New Haven, CT at 07:12:14 AM and listed the Max MPH at 35. The next available GPS coordinates showed that the vehicle was at 81 Fournier St, New Haven, CT at 07:13:14 AM and listed the Max MPH at 25. The next available GPS coordinates showed that the vehicle was at 742 Sherman Pkwy, New Haven, CT at 07:14:15 AM and listed the Max MPH at 12. The next available GPS coordinates documented that the vehicle was at 742 Sherman Pkwy, New Haven, CT at 07:15:10 AM and listed the Max MPH at 0. The landmark listing documented for 742 Sherman Pkwy, New Haven, CT. was PD Garage/Pd Academy.

The GPS coordinates for CT 587NH on July 7th, 2021 confirmed that this vehicle, which matched the description given by Hawthorne, was in the same areas on the same date and same approximate timeframe that Hawthorne documented in her civilian complaint form. That these areas are also located in close proximity to the New Haven Police Academy, located at 710 Sherman Parkway, where Sgt. Shayna Kendall is currently assigned as the Deputy Academy Commander. It should be noted that the Verizon GPS Network fleet system that the City of New Haven presently utilizes was not configured to record patrol vehicle emergency light activation or length of time for such activation. A copy of these GPS records shall be maintained in this investigative case file.

Body-Worn Camera Query in Evidence.com:
On July 9, 2021, I performed a search in Evidence.com for any body-worn camera footage recorded by Sgt. Kendall for the date of July 7, 2021. This search yielded negative results for any body-worn camera footage recorded by Sgt. Kendall for the motor vehicle stop involving Hawthorne. The last body-worn camera footage segment listed in evidence.com for Sgt. Kendall was recorded on October 26, 2019, for an unrelated incident and uploaded on April 28, 2021. During this investigation I confirmed that Sergeant Kendall was issued and trained on the requirements and proper use of body worn cameras. On July 16, 2022, I sent an email to Sergeant Hawley. In the email I requested the information for the body worn cameras assigned to Sergeant Kendall. On January 17, 2022, I received a reply email from Sergeant Hawley. In the email Sergeant Hawley documented that body worn cameras 306 A and 306 B are assigned to Sergeant Kendall. A copy of this evidence.com record shall be maintained in this investigative case file.

**Canvass for Video Surveillance:**

On July 17, 2021, I conducted a canvas of the area identified by the GPS coordinates for the motor vehicle stop. The canvas was performed to determine if there were any surveillance cameras which may have captured the interaction between Sergeant Kendall and Hawthorne. This search yielded negative results for footage of the motor vehicle stop.

**Sergeant Shayna Kendall - Department Issued**

**Telephone Number (475) 331-3251:**

On July 25, 2021, I sent an email to G. Oliwa requesting the telephone records for NHPD telephone number (475) 331-3251 for the date of July 7, 2021 from the hours of 06:30 to 09:00 AM. NHPD records confirmed that this telephone number is issued to Sgt. Shayna
Kendall. The phone records were requested based on Hawthorne indicating in her civilian complaint form that the officer who pulled her over may have been “distracted.”

On August 5, 2021, I received an email from G. Oliwa with the phone records attached for telephone number (475) 331-3251 for the dates of July 6, 2021, through July 12, 2021, even though I only requested the records for July 7, 2021, between the hours of 06:30 AM to 09:00 AM. The telephone records from subscriber Verizon listed the account number as 242067705-00002 and listed the invoice number as 9884567558. The Verizon telephone records listed Shayna Kendall as the name associated with (475) 331-3251.

The telephone records documented that at 07:07 AM this telephone number was on an active phone call with telephone number [REDACTED] for the date of July 7, 2021. The records documented that this phone call lasted 3 minutes in duration. The records also documented that at 07:11 AM this telephone number was on an active phone call with telephone number [REDACTED]. The records documented that this phone call lasted 120 minutes in duration. Telephone number [REDACTED] was later confirmed as belonging to Ofc. K. Hoffman based on Telestaff records. These records indicated that Sergeant Kendall spoke with Officer Hoffman one additional time on July 7, 2021 at 3:40 PM for eight minutes.

The Verizon telephone records indicated that telephone number (475) 331-3251 issued to Sgt. Shayna Kendall, was actively in operation on the same date/time frame that Sgt. Kendall’s department issued vehicle (CT 587NH) was in operation based on the GPS coordinates listed above. Hawthorne documented in her civilian complaint form that when the Silver Acadia did not proceed at the green light, she believed the driver may have been “distracted.” Hawthorne later stated in her interview that she could not observe if the operator of the Silver Acadia was on the phone or not because of the tinted windows. Hawthorne documented in her civilian complaint form that she believed the incident occurred between 07:05 AM and 07:10 AM. This corroborates the time the silver GMC Acadia bearing marker plate 587NH was in operation in the area specified by Hawthorne in her complaint. A copy of this phone record shall be maintained in this investigative case file.
I also received telephone records back for Sergeant Kendall’s department issued cell phone number (475) 331-3251 for the dates of July 6, 2021 through July 12, 2021, even though I only requested that records for July 7, 2021, between the hours of 06:30 AM to 09:00 AM. The additional cell phone records for Sergeant Kendall’s department issued cell phone revealed that there were a total of thirteen (13) phone calls between Officer Hoffman’s telephone number, [REDACTED], and Sergeant Kendall’s work issued telephone number. Below is a list of these telephone contacts and their durations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/06/2021</td>
<td>3:38 PM</td>
<td>Duration 7 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/2021</td>
<td>4:10 PM</td>
<td>Duration 34 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/2021</td>
<td>5:10 PM</td>
<td>Duration 37 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/2021</td>
<td>5:48 PM</td>
<td>Duration 20 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/07/2021</td>
<td>7:11 AM</td>
<td>Duration 120 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/07/2021</td>
<td>3:40 PM</td>
<td>Duration 8 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2021</td>
<td>2:14 PM</td>
<td>Duration 42 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/2021</td>
<td>2:49 PM</td>
<td>Duration 1 Minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/2021</td>
<td>2:49 PM</td>
<td>Duration 22 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/2021</td>
<td>3:19 PM</td>
<td>Duration 17 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/2021</td>
<td>3:45 PM</td>
<td>Duration 1 Minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/2021</td>
<td>3:46 PM</td>
<td>Duration 106 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/2021</td>
<td>5:59 PM</td>
<td>Duration 24 Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview Virginia Hawthorne:**

On July 28, 2021, at approximately 9:57 AM, I conducted an audio recorded voluntary interview with Hawthorne at the Office of Internal Affairs Hawthorne read, signed, and acknowledged she understood the False Statement Form. Hawthorne read, signed, and acknowledged that she understood the Voluntary Statement Form I asked Hawthorne if she was appearing voluntarily of her own free will to assist me in investigating her complaint by providing this statement. Hawthorne stated that she was.
I asked Hawthorne if she could provide me with a summary of the incident in her own words. Hawthorne stated that she left her home around 7:00 AM and was on her way to work. She is currently employed as a registered nurse at Yale Hospital. Hawthorne stated that she stopped for the red light on Crescent Street near Ella Grasso Blvd. Hawthorne stated there was a silver SUV that was stopped in front of her at the red light. Hawthorne stated that the traffic control signal light turned green. Hawthorne stated that she waited a few seconds, and the silver SUV did not move. Hawthorne stated that she beeped her vehicle’s horn lightly in case the operator of the silver SUV was distracted.

Hawthorne stated that the silver SUV proceeded straight onto Crescent Street while Hawthorne turned right onto Ella Grasso Blvd. Hawthorne stated she then observed the silver SUV make a U-turn on Crescent Street and begin following behind Hawthorne’s vehicle. Hawthorne stated she saw emergency lights flash behind her vehicle. Hawthorne stated that she was not sure what the lights were at the time, but that the lights were on the grill of the Silver SUV. Hawthorne stated that the Silver SUV was so close to her vehicle that she could not see the grille of the silver SUV any longer. Hawthorne stated that she pulled to the side of the road because she wasn’t sure if this was some sort of road rage incident and she was afraid the vehicle might strike her vehicle in the rear due to its close proximity.

Hawthorne stated that the Silver SUV then pulled alongside her vehicle which Hawthorne stated made her fear for her safety. Hawthorne stated that there are many vehicles she has seen in New Haven with “Novelty” lights. Hawthorne stated that when the silver SUV’s tinted window began to roll down, she thought she might be shot at and immediately ducked down in her vehicle. Hawthorne stated she then heard a voice and saw the silhouette of a woman inside the silver SUV. Hawthorne stated that she was too afraid to look further into the vehicle. Hawthorne stated that the female operator of the silver SUV said, “I bet you didn’t know that you were beeping at a police officer.” Hawthorne stated that she responded by saying, “No, but you were stopped at a green light.”

Hawthorne stated that the female operator said, “Well, what’s your hurry?” Hawthorne stated she told the female that she was on her way to work. Hawthorne stated that the female
replied, "Well now, you're detained. And you're not the only one on the road you know." Hawthorne stated that the female told her that it was a construction zone. Hawthorne stated that there was no active construction zone and that the road pavement had already been milled. Hawthorne stated that there was no longer a construction sign up and that the construction sign hadn't been displayed for days. Hawthorne stated that she thanked the female four or five times and that she just wanted to be free to leave. Hawthorne stated that the female did not move her vehicle or tell her she was free to leave at any point during the encounter. Hawthorne stated that the female's vehicle was positioned in such a way that it made it difficult for Hawthorne to leave. Hawthorne stated she was eventually able to maneuver her vehicle and leave the scene to continue to her place of employment.

I asked Hawthorne if she was able to see if the female was in a police uniform. Hawthorne stated she did not see. I asked Hawthorne how the female identified herself as a police officer. Hawthorne responded that the female operator said, "I'm a police officer." Hawthorne stated that she wasn't sure if the female operator was actually a "cop" because she "didn't say who she was, and I was scared." Hawthorne stated that she later called New Haven Police and described the vehicle that stopped her and was told that it may have been an off-duty vehicle, but there were no vehicles they were aware of. Hawthorne then called SCSU Police Department and spoke with Officer Cordero. Hawthorne stated that Ofc. Cordero asked for Hawthorne's vehicle's marker plate number and said that if a police officer stopped her, that there should be a record of her marker plate being searched. Hawthorne stated that she gave Ofc. Cordero permission to perform a search for her marker plate.

Hawthorne stated that Ofc. Cordero told her that he would review the surveillance tapes from the SCSU campus to see if they captured the vehicle that performed the motor vehicle stop on her vehicle. Hawthorne stated she also contacted a friend who was a CT State Trooper and asked them about the vehicle that pulled her over. Hawthorne stated that she did not receive any information from this friend. Hawthorne stated that Ofc. Cordero contacted her and told her she should contact the New Haven Police Department again since her marker plate had
Hawthorne identified the marker plate to her vehicle as CT marker plate

I asked Hawthorne to describe where the lights were located on the vehicle that stopped her. Hawthorne stated that the lights were located in the front grill of the GMC SUV. I asked Hawthorne if the female police officer ever requested her license, registration, or insurance information. Hawthorne stated that she did not. I asked Hawthorne if the female officer ever exited her vehicle. Hawthorne stated that she did not. Hawthorne stated that she believed the GMC to be an Acadia because it was smaller than the GMC Denali and she is familiar with the GMC Terrain, and it was not a Terrain. I asked Hawthorne if the operator of the GMC SUV was on the phone. Hawthorne stated that the windows to the GMC SUV were tinted and she was unable to see through them, so she was unsure.

I asked Hawthorne what her path of travel was to arrive at the intersection of Crescent Street and Ella T. Grasso Blvd. Hawthorne stated that she traveled on Fitch Street and turned left onto Crescent Street then right onto Ella T. Grasso Blvd. Hawthorne stated that she was so upset about the incident that she returned to the area herself to see if she was able to locate any surveillance cameras which may have captured the incident. Hawthorne stated her personal search for video surveillance in the area where she was stopped by the female officer yielded negative results. I explained to Hawthorne that I performed a canvass of the area as well for surveillance cameras which may have captured the motor vehicle stop. I told Hawthorne that I was also unable to locate any surveillance cameras in the area.

During the interview I showed Hawthorne the video surveillance I recovered from Ofc. Cordero. I asked Hawthorne if she could identify her vehicle in the footage. Hawthorne identified her vehicle as the dark blue Audi pictured in the footage. I explained that I was unable to locate the GMC Acadia on the video footage provided by Ofc. Cordero. Hawthorne stated that she did not see the GMC Acadia until she was behind it at the red light on Crescent Street before it’s intersection with Ella T. Grasso Boulevard.
I asked Hawthorne to describe the positioning of the GMC Acadia in relation to her vehicle after being pulled over. Hawthorne stated that the GMC Acadia was positioned alongside her vehicle in side-by-side fashion. Hawthorne stated that the hood of the GMC Acadia was positioned so that it was visible from her vehicle’s front-driver side window, but not parallel. She described the Acadia as being slightly farther back than parallel from her vehicle, but not completely even with her vehicle. Hawthorne stated that she was positioned where she would be able to see into the Acadia, but Hawthorne was afraid to look inside the vehicle for a long time.

I explained to Hawthorne that she documented in her civilian complaint form that she believed the officer who stopped her abused her power. I asked Hawthorne if she could elaborate on this statement. Hawthorne stated that she was detained for no reason. Hawthorne further pointed out that her marker plate was never searched by the officer. Hawthorne stated that when she spoke with Ofc. Cordero she was advised that her marker plate was never searched, and a police officer would have searched it while performing a motor vehicle stop. Hawthorne stated that this made her concerned. I asked Hawthorne if she would be able to identify the female officer who performed the motor vehicle stop. Hawthorne said she would not be able to do so because she was afraid to stare at the female officer during the encounter. The interview ended at 10:20 AM.

**Telestaff Records:**

On September 7, 2021, I performed a search of Telestaff records. Based on Telestaff records, Sergeant Kendall was scheduled for duty on July 7th, 2021 for the hours of 0700 through 1500 hours. Based on her transfer letter, she is assigned to work at the police academy as the Deputy Commander of Training with a Monday-Friday work rotation/schedule. Based on Telestaff records, Officer Hoffman was scheduled to work C squad in District 6 on July 7th, 2021.
Internal Affairs Investigation 21C-053 - Extension Requests:

On September 8, 2021 at approximately 9:49 AM I sent an email to Captain Zannelli requesting an extension for this investigation categorized under New Haven Police Internal Affairs case number 21C-053. On September 9, 2021, I was granted a 45-day extension for this investigation by Interim Chief of Police Renee Dominguez. This email was forwarded to Union President Cotto.

On October 24, 2021, I requested an additional extension for this investigation through Lt. Colon (OIC) of Internal Affairs. On October 25, 2021, I received an email from Lieutenant Colon documenting that a 90-day extension was granted for this investigation by Interim Chief R. Dominguez. This email was forwarded to Union President Cotto. A copy of these emails shall be maintained in this investigative file.

Based on Attendance Controller records Sergeant Kendall was on Administrative Covid leave from August 4th through August 6th 2021, which was in conjunction with her regularly scheduled days off, August 7th and 8th. On August 9th 2021, she was scheduled on vacation through August 17th. Additionally, Sergeant Kendall was scheduled for H days October 21st and 22nd as well as the 27th, 28th, and 29th of October 2021. Also, Sergeant Kendall was scheduled for training and/or as a monitor for another agency for a promotional process from August 30 through September 3, 2021.

Based on Attendance Controller records Officer Hoffman was on days off and Administrative COVID leave from September 21st through September 30th. Officer Hoffman was on days off, Administrative Covid leave, and sick days from October 11th through October 18th. In addition, Union Representation was unavailable for interviews on several days in September and October. As a result of this scheduling concerns a second extension was requested.
Interview Sergeant S. Kendall:

On November 5, 2021, at 09:50AM Lieutenant Colon and I conducted an audio recorded interview with Sergeant Shayna Kendall in the Office of Internal Affairs located on the first floor of the New Haven Police Department. Sergeant Shayna Kendall declined union representation and signed the union representation declination form. Sergeant Shayna Kendall read, signed, and stated that she understood the False Statement Form. Sergeant Shayna Kendall read, signed, and stated she understood the Internal Investigation Form. I allowed Sergeant Shayna Kendall to review the civilian complaint form authored by Hawthorne prior to the interview commencing.

I explained to Sergeant Kendall that I was unable to locate any reports that were authored for the interaction between Hawthorne and herself. I asked Sergeant Kendall if she completed any documentation for this incident. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she completed a motor vehicle statistics form for this incident. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she authored an infraction for this incident. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No.”

I explained to Sergeant Kendall that I was unable to locate any body-worn camera footage for this incident. I asked Sergeant Kendall if she recorded any body-worn camera footage for this incident. Sergeant Kendall replied, “NO. because I was not on duty.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she remembered this incident. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yes.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she could please describe the incident as she understood it at the date and time it occurred.

Sergeant Kendall stated that she was late to work and had notified her commander, Lt. Maturo, that she would be arriving late. Sergeant Kendall stated that at that time she was traveling to work and was not in her police uniform. Sergeant Kendall said, “Sure. Um, I was late to work. I had notified my commander that I would be arriving late. Um, during this time, I was travelling on my way to work, um, so I wasn’t in uniform or anything.” Sergeant Kendall stated that she was wearing, “Sweats and a t-shirt.” Sergeant Kendall stated that
while she was on Crescent Street, she observed that a vehicle, “appeared to be pressuring another driver so, um kind ...of like, you can see the, the headlights in the...like on your side mirrors. Um, we get up to where they were milling the road...” Sergeant Kendall continued stating that the road on Crescent Street was being milled and as a result there was a heavy dip in the road where the fresh milling had been started. Sergeant Kendall stated that as a result of this dip, cars slow down.

Sergeant Kendall stated that at this time she, “saw the car cut a right onto Ella Grasso.” Sergeant Kendall stated she then performed a U-turn and, “went to the car so I’m thinking, oh, my gosh, is there an emergency? I see this car. Is this car in distress? Is something going on in the car?” Sergeant Kendall continued, “So I, I pull up right onto Ella Grasso from Crescent. Not like, a ways up the street or anything, um, but I can remember pulling on the side of the car, she rolls down her window.” Sergeant Kendall stated that she said, “Are you okay? Are you Okay? Where are you going?” Sergeant Kendall stated that she believed Hawthorne told her she was going to work. Sergeant Kendall stated that she again asked Hawthorne, “But are you okay? I saw the way you were driving back in the, um, where they were milling, they’re doing construction. If you don’t have an emergency, are you okay?”

Sergeant Kendall stated that Hawthorne told her that she was going to be late for work. Sergeant Kendall said, “But if you get into an accident, you’re gonna really be late for work. You have to be careful on the road.” Sergeant Kendall stated that she did not say anything more to Hawthorne and, because her vehicle was parallel to Hawthorne’s vehicle. Sergeant Kendall moved over and began driving towards work. Sergeant Kendall stated that Hawthorne’s vehicle continued on Ella Grasso Boulevard. I asked Sergeant Kendall if at any point Hawthorne’s vehicle was behind her vehicle. Sergeant Kendall said, “She was, she was behind me because she came...if I can remember, she came, like, almost on the side and then cut that right turn to Ella Grasso Boulevard ‘cause that’s when I had... I was driving on Crescent and then turned around. Sergeant Kendall said, “So then when I saw her make the right, I’m like...it alerted me. I’m, like, oh my gosh, is, is this person okay in this car? And then that’s when I made the U-turn and then, um, and then went up, like, si, parallel to her, side by side.”
I asked Sergeant Kendall if she knew what time this occurred. Sergeant Kendall said, “I do not.” I asked Sergeant Kendall what hours she was scheduled to work. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Uh, 7:00 to 3:00PM.” I asked Sergeant Kendall, “and were you on duty at this ti-at ti-, at the time that this occurred? Sergeant Kendall replied, “No.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she could explain why she felt she was not on duty. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yes. Because I was running late. So, I had notified my, uh, my lieutenant, Lieutenant Maturo at the time that I would be late arriving and that I would let him know when I got there.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall what vehicle she was operating at the time of the incident. Sergeant Kendall said, “Uh, my, uh, the Acadia, my work vehicle.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she knew the marker plate assigned to her work vehicle. Sergeant Kendall stated that she did not know offhand. I asked Sergeant Kendall if her Acadia was a clearly marked police vehicle. Sergeant Kendall said, “Uh, it...just by the municipal plate.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she activated the police lights in her vehicle to signal Hawthorne’s vehicle to pull over. Sergeant Kendall said, “When I made the U-turn because I was making a U-turn in the, Um, in the, in the construction zone to caution drivers that I’m making a U-turn.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if she activated her work vehicles’ emergency lights while she was behind Hawthorne’s vehicle. Sergeant Kendall replied, “I was never behind her vehicle.” I said to Sergeant Kendall, “Okay. But as you’re going up Ella Grasso, was she ahead of you?” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yeah. She was ahead of, she was ahead of me at that time, so are you asking if I activated my lights to pull...to get her to pull over?” I said, “Yes.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “So my lights were activated when I made the U-turn. I don’t know if they were still on when she pulled over, but I don’t recall, like, reactivating them.” Sergeant Kendall continued, “But, again, this is based off my memory from when this occurred in July.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she activated the audible siren in her take home police vehicle. Sergeant Kendall said, “I don’t remember activating the siren, no.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall what violation she observed that prompted her to make the motor vehicle stop. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Um, so reckless use of a highway, um, um, but that’s something I’m just thinking of as we’re sitting here. My, my primary concern was, is there an
emergency that this lady i-, well, now, I know she’s a lady, um, is driving this way and just to make sure that she was okay on my way to work, but you know, not to address a violation of some sort.” I asked Sergeant Kendall what her location was when she observed Hawthorne’s vehicle driving erratically. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Crescent Street.” I then asked Sergeant Kendall the location of the motor vehicle stop. Sergeant Kendall replied, “On Ella Grasso.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she notified dispatch of her location of the motor vehicle stop. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, I was not on duty. I…my primary concern was to make sure that whoever was in the vehicle was okay ‘cause I thought emer-, uh, di-, initial thought was emergency. If there is an emergency, then there’s something that I can do obviously to help, but it wasn’t you know, enforcement action or to address, um, any motor vehicle violations. Like I said, I was not on duty, Um, I literally was in sweats and a, and a t-shirt in the ca-, in the vehicle, um, and so once, you know, the assessment was made that she didn’t need any medical attention, then there was no need for me to continue my conversation with her.

I asked Sergeant Kendall to describe Hawthorne’s demeanor while dealing with her. Sergeant Kendall replied, “She was upset, yeah. She was upset. Almost, uh, maybe agitated.” I explained to Sergeant Kendall that Hawthorne documented in her civilian complaint form that she believed that she was unlawfully detained. I asked Sergeant Kendall if she thought that activating her police lights would lead Hawthorne to believe she was being detained. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. I…based on what she said here, for me I can’t tell you that, Okay. She felt that way. Just because you know, I never exited my car. I checked on her well being and then after that, I was, like, “Okay. You can go. I’m gonna turn around.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if she identified herself as a police officer during the encounter. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. No.” I asked Sergeant Kendall how she positioned her police vehicle during the motor vehicle stop. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Parallel. So, Um, if you were driving up the street and then you have parked cars closest to the curb, I was literally, like, car side by side to her.” I asked Sergeant Kendall how she communicated to Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall stated that she spoke to Hawthorne through the front passenger side window of her police vehicle. I asked Sergeant Kendall if she requested a cover unit. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, I was not on duty or doing any enforcement action. I asked
Sergeant Kendall if she was in a clearly recognizable New Haven police uniform. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if she performed a query of the marker plate for Hawthorne’s vehicle. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. That wasn’t my concern. My concern was I’m off duty and this person in this vehicle may have an emergency. Let me see if everything is okay because, like I said, the, the driving and going through a construction zone where there’s people milling and so there’s a significant dip, you know, people are cautious, obviously, one ‘cause it’s a con-, a construction zone and they don’t want to ruin their car but my first thought was, is everything okay in this car, um, so no, I didn’t...I...you know, there was something else....I didn’t get out of the car. I didn’t...you know, my concern wasn’t, oh, okay. Well, she’s driving too fast in this construction zone. My concern was, is this person okay? Do they need medical attention?” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she ever exited her vehicle. Sergeant Kendall replied, “I was inside my vehicle. I did not exit my vehicle.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if her vehicle’s lights were activated while she was behind Hawthorne’s vehicle as Hawthorne documented in her civilian complaint form. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yeah. So as I mentioned earlier, I don’t remember re-engaging my lights but when I made the U-turn...because there were other cars behind me, when I made the U-turn on Crescent almost like I’m going to work, um, when I made the U-turn, I can’t tell you if I immediately turned them off. So if...so there is a possibility that my lights were still on when I had got up to her but I can’t...I don’t remember, like, re-engaging my, my lights.” I asked Sergeant Kendall what she said to Hawthorne upon making contact with Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Are you okay?”

I asked Sergeant Kendall what Hawthorne said to her. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Uh. I can’t give you her exact words but yes, she’s okay. Um, I asked her, where was she going, is...does she have an emergency. Um, she said she was going o-, she was on her way to work and so I reminded her, I said, “You know, cars are slowing down because there is a construction zone, you have to be careful.” Um, again, these are...I just did...i...you can’t quote me on this, um, “But as long as you don’t have an emergency, Like, we-, we-, we’re
good to go. You’re good to go.” Um, and that’s, that’s kind of where it was left.”

I explained to Sergeant Kendall that Hawthorne documented in her civilian complaint form that she was behind Sergeant Kendall’s vehicle at the red light. When the light turned green, Hawthorne stated that Sergeant Kendall’s vehicle did not move. I explained to Sergeant Kendall that Hawthorne documented that after waiting a few seconds she beeped her horn at Sergeant Kendall. I asked Sergeant Kendall if she was on the phone at the time of the incident. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she was distracted in any way. Sergeant Kendall responded, “No. I don’t remember. Um, but, like I said, at the light was, were the milling was happening so there is a big dip there so, again, I don’t recall, like, I’m sitting at the light or anything like to say, you know, like, that’s why it took a long time but ju-, operators are going slow during that time because, like I said, they’re doing fresh milling, so…”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if she identified herself as a police officer. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. No. I don’t … no. I don’t remember saying, “I’m a police officer.” Again, because like I said, I literally am in, like, a… like, sweats, um, and my primary concern was to make sure she was good.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she provided her name and badge number to Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if any of the conversation with Hawthorne was recorded. Sergeant Kendall, “No, not that I’m aware of, no.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she asked Hawthorne where she was going. Sergeant Kendall replied, “To work.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she told Hawthorne she was detained. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. No. I don’t recall saying, You’re detained.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if there was construction actively occurring in the area at the time of the incident. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yes.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if the construction zone was active at the time of the incident or if it had already been milled. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. It was active so there were trucks out there and cones. But I don’t recall seeing, like, an officer out there so maybe he or she has yet to arrive.” I asked Sergeant Kendall to identify her work cell phone number for the record. Sergeant Kendall replied, “475-331-3251.”
I asked Sergeant Kendall if she remembered the time the incident occurred and explained that Hawthorne estimated it occurred between 7:05 AM and 7:10 AM. Sergeant Kendall replied, “The…again, I, I can’t, I can’t tell you if that was the time, you know. I don’t…it…for me, this was something that was so insignificant considering she was okay, that it’s not something that I can remember saying, “Okay. Well yeah, this was the time.”

I explained that Hawthorne stated she wasn’t sure the person who stopped her was a police officer since there are a lot of people that have novelty lights in their vehicles. I explained that Hawthorne stated that she was afraid she may be shot when an unmarked SUV pulled alongside her vehicle and rolled the passenger side window down. I asked Sergeant Kendall if the windows on her department issued Acadia were tinted. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yeah.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if Hawthorne appeared to be nervous while speaking with her. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. She literally just seemed irritated, like, you know, I was wasting her time. That’s the only thing that I got from her, but not, like…nothing that was, like, fear driven. And that’s….again, that’s my perception of, of her behavior.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if she needed to accelerate quickly to catch up to Hawthorne’s vehicle after Sergeant Kendall performed a U-turn. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Again, I don’t…accelerate? I-, I’m dri-, I was driving at, you know, my…I guess my normal rate of speed. Um, I don’t remember her being such a ways off that I needed to, you know, like, go super fast but it’s nothing that…like, again, I don’t, I don’t remember, “Okay. Well, yeah, I went, you know, this, this many miles per hour, etc.” Um, but I don’t recall her being so far ahead that I needed to go really fast.” I explained to Sergeant Kendall that a search was performed for her department issued vehicle, a GMC Acadia bearing marker plate 587NH. I told Sergeant Kendall that these records indicated that her vehicle was located at 1807 Ella Grasso Boulevard at 7:11 AM. I asked Sergeant Kendall if this was the area that the motor vehicle stop occurred. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yeah. No. I don’t recall.” I explained to Sergeant Kendall that her department issued cell phone records were requested for the time of this incident. I told Sergeant Kendall that these phone records indicated that Sergeant Kendall was actively on her work cell phone from 7:07 AM until 7:10 AM. I told Sergeant Kendall that her work phone records indicated that she was also on an active phone call at 7:11 AM which continued for 120 minutes.
I asked Sergeant Kendall if the phone calls took place before or after the motor vehicle stop with Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall replied, "No. ‘Cause I don’t even remember being on the phone, um, for it to... I, I don’t. ‘Cause I don’t, don’t even remember the time that this happened. Like I said, it was something that was, for me, very insignificant, you know. It was just, "Okay. Well, is something wrong? Nope. Nothing is wrong." And then go on my way so no, I can’t tell you, like, the exact time." I explained to Sergeant Kendall that her vehicle was located at 1807 Ella Grasso Boulevard at 07:11 for a few minutes. I explained that this appeared to be the same area of the motor vehicle stop according to Hawthorne. I told Sergeant Kendall that Hawthorne documented in her civilian complaint form that she believed Sergeant Kendall abused her power and that Hawthorne felt harassed and detained.

I told Sergeant Kendall that Hawthorne alleged in her audio recorded voluntary interview that she believed Sergeant Kendall made a U-turn to follow her vehicle after she turned onto Ella Grasso Boulevard because she beeped her vehicle’s horn at Sergeant Kendall when she (Kendall) did not proceed through the green control signal. Sergeant Kendall responded by saying, "Oh, okay. Yeah. No. That’s, that’s unfortunate that that’s her interpretation of that a-, um, but no, I, I mean, I’ve not had an IA complaint and for someone to beep, that’s unfortunate that that’s her perce-, that’s her perception, but my primary reason was to make sure that Shewa-, like, everything was okay in the vehicle. Whether it was her or someone else, um, that’s...that literally, was it...again, I didn’t get out of my car, I didn’t call for a unit, I didn’t you know, I wasn’t in uniform so I literally was...and even if I was in, like, a civilian car, um, if I was able to, like, get this lady to stop, I would have asked the same thing just as a civilian to say, “Are you okay?” So that was my primary goal to make sure that all was well. And then she went off to...she said she was going to work and she went off to work. So anything as far as, like, the times or anything like that, I...if you tell me that this is the time that it happened, then I’m going to say okay, you know, because I don’t, I don’t have anything else to go on. Again, it was something that’s so insignificant...that was insignificant to me because it wasn’t anything that happened, um, and, you know, it’s just sad that was her perception, her perception of that."
I asked Sergeant Kendall if she believed that Hawthorne would have pulled over had Sergeant Kendall not activated her lights. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Um, I...you know, I don’t know. Again, she...if sh-, I know in her complaint she said that she saw my lights but, again, I can’t tell you that, “Oh, okay. I reactivated my lights.” But I did activate my lights to make a, a U-turn in the, um; in the, the construction zone.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if her body-worn camera was activated at the time of the encounter. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, I was not on duty.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she is a body-worn camera trainer. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. I did not train in body-worn camera.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she took any enforcement action on Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, I was not on duty.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall how the incident concluded and what the outcome was. Sergeant Kendall replied, “So it concluded with, “Okay.” Like, she can go, she can go on her way. There was nothing...you know, there was nothing else that was needed. Again, the primary reason is because I wanted to make sure she was okay, I mean, very hard to compare, but it kind of, Uh, brought me back to Capt. Duff’s incident. Right? You’re just minding your business on your merry little way. I saw her what, to me, was, like, pressure driving. You know, like, it’s...when you’re all in a, in a lane and then you see someone, you know, trying to signal in your rear-, in your side mirrors that they’re trying to get ahead of you or whatever the case may be. So, when she had cut that corner, again, again, for me, I’m, like, is everything okay with this lady? Turned around, made sure that she was good and that was it. So there was no...and I didn’t...I wasn’t, I wasn’t acting like, you know, wha-, for enforcement purposes. It was, “Are you safe? Are you good? Okay. You’re good? All right. You can go onto work.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if she contacted her supervisor, Lieutenant Maturo in regard to arriving late for work. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Lieutenant, yes.” I asked Sergeant Kendall how she contacted Lieutenant Maturo. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Uh, in...by phone, I remember when I had gotten to the office ‘cause I let him know, Okay. I’m here now.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she contacted Lieutenant Maturo by phone to advise him that she was running late. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Oh, yeah. I let him know, yeah that I’m running
late.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she notified Lieutenant Maturo using her department cell phone. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. That was my personal phone.” I asked Sergeant Kendall what her purpose was for self-initiating the motor vehicle stop. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Oh, for what purpose? To make sure that she was okay. You know, like, to make sure, like, there wasn’t an emergency, um, you know, diabetic shock, people going into labor in the car. Just to make sure that she was okay. Literally, her well-being. For me, people just don’t drive like that unless they’re... you know, unless there’s a... like, an emergency or I see marked patrol vehicles, you know, coming quickly behind them. Um, so no, it was just for emergency purposes to make sure that she was okay or whoever else was in the car okay.”

I explained to Sergeant Kendall that Hawthorne stated that Sergeant Kendall’s vehicle was positioned in such a way that Hawthorne had difficulty driving away after the interaction. I asked Sergeant Kendall if she pulled off first or if Hawthorne pulled off first. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. So I remember, like, just...’cause I, I, I was...I turned around to come back down Ella Grasso Boulevard to go back into work. Um, so she went in front of me because if I would have gone, then I was going the opposite way of my, of my job. So no, I...she was able to go so I, I don’t remember being in a compromising position where she couldn’t, she couldn’t go.” I asked Sergeant Kendall how she thought Hawthorne was able to identify her as a police officer. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Because I had lights, yeah.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if she asked Hawthorne for her license, identification, registration, or any paperwork for the vehicle during the stop. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, because this wasn’t for enforcement action and I was not on duty. I was checking to make sure that she was safe, um, so, you know, that wasn’t...I didn’t need any of that because, you know, all was well with her so she proceeded on her way and then I proceeded on mine.” Lt. Colon explained to Sergeant Kendall that she had stated she was not on duty and asked Sergeant Kendall what she considered to be “on-duty.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Um, well, in uniform, um, on duty, my supervisor knows that I’m physically there and I’m prepared for the tour, um, and conducting, you know, m-, the requirements of whatever my assignment is or, um, being out and then, you know, seeing violations and for whatever reason, calling in a violation for assistance or something like that.”
Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall if she has ever driven her department issued vehicle while in civilian clothes. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Oh, absolutely. It’s, uh, my take home car…so yeah. So when I come into work, I’m literally in civilian clothes for that reason, um, and then when I leave, I’m in civilian clothes as well.” Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall if her shift starts at 0700 and ends at 1500. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Mmm hmm” in agreement. Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall if she was checking on Hawthorne as an officer for emergency purposes or as a civilian. Sergeant Kendall replied, “So…well, at the time, I’m not on duty. Right? So if sh-, if there was an emergency there, then obviously, I would utilize my, um, my department resources to provide her with, like, aid so I would u-, I would pick up the radio in my car, I would call for units, I would call for, um, EMS, for FD, um, but because none of that was the case, I didn’t have to, I didn’t have to use those resources.”

Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall how long she thought her interaction with Hawthorne lasted. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Like I said to Sergeant Fennessey, I…not less…not more than five minutes from what it…what I felt…again, this was in July but…I could say, like, 30 seconds but it…didn’t feel like any more than five minutes. Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall why there would be a time discrepancy if Sergeant Kendall simply asked Hawthorne if she was okay and then ended the encounter shortly after. Lt. Colon asked what occurred during the rest of the time of the interaction. Sergeant Kendall replied, “So correction. So when I asked if she’s okay, she actually said, “Yes.” Um, then I asked her where she was going and I said, “Are you sure everything is okay? Are you sure you don’t need any medical attention or anything like that?” And I told her cars are, are going slow because there’s a construction zone, it’s milling in the road and then that was, that was literally the gist of what I can recall.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if she, as a police officer she thought it would be reasonable that a civilian seeing her police/emergency lights activated would believe that she was acting under color of law. Sergeant Kendall replied, “So that’s a hard question because you’re asking a police officer who is obviously also a civilian also, um, so for me, the process of the a-, of activating your lights is to…for…like, for an emergency or to assess a situation for an emergency investigation if you’re in, you know, on-duty capacity or anything like that. So
it’s, it’s hard for me to say to you, Okay. This is what I believe people would think.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if there were any witnesses or evidence that I had not already asked her about that were relevant to this incident. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. it… I mean, I was in the car by myself and then I was talking to her, I, I don’t remember if there was anybody with her or anything like that cause my, my focus was on, um, her and that’s who my communication was with?” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she was stating that she was not on the phone at the time of the incident. Sergeant Kendall replied, “You said that I was, but I’m, I’m telling you, like… “Oh, I don’t, I don’t remember, you know what I mean?” I explained to Sergeant Kendall that she stated that she could not say conclusively what time she performed the stop and the reason for my inquiry was to determine if she was actively using her phone during the time frame of the incident.

I explained to Sergeant Kendall that I knew she was on her work phone from 07:07 AM to 07:10 AM on July, 7th, 2021, and then at 07:11 AM for 120 minutes. Sergeant Kendall replied, “So I don’t… Fennessy, I really don’t… I’m on the phone every single day, um, so I… you know, I can’t…” Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall if either of the people from her phone conversations may have overheard the interaction between Sergeant Kendall and Hawthorne and could speak on Sergeant Kendall’s behalf. Sergeant Kendall replied, “I, I don’t even remember who I was on the phone with. You know what I mean?” I replied, “I, I can tell you exactly.” I retrieved the phone records for Sergeant Kendall’s department issued cell phone. I explained to Sergeant Kendall that on July 7th, 2021 at 07:07 AM the telephone number she was communicating with was [redacted] which lasted 3 minutes and the second number was [redacted] and lasted 120 minutes. I asked Sergeant Kendall if she thought she was on the phone with either of these telephone numbers when the incident with Hawthorne happened. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Well yeah the fir-, the first number, yes, of course. That’s my fiancé’s phone number.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if she believed that she may have been speaking with her fiancé’ while she was performing the motor vehicle stop. Sergeant Kendall replied, “He, he hasn’t made any mention to me… to me about that. The only person who… I mean, I wasn’t on the
phone, but Lieutenant Maturo, I had made him aware of the encounter but other than that…” Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall if the person she was on the phone with for 120 minutes would be able to provide details of her encounter with Hawthorne and if this was Sergeant Kendall’s work phone. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Right.” Lt. Colon asked if Sergeant Kendall could identify who telephone number belonged to and if that person may have overheard her conversation with Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. I…I don’t even know whose number that is. I’d have to put it in my phone. Sergeant Kendall picked up her phone and began looking at it while she was holding it in her hand, appearing to check for contact names under that number. “No. The number doesn’t even come on in my phone. I don’t know who that is.” Sergeant Kendall continued, “So I can’t tell you, um, are you sure?” I showed Sergeant Kendall her work phone records at this time. Sergeant Kendall looked at the number and said, “That-, that’s right, Um, I, I couldn’t tell you.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if she believed that Hawthorne would have pulled to the side of the road on her own or if the lights prompted her to pull over. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yeah. I, I, I don’t know because, again, I don’t, I don’t remember re-engaging my lights so for me in the car, like, I can’t see that my li-, you know, like, I can’t see that my lights are on or even in, like, a reflection of her that I could recall so I, I couldn’t tell you that. Would so-, would she pull over if there weren’t any lights, I would…for that, I could only answer for my own protection and if someone was behind me, I’d pull over and get out of their way.” Sergeant Kendall continued, “So I…you know, I would pull over. It doesn’t necessarily mean, mean that there would have to be lights behind me but, you know, you want to get out of somebody’s way if they seem that, you know…they’re…you’re , um, they’re behind you and it’s making you feel uncomfortable or whatever the reason.”

I again explained that Hawthorne noted that she pulled over because she saw emergency lights and that was why Hawthorne felt like she was detained and the stop was a detention. Sergeant Kendall replied, “So, again, were my lights activated? I ca-, I…again, I, I can’t tell you that I reactivated my lights, but I did turn my lights on to make a U-turn in a construction zone.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if there was anything else she would like to add that could
aid me in this investigation. Sergeant Kendall replied, Um, no, no. Um, I’m so-, sorry that you have to be here for this but, I mean… you know, I’m, I’m sorry that her perc-, her perception is what it was, um, but no, I don’t, I don’t have anything else that would aid you.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if there was anything she wanted to add to her statement. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Not that I… nothing more than I’ve already said.” Sergeant Kendall continued, “You know, I’m checking on someone, make sure that they’re okay, there’s no emergency, um, and then once that was determined, then there was, there was nothing else for, you know, me to… nothing more for me to assess with this individual.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if she was aware that intentionally misleading investigators or answering untruthfully may result in criminal charges as defined under the United States versus Veal, which defines that scope of Garrity rights. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Absolutely.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if all the answers she provided me with were truthful and to the best of her knowledge. Sergeant Kendall replied, “To the best of my knowledge, yes.” The interview ended at 10:33 AM.

**Interview Lieutenant R. Maturo:**

On November 16, 2021 at 10:31 AM, Lt. Colon and I conducted an audio recorded interview with Lt. Maturo in the Office of Internal Affairs located on the first floor of the New Haven Police Department. Lt. Maturo was represented by Elm City Local Union President Officer Florencio Cotto. Lt. Maturo read, signed, and stated that he understood the False Statement Form. Lt. Maturo read, signed, and stated he understood the Internal Investigation Form. I allowed Lt. Maturo to review the civilian complaint form authored by Hawthorne prior to the interview commencing.

I asked Lt. Maturo if he was aware of any reports authored by Sergeant Kendall for the interaction with Hawthorne. Lt. Maturo replied, “I do not. She did… to, to my knowledge, she did not.” I asked Lt. Maturo if he was aware of any body-worn camera footage recorded by Sergeant Kendall for this interaction. Lt. Maturo responded, “I am not.” I explained to Lt. Maturo that Sergeant Kendall stated in her audio recorded interview that she was off-duty at
the time of the incident. I informed Lt. Maturo that the incident was estimated to occur between 07:07 AM and 07:11 AM on July 7, 2021. I told Lt. Maturo that the incident occurred in the area of Crescent St. and Ella Grasso Blvd. I asked Lt. Maturo what hours Sergeant Kendall is scheduled to work. Lt. Maturo replied 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM.

I explained to Lt. Maturo that Sergeant Kendall stated in her audio recorded interview that she contacted him via cell phone to advise him that she would be arriving late for work on July 7, 2021. I asked Lt. Maturo if this statement was accurate. Lt. Maturo replied, "I was not contacted by cell phone. If I remember correctly, she told me the day before. (It should be noted that after further investigation it was found that Lt. Maturo was on days off from June 25, 2021 through July 12, 2021 based on payroll records. This information was brought to my attention by Lt. Maturo later in this investigation).

I asked Lt. Maturo, "She told you the day before?" Lt. Maturo replied, "To my knowledge, I was not called that morning." Lt. Maturo continued, "She, uh, from what I remember, we, we had spoken, uh, the day before during our meeting, she said that, uh, she would be late." For clarification, I asked Lt. Maturo if there was a phone conversation the morning of July 7th, 2021 between, he and Sergeant Kendall. Lt. Maturo replied, "No." I asked Lt. Maturo if there was any record of the communication between Sergeant Kendall and himself. Lt. Maturo replied, "No."

I asked Lt. Maturo if Sergeant Kendall advised him of the incident between Hawthorne and her. Lt. Maturo replied, "She did." I asked Lt. Maturo what details Sergeant Kendall provided him with in regards to the incident. Lt. Maturo replied, "Uh, she did mention wha-, during our meeting...An-, and I can't remember if it was that day or the following day, uh, but we meet daily. Um, and just for the record I run a pretty tight ship there so all the staff understand that if they're gonna be late, uh, the...regardless of the reason, that I'd need to know about it. So, um, any of the staff members could tell you that. That's...so that's, that's a given and that's a definite, uh, something I demand, uh, just for the record. But, um, concerning this incident, um, I, I vaguely remember, uh, obviously no red flags when she's discussing this with me. She did discuss it. It's something that, uh, made her a little bit more
late. I said, “Tell me about it.”

She said that, “you know, a lady was, uh, behind her and she could see that she was going through a construction zone and she could see that she was, uh, kind of moving her car quickly. It brought it to her attention, so it was something that was going on behind her.” I said, “Okay.” And then, uh, you know, later was beeping her horn, kind of push-, but from what I remember, um, I thought I, I remember her saying there was, there was two cars...or there was another car in the...involved that, that was in back of her and another car, if I remember correctly. I said, “Okay.” And then she said...I said, “So, so what else did you do” So she said, “Well...” She said she had turned around or something was wrong with her, whether she was having a-, an emergency or whatever. I said, “Well, was she hurt or something or...?” She said, “No. Uh, she said she was just late for work.” I said, “Really?” She’s like, “Yeah. But she was acting aggressively through the, the work zone. I figured there’s got to be a good reason why she’s doing that, and I just wanted to make sure she was okay.” And I said, “She was okay?” She goes, “Yup.” I said, “Oh.” I said, “Was there any problem with the conversation?” She said, “No. She said she was late. I told her just be careful in a construction zone and that was it.” So that-, that’s my recollection, recollection of, recollection of the conversation. I didn’t see any red flags or violation of policy or serious misconduct. Uh, I just...A Deputy Commander talked to a, a woman out of...she thought was, was...there was something...that, that maybe a medical issue with her and that was it. And I didn’t go any further with it.”

I asked Lt. Maturo if he knew if Sergeant Kendall activated the police lights in her take home vehicle during the incident. Lt. Maturo replied, “I don’t remember having that...I don’t remember talking about lights with her.” I asked Lt. Maturo if he knew where the lights were located in Sergeant Kendall’s department issued vehicle. Lt. Maturo replied, “I believe they’re all interior lights.” Lt. Colon asked Lt. Maturo if Sergeant Kendall notified him the day of the incident or if it was the day after. Lt. Maturo replied, “I thi-, you know what, I-, I’m not, uh, it would have had to have been close.” Lt. Maturo continued, “...cause I speak to her every single morning...uh, we have that meeting so I’m almost a hundred...I, I want to tell you it’s 100% it was that day,” but it was either within...those...it was in those two
days..." Lt. Colon asked Lt. Maturo if he spoke with Sergeant Kendall since she participated in her internal affairs interview on November 5th about the incident. Lt. Maturo replied, "She spoke to me fo-, after her...after she came here." Lt. Colon asked Lt. Maturo what the topic of conversation was between he and Sergeant Kendall. Lt. Maturo replied, "She said that she came, she, she made her statement exact-, you know, pretty much of what she told me. I said, "Okay." And that was really it. Uh, uh, I didn’t want to get into any details with her, uh, knowing that the probability that I would have to be here. I could give you an effective view of, uh, of what, uh, you know, my...what my interaction with her, uh, as far as the incident occurred."

Lt. Colon advised Lt. Maturo that he had mentioned that Sergeant Kendall told him that Hawthorne was driving aggressively in a construction zone. Lt. Maturo replied, "I don’t know if those were her exact words but it was something that was...I don’t if aggressive-, uh, it was something that alerted to her...you know, I mean, this is, like, June or July or whatever but she...what she’s mentioning it to me is that she’s acting like she’s just trying to... she’s in a hurry. She’s trying to get somewhere. She’s trying to push through traffic." Lt. Maturo continued, "Uh, it was something, uh, those weren’t her exact words, but it was enough to let me know, "Okay. So, you checked her out. She was okay. You felt good about it" Lt. Maturo was asking Sergeant Kendall. Lt. Maturo continued, "There was no, uh, problems with the conversation. That would have, that would have been my concern...uh, if there was a negative inter-, if she felt as though if it was a negative interaction and that’s not what...you know." Lt. Colon asked Lt. Maturo if Sergeant Kendall arrives at work in uniform. Lt, Maturo replied, "She does not come to work in her uniform." Lt. Colon asked Lt. Maturo if Sergeant Kendall changes into her uniform once she arrives at work. Lt. Maturo replied, "Into her uniform at work."

Lt. Colon explained to Lt. Maturo that Hawthorne stated that she believed that Sergeant Kendall may have been distracted or on the phone while driving during the incident. Lt. Colon continued explaining that as a result, part of this investigation was to retrieve Sergeant Kendall’s department issued cell phone records. Lt. Colon explained that if Sergeant Kendall was on the phone with someone at the time of the incident, then that person might be able to
corroborate Sergeant Kendall’s account of the incident with Hawthorne. Lt. Colon told Lt. Maturo that one of the phone numbers that appeared on Sergeant Kendall’s work cell phone records on this date and time belongs to Officer K. Hoffman. Lt. Colon asked Lt. Maturo if Officer K. Hoffman was assigned to the training academy. Lt. Maturo replied, “No. No.” Lt. Colon asked Lt. Maturo if Officer K. Hoffman was assigned to in-service training on the date of July 7, 2021. Lt. Maturo replied, “I don’t know. I have no idea.”

Lt. Colon asked Lt. Maturo if Officer K. Hoffman was assigned to Sergeant Kendall for any function at the Academy. Lt. Maturo replied, “For Academy business? No. I don’t know that Kendall is involved in a lot of other, uh, uh, programs within the Department so... I me-, uh, it could be so-, something along those lines. I don’t know. But as far as under my tutelage, no.” I asked Lt. Maturo if there was anything else relative to this incident such as evidence or witnesses that I had not asked him about. Lt. Maturo replied, “No.”

I asked Lt. Maturo if he was aware that intentionally misleading investigators or answering untruthfully may result in criminal charges as defined under United States versus Veal, which defines the scope of Garrity Rights. Lt. Maturo replied, “Yes, sir.” I asked Lt. Maturo if all the answers he had given me were truthful and complete to the best of his knowledge. Lt. Maturo replied, “To the best of my knowledge.” The interview ended at 10:44AM.

**Sergeant Kendall Telephone Numbers:**

During his November 16, 2021 internal affairs interview Lt. Maturo provided telephone number [redacted] as the number he usually receives contact from Sergeant Kendall on. A search of New Haven Police Department issued cellphones revealed that telephone number 475-331-3251 is the department telephone number officially assigned to Sergeant Kendall.
Department Issued Telephone Number –
Lieutenant R. Maturo (203) 999-2597:

On November 16, 2021, at 12:04 PM I emailed City of New Haven Purchasing Agent M. Fumiatti. In the email I requested the records for Lt. Maturo’s department issued cell phone number (203) 999-2597 for the dates of July 6, 2021 and July 7, 2021. On November 17, 2021, I received the records back through email. These records showed no contacts from Sergeant Kendall’s work or personal cell phone numbers. It should be noted that the two New Haven Police Academy land lines, identified as 203-946-6309 and 203-946-6308, did not appear on either Lt. Maturo’s personal or department issued cell phone records during this time. A copy of this email shall be maintained in this investigative file.

Telephone Records - New Haven Police Training Academy:

On November 17, 2021, at 4:26 PM I emailed Dean Criscio, City of New Haven Internal Auditor, to request the phone records for the dates of July 6, 2021 and July 7, 2021 for all of the telephone landlines at the New Haven Police Training Academy. On November 18, 2021, I received an email from Criscio stating that he would need the telephone number I was requesting the records for and permission from Mike Gormany, Acting Controller, before he could perform my request.

On December 2, 2021, Lt. Colon contacted Mike Gormany and received permission for the phone records request. Lt. Colon provided Mike Gormany with the listed telephone numbers for the New Haven Police Training Academy, 203-946-6309 and 203-946-6308.

On December 3, 2021, I received an email from Criscio in return. The email documented as follows:

“Everyone, When the Police Department switched out of Frontier into their separate VoIP system, the Frontier bill no longer separates calls made by individual telephone number.
When we had the PIN system in then it was different. I can only provide you a detail of all long distance calls made on the 2 days in question however we cannot determine who made the calls.” A review of these phone records yielded negative results for both Sergeant Kendall’s personal and work phone numbers for the date of July 6, 2021 and July 7, 2021 on the telephone numbers of 203-946-6309, 203-946-6308. A copy of the email requests shall be maintained in this investigative file.

**Discrepancy Interview Lieutenant R. Maturo:**

On December 6, 2021, at 10:31 AM, Lt. Colon and I conducted an audio recorded interview with Lt. Maturo in the Office of Internal Affairs located on the first floor of the New Haven Police Department. Lt. Maturo read, signed, and stated he understood the Union Waiver Declination Form. Lt. Maturo read, signed, and stated that he understood the False Statement Form. Lt. Maturo read, signed, and stated he understood the Internal Investigation Form.

I explained to Lt. Maturo that the purpose of this interview was to address discrepancies which were noted during the investigation in an effort to clarify information. It was also explained to Lt. Maturo that recently, during a separate Internal Affairs Investigation the New Haven Civilian Review Board and New Haven Civilian Board of Police Commissioners recommended that officers who provide conflicting statements to internal affairs investigators be interviewed a second time in an effort to clarify discrepancies.

I asked Lt. Maturo if he wanted to review the civilian complaint form authored by Hawthorne before the interview commenced. Lt. Maturo declined but stated that he may refer to it during questioning. I told Lt. Maturo that Sergeant Kendall stated in her initial internal affairs interview that she contacted Lt. Maturo by phone to advise him that she would be late the morning of July 7th, 2021. I told Lt. Maturo that he stated in his initial internal affairs interview that Sergeant Kendall did not contact him by phone. I asked Lt. Maturo if this information was accurate. Lt. Maturo replied, “to my recollection, she did not.”
I asked Lt. Maturo to provide his department issued cell phone number. Lt. Maturo identified 203-999-2597 as his issued department cell phone number. I explained to Lt. Maturo that I was unable to locate any telephone numbers for Sergeant Kendall in his department issued cell phone records. I asked Lt. Maturo to please review the phone records which were provided to me. Lt. Maturo looked at the phone records and said, “N-, I don’t see anything.” I reminded Lt. Maturo that the date of the incident was July 7, 2021. I asked Lt. Maturo if this telephone number was the number he would normally be contacted on. Lt. Maturo replied, “Yeah, it depends.” I asked Lt. Maturo if this was his only work cell phone. Lt. Maturo replied, “It’s my only work phone.”

I asked Lt. Maturo if he could provide me with the main telephone number for the New Haven Police training academy. Lt. Maturo replied, “Not off the top of my head.” I presented Lt. Maturo with the phone records for the academy and asked him if he was able to identify any calls from Sergeant Kendall. Lt. Maturo replied, “To be honest with you, I don’t even know the number off the top off my head.” I asked Lt. Maturo how many contact numbers he had for Sergeant Kendall. Lt. Maturo replied, “Two, I think.” I asked Lt. Maturo if he could provide those numbers to me. Lt. Maturo replied, “Not off the top of my head.” I asked Lt. Maturo if he would be able to search for those two numbers in his cell phone and provide them to me. Lt. Maturo looked in his cell phone and said, “I have her work cell phone number.” I asked Lt. Maturo if this was Sergeant Kendall’s personal phone number or work phone number. Lt. Maturo replied, “I don’t remember.” I asked Lt. Maturo if this was the telephone number that Sergeant Kendall would normally communicate with him from. Lt. Maturo replied, “I assume. I don’t know.” Lt. Maturo continued, “so I just see a name, so I just put in her name. So, I don’t go to a number. But that’s the number…” I said to Lt. Maturo, “Okay. But that’s the number you have. You don’t have any numbers besides that number?” Lt. Maturo replied, “Mmm hmm” in agreement.

I explained to Lt. Maturo that I reviewed the phone records for the New Haven Police training academy, in addition to his department issued cell phone number and I was unable to find any telephone call records for Sergeant Kendall’s department issued cell phone, 475-331-3251 or telephone number, that Lt. Maturo just provided for Sergeant Kendall
in the records. I explained that I was seeking to clarify if a phone call conversation occurred between them based upon the conflicting statements from him and Sergeant Kendall. I asked Lt. Maturo if he would be willing to voluntarily provide me with his personal cell phone number and personal cell phone records. Lt. Maturo replied, “If I thought it would aid this investigation, I, I certainly would want to cooperate that way. But to give out my personal cell information and phone calls, I think is, uh, uh, that’s not something I’m prepared to do nor would I do it without counsel.” Lt. Maturo continued, “No, but I take it...i-, if I thought it would aid the investigation, I would certainly do it, um, but to my recollection, there was no phone call made. This, this was, I think she’s mistaken. It was a long time ago. It’s a possibility. I mean, this is July. Um, but to my recollection th-, there was no conversation that morning that I had with her. Lt. Maturo continued “Not on a cell phone or a landline.”

I asked Lt. Maturo if, since his initial interview, he spoke with Sergeant Kendall about this investigation.” Lt. Maturo replied, “No.” I asked Lt. Maturo if he was ever contacted by Sergeant Kendall on his personal cell phone. Lt. Maturo replied, “I don’t know. Cause’ I don’t that num-, well, I don’t know. I don’t know.” Lt. Colon asked Lt. Maturo if Sergeant Kendall normally calls his personal or work phone. Lt. Maturo replied “I, I’m thinking it could be both phones. Thinking.” Lt. Colon told Lt. Maturo that he mentioned in his first internal affairs interview that Sergeant Kendall may have called him or told him she would be late the day prior to the incident. Lt. Maturo replied “No, I think I said I might have talked to her the day prior. I wasn’t sure if we spoke about the incident, so it wasn’t a call, it was...cause I spoke to her daily.” Lt. Maturo continued, “So we met daily, um, so it would have been in...it would have been during the meeting. So I meet, I would meet her daily. We’d discuss the daily events, uh, for the academy, uh, so it would have been in...it should have been in one or two days. But I wasn’t sure if it was the day of the incident.” Lt. Colon asked Lt. Maturo if Sergeant Kendall notified him she would be late the day prior. Lt. Maturo replied, “So here’s the thing, that usually...and that’s what gives me a, a, a better feeling, uh, that I’m 100% right, is because normally, um, she would discuss something like this the day before.” Lt. Maturo continued, “She’s not a person that would call, like, a last minute.” Lt. Colon asked Lt. Maturo if he remembered mentioning that Sergeant Kendall said the driver of the vehicle was driving aggressive. Lt. Maturo replied, “It was something to do with the
way she was driving.” Lt. Maturo continued saying, “Like, she…the way I took it, is she thought the lady was having some type of emergency.”

I asked Lt. Maturo if there was anything relevant to this incident, such as evidence or witnesses, that I had not asked him about. Lt. Maturo replied “No, sir.” I asked Lt. Maturo if there was anything else he would like to add that could aid me in the investigation. Lt. Maturo replied, “No.” I asked Lt. Maturo if he was aware that intentionally misleading investigators or answering untruthfully may result in criminal charges as defined in The United Stated versus Veal, which defines the scope of Garrity Rights. I asked Lt. Maturo if all the answers he had given me were truthful and complete to the best of your knowledge. Lt. Maturo replied, “Yes.” The interview ended at 11:32 AM.

**Lt. Maturo’s Personal Phone Records:**

On December 7, 2021 Lt. Maturo contacted Lt. Colon via phone and agreed to provide his personal cell phone records under the condition that his information be redacted in the event that this internal affairs report was requested via a freedom of information act (FOIA) to protect his personal information. These records were received on December 9, 2021. The personal cell phone records for Lt. Maturo’s personal cell phone number indicated that Lt. Maturo was contacted by Sergeant Kendall on June 30, 2021 at 10:37 AM and 11:30 AM respectively from her work cell phone, 475-331-3251. These telephone records also indicated that Lt. Maturo did not have telephone contact with Sergeant Kendall again until July 9, 2021 at 10:33 AM. The communication on this date was with Sergeant Kendall’s personal cell phone number.

**Attendance Controller Record for Lt. Maturo:**

On December 9, 2021 I received the attendance records for Lt. Maturo. These records revealed that Lt. Maturo was not present at work from June 25, 2021 until July 12, 2021 as he took H-days and vacation days. These records were not listed in Telestaff where viewing
is easy for department members. They had to be requested specifically from payroll. This would indicate that Lt. Maturo and Sergeant Kendall did not have an in-person conversation during this time frame regarding her arriving late on July 7, 2021. Lt. Maturo's key card activity also confirmed that he was not present at the academy during this same timeframe.

Lt. Maturo’s Department Email Correspondences:

On December 10th, 2021 at approximately 7:06 AM Lt. Colon emailed Eric Valli requesting all of Lt. Maturo’s department email correspondences from June 14, 2021 to July 12, 2021. I reviewed the email correspondences, but was unable to locate any email exchanges between Sergeant Kendall and Lt. Maturo regarding her being late on July 7th, 2021. I did review an email sent from Lt. Maturo to Chief Dominguez on June 24th, 2021 advising her that he will be starting his two week vacation starting 6/28 to 7/12. Chief Dominguez responded that she would communicate directly with Sergeant Kendall for any academy needs. This email will be maintained in this IA file.

Interview Officer K. Hoffman:

On December 10, 2021 at 7:25 AM, Lt. Colon and I conducted an audio recorded interview with Officer K. Hoffman in the Office of Internal Affairs located on the first floor of the New Haven Police Department. Officer K. Hoffman was represented by union representative Elm City Local Vice President Officer Jon Lambe. Officer K. Hoffman read, signed, and stated that she understood the False Statement Form. Officer K. Hoffman read, signed, and stated she understood the Internal Investigation Form. I asked Officer K. Hoffman if she wished to review the civilian complaint form authored by Hawthorne prior to the interview commencing.

Officer Hoffman reviewed the civilian complaint form authored by Hawthorne. I asked Officer Hoffman if she was scheduled to work on July 7, 2021 and presented her with a copy of the work detail from Telestaff for July 7, 2021 for reference. Officer Hoffman stated that
she was scheduled to work on July 7, 2021 and was assigned to radio car 62 C squad. Officer Hoffman told me that she was approved for four hours of Time Allowed at the end of her shift, which meant her work hours for this date were only from 12:00 AM to 04:00 AM. I asked Officer Hoffman if she could provide me with her Department issued cell phone number. Officer Hoffman replied, “Uh, 475-434-2634.” I asked Officer Hoffman if she could provide me with her personal cell phone number. Officer Hoffman replied, [redacted]

I asked Officer Hoffman if she recalled getting a telephone call from Sergeant Kendall on July 7, 2021. Officer Hoffman replied, “Yes.” I asked Officer Hoffman if she recalled what time the phone call took place. Officer Hoffman replied, “No, I do not recall. It was in the morning, though.” I told Officer Hoffman that according to Sergeant Kendall’s phone records the call was at 07:11 AM. I asked Officer Hoffman if she recalled this phone call. Officer Hoffman replied, “Yes.” I asked Officer Hoffman if she could explain the nature of her conversation with Sergeant Kendall since it took place during the time of the motor vehicle stop and subsequent civilian complaint. Officer Hoffman replied, “Okay, I believe…” Union Representative and Vice President Officer John Lambe interrupted and asked Officer Hoffman, “Were you on duty? You were on duty?” Officer Hoffman replied, “No, I, I, I guess I have TA time.”

Lt. Colon stated “So, I’ll clarify the question. Uh, the complainant…the subject officer is Sergeant Kendall. Uh, Miss Virginia Hawthorne is making a complaint and the reason why we looked at the phone records is because Miss Hawthorne, uh, when she is in her vehicle prior to getting pulled over, she says…she believes that the officer was on the phone…” Officer Hoffman replied, “Okay.” Lt. Colon continued, “…Sergeant Kendall. So, uh, believing that she was on her phone and distracted possibly, um, is why we pulled those phone records…” Officer Hoffman replied, “Okay. Mm hmm.” Lt. Colon continued, “…right? Because we want to see if that is, in fact, the case and number two, she’s claiming those things happened in her complaint. You got a chance to read them.” Officer Hoffman replied, “Mm hmm.” Lt. Colon said, “We want to be able to get someone to confirm or corroborate or tell us otherwise…” Officer Hoffman replied, “Okay.” Lt. Colon continued, “…what the conversation was about Sergeant Kendall’s on-duty conduct with this individual
and which is why we pulled those phone records to see if she was, in fact, on the phone. And it shows right around that time she was in the area of, like, the Boulevard..." Lt. Colon said, "That the complainant’s stating this happened. You have Sergeant Kendall stating her, uh, side of the story...we...and that’s why we wanted to see is there...anyone on the phone that you can confirm her on-duty conduct? Kendall’s on-duty conduct as to the conversation that you might have overheard?” Officer Hoffman replied, “Okay. Yeah.” Union Representative and Vice President John Lambe requested a brief time out. The time for this time out was 07:35 AM. The interview resumed at 07:37 AM.

Upon resuming the interview, Lt. Colon asked Officer Hoffman, “Yeah so does that, does that explain...” Officer Hoffman replied, “Yes.” Lt. Colon continued, “...the O-, Sergeant’s on-duty conduct is what we’re asking. Did you, do you know about this incident?” Officer Hoffman replied, “I did. I did.” Lt. Colon continued, “...while you were out on the phone?” Officer Hoffman replied, “Mm hmm.” Lt. Colon asked if Officer Hoffman could provide information regarding the incident with Hawthorne and Sergeant Kendall in July. Officer Hoffman said, “Okay. S- a while ago. Um, I don’t remember word for word exactly what was discussed, but I do remember she did tell me that she was at a light. I, I believed she started at eight so I don’t know if she was actually on duty or if...I think, I think she was heading to work, but I could be mistaken. Um, but, uh, she was at a stop light. Um, I believe she said there was construction in front of her. Um, a lady was behind her beeping. Um, she said that when...she couldn’t move, I guess, because of the construction and there was traffic, whatever, so when the light changed, uh, she stayed at the intersection and the lady kind of zoomed around her, like, quickly. And she followed the lady and initiated her 21’s (New Haven Police radio code for lights and sirens) and pulled alongside her and kind of asked her where she was going and, and she realized that it was a construction area and that, you know, the lady can’t be speeding and driving reckless conduct, but that was the gist. Like, I...we were on the phone and I g-, I’m assuming she put the phone down ‘cause I didn’t hear her. She just asked her...” I asked Officer Hoffman “So you were on the phone with her a-, a-...” Officer Hoffman replied, “At that time, yes.” I said, “At the time of the motor vehicle stop? I continued,” But she didn’t...did you..” Officer Hoffman said, “So I didn’t hear her. After she
was, like, well, you know, guess what just happened. I had to do X, Y, Z, so that’s what she told me,” referring to Sergeant Kendall.

I stated to Officer Hoffman “So you knew…” Officer Hoffman said, “I didn’t actually hear the interaction.” I said, “Yeah, I was gonna ask. Did you witness or hear the actual…” Officer Hoffman replied, “No, I didn’t” I continued, “…interaction? Okay. ‘Cause that, that’s why we’re. we’re asking. That’s, that’s why…” Officer Hoffman stated “Oh, we were definitely on the phone and she definitely did approach this, this, but she didn’t get out the car ‘cause she wasn’t in uniform, so I believe…” I asked Officer Hoffman, “And that’s based on information that she gave you?” Officer Hoffman replied, “Yes.” I said, “Okay.” Officer Hoffman said, “So she, she was heading into work.” I asked Officer Hoffman “Um, is Sergeant Kendall your supervisor?” Officer Hoffman replied, “No.” I asked Officer Hoffman if she was assigned to the academy. Officer Hoffman replied, “No.” I asked Officer Hoffman if she was assigned to in-service training for the date of July, 7, 2021. Officer Hoffman replied, “No.”

I asked Officer Hoffman if she would be willing to voluntarily provide me with her personal cell phone records. Officer Hoffman replied, “No.” I told Officer Hoffman, “You already answered this question. So, we have the, the GPS that says the, the motor vehicle stop likely occurs due to the miles per hour at 07:11 AM. But you already answered this question if you were on the phone or not and, and what you heard. Um, and Sergeant Kendall spoke with you about the motor vehicle stop?” Officer Hoffman replied, “Uh, that, that day briefly, yeah. In the morning.” I said to Officer Hoffman “And you already told me what she told you.” Officer Hoffman replied, “Yes.” I asked Officer Hoffman if she discussed this internal investigation with Sergeant Kendall. Officer Hoffman replied, “No.”

Lt. Colon asked Officer Hoffman, “yeah, so, um, I know you said you couldn’t hear the conversation. At what d-…when you…and when you say 21? What is 21’s to you?” Officer Hoffman replied, “Lights and sirens.” Lt. Colon asked Officer Hoffman if she heard an audible siren while on the cell phone with Sergeant Kendall. Officer Hoffman said, “Yeah.” Lt. Colon continued, “Okay. All right. Um, how do you know about the 21’s?” Officer
Hoffman replied, “Um, well just because the car’s unmarked, So I’m assuming, you know, wanted for someone to pull over. Well, she told me she did and, you know, a normal person is not gonna just pull over because you’re behind them.” Lt. Colon said, “Okay. All right. And then, was it immediately after? So, like, you couldn’t hear anything. Did you…you didn’t hear any conversation? Did you…” Officer Hoffman replied, “I heard her talking.” Lt. Colon said, “You heard…Kendall talking?” Officer Hoffman replied, “Right.” Lt. Colon asked Officer Hoffman, “What did she say?” Officer Hoffman replied, “Word for word verbatim, I…” Lt. Colon continued, “That’s fine. What was the gist of what she said?” Officer Hoffman replied “Where you going? This is a construction zone, Um, you know.”

Lt. Colon asked Officer Hoffman “Did she say anything about, um…you have to be very truthful about this. Did she said anything about offering medical attention to the individual or asking if she was okay?” Officer Hoffman replied “I can’t recall that.” I asked Officer Hoffman “Do you recall her identifying herself as a police officer?” Officer Hoffman replied, “I don’t know.” I advised Officer Hoffman “It’s just to the best of your recollection.” Lt. Colon added, “It’s been a few months.” Officer Hoffman stated “I’m sure at some point, but…No. I can’t be certain” Lt. Colon asked “Okay. Was it right after she told you what just happened or was it later in the day?” Officer Hoffman replied, “No, right after.” Lt. Colon asked what Sergeant Kendall told Officer Hoffman directly. Officer Hoffman responded, “It was a construction area, Jam, whatever. The person beep, beep, beep, and zoomed around her fast. Um, so she, you know, I mean she made the stop. Um, and just rolled her window down and spoke to the woman.” Lt. Colon said “You said something about speeding and then reckless…” Officer Hoffman continued, “Or don’t. you know…Don’t drive fast through, through construction area. Be mindful of that.”

Lt. Colon asked Officer Hoffman “Okay. Um, and do you know if your phone number is stored in Kendall’s phone? Like, as in, you know, if I have a contact like, I have your number stored.” Officer Hoffman replied, “I’m sure..she was my supervisor at some point…prior, so, and that was before we had cell phones, so…And b-, that was before we had cell phones so…” Officer Hoffman mentioned she believed her and Sergeant Kendall went to the gym together that morning on July 7th, 2021. I asked Officer Hoffman if she could hear Sergeant
Kendall speaking during Sergeant Kendall’s interaction with Hawthorne. Officer Hoffman replied, “Sure.” I asked Officer Hoffman how she would describe Sergeant Kendall’s demeanor or tone of voice. Officer Hoffman said “She wasn’t yelling. I was normal.” Lt. Colon asked Officer Hoffman if Sergeant Kendall said anything at any point about Hawthorne having road rage. Officer Hoffman stated “I can’t recall that.”

I asked Officer Hoffman “Is there anything relevant to this incident such as evidence or witnesses that I have not asked you about?” Officer Hoffman replied, “No.” I asked Officer Hoffman, “Is there anything else that you would like to add that could aid me in this investigation?” Officer Hoffman replied, “No.” I asked Officer Hoffman, “Are you aware that intentionally misleading investigators may result in criminal charges as defined under United States versus Veal which defines the scope of Garrity Rights?” Officer Hoffman replied, “Yes.” I asked Officer Hoffman if all the answers she had given me were truthful and complete to the best of her knowledge. Officer Hoffman replied, “Yes. Complete to the best of my knowledge.” The interview ended at 07:45 AM.

**Discrepancy Interview Sergeant Kendall:**

On December 10, 2021, at 8:01 AM, Lt. Colon and I conducted an audio recorded interview with Sergeant Shayna Kendall in the Office of Internal Affairs located on the first floor of the New Haven Police Department. Sergeant Shayna Kendall was represented by union representative Elm City Local Vice President Officer Jon Lambe. Sergeant Shayna Kendall read, signed, and stated that she understood the False Statement Form. Sergeant Shayna Kendall read, signed, and stated she understood the Internal Investigation Form. I asked Sergeant Shayna Kendall if she wished to review the civilian complaint form authored by Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, I reviewed it at the last, um, interview.” I explained to Sergeant Kendall that the purpose of her interview was to clarify discrepancies between other interviews and evidence which were revealed through the course of the investigation.
I told Sergeant Kendall that in her initial internal affairs interview she stated that she was not on-duty and that she called Lt. Maturo to tell him she would be arriving late to work. I asked Sergeant Kendall if this was correct. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yes. I called him or notified him but, yes. He knew that I was late for work that day.” I asked Sergeant Kendall to clarify what she meant when she said “notified.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “So that means either called him, text him, or told him, like, in person before he had left for vacation. I don’t remember the exact method. Again, like I said in the initial interview, this was in July. This was off-duty and this was something that was so insignificant, I don’t remember the details, but my commander was aware that I would be late that day.” I told Sergeant Kendall that in her initial interview she stated that she contacted him by phone to tell him she was going to be late to work. Sergeant Kendall replied, “I don’t remember it being that day.” Sergeant Kendall continued, “But I can’t say that it w-...you know, I can’t say def-., definitively that it was not, but he was aware that I would be late and, therefore, at the time of this encounter, I was not on duty.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall what contact numbers she had for Lt. Maturo. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Um, his work cell phone number and his personal cell phone number.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she could provide me with both of Lt. Maturo’s telephone numbers. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Well, I’m sure you know his work phone number.” I replied, “I just want to see what numbers you have for him...if you don’t mind.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “So I have 203-999-2597 for his work phone number and then his personal is.” I replied, “Thank you.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall, for clarification, if she stated she wasn’t sure what time the call was placed. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, it was insignificant. I don’t remember what time a call was placed yesterday.” I told Sergeant Kendall that she stated in her initial interview that she placed the call to Lt. Maturo from her personal cell phone. I asked Sergeant Kendall if she would be willing to voluntarily provide her personal cell phone number. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she would be willing to provide her personal cell phone records for the date of July 7, 2021. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No.”
I explained to Sergeant Kendall that in Lt. Maturo’s audio recorded interview he stated that she did not contact him by phone to advise Lt. Maturo she would be late arriving for work. I asked Sergeant Kendall if she could provide an explanation for this discrepancy. Sergeant Kendall replied “Then it must have been in person, but he knew I was late. Again, I...discrepancies of I called him or text him or told him in person? He was aware that I was going to be late that day. So, therefore I was not on duty. You’re asking me to remember something that happened in July. Before you continue to ask these questions, I will say this just for the record. This reeks of personal avarice. All right? Um, to have an investigation that is nearing six months for an encounter that lasted, by this interview speculative, from three minutes off-duty reeks of personal avarice, okay? It’s been seen in previous incidents to which you are aware, where these incidents are selective. I’ve never once had to sit in this seat to discuss anything about any discrepancies that I’ve ever had or any misconduct on this job, and I’ve been on since 2009. So moving forward, this is exactly what is happening. It is inconsistent biased treatment based on those who are here at this department that challenge these very practices and so that’s exactly what this is. The fortunate part is that I have the ability to not see things through rose-colored lenses. Therefore, I see the practices that are occurring and with specific people. In these same incidents, complaints like this are often given to the patrol supervisor, the, the, whoever the person’s supervisor is because it’s something that is so insignificant. Have we truly gotten to a place where being human, offering assistance to check on someone is something that we are now being in Internal Affairs, having an investigation that is approaching six months for something that was less than three minutes? And you want me to, you want me to, to tell you when exactly I, I informed Lieutenant Maturo? I can’t tell you that. I know that I communicate with him very often through phone, whether it’s voice, voice calls or it is text messaging, or it is in person if he is there. There’s not one move that I’ve ever made that I don’t let my superior aware...make him aware of. You want to know why? Because I don’t sit in the seat of position where I have the luxury of doing that where there are other people who do. There are people who sat before you and actually lied to you and have been cleared in the investigation took less time than it takes for this off-duty encounter that’s three minutes long. So I want you to know and I want the record to reflect, this is personal. It is personal from David Zannelli down to M-, Manmeet Colon, and I know that you just follow, you just follow the
instructions that you are given, but this is personal. And there’s evidence to prove that. So before we continue, I just want the record to reflect that three minutes, three minutes of asking if someone is okay. I’m sitting before you to have a conversation of well, when exactly I called Lt. Maturo. Did Lt. Maturo tell you that he was aware I was gonna be late? Whether I called him, text him, informed him in person.”

(It should be noted that Interim Chief of Police R. Dominguez was alerted to Sergeant Kendall’s allegations shortly after the interview concluded. Sergeant Kendall did not make any of these same allegations during her first internal affairs interview).

I told Sergeant Kendall that Lt. Maturo stated that he may have had an in person conversation with her the day previous to the incident and was going to tell Sergeant Kendall that Lt. Maturo was not there the previous day to have that conversation with her since he was on vacation according to payroll records when Sergeant Kendall interrupted and began to speak. Sergeant Kendall said, “And this is, and, and, and we’re here for what? ’Cause there’s a discrepancy in me saying…” Lt. Colon interjected and said, All right. I’m gonna stop you right now.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, hold on.” Lt. Colon said, “No, hold on for a second.” Sergeant Kendall continued, “Six, six months ago.” Lt. Colon said to Sergeant Kendall, “Sarge, Sarge, Sarge” in an effort to continue with the interview uninterrupted. Sergeant Kendall continued, “When did you have a conversation?” Lt. Colon said, “Sarge. Answer the question that was asked and we can go into what you were saying because we have to continue the investigation.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “No.” Lt. Colon advised Sergeant Kendall that the interview was becoming, “derailed” due to Sergeant Kendall’s behavior and refusal to listen. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Of course… no. It’s not derailing at all.” Lt. Colon said, “Whatever you want to say you can say.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Exactly.”

Lt. Colon told Sergeant Kendall “Answer Sarge’s question and then we will go back to what you’re saying.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “So I answered the question. I do not remember if it was through text, in person, or call. Most of the time, I would give him a call. But I’m telling you, there’s not one single time that I was late or otherwise that my Lieutenant was
not informed. Again, if you ask me, oh, well, when you had a doctor’s appointment, did you let Lieutenant Maturo know? I would 100% say yes. If you ask me, well, did you call him, did you text him, did you notify him in person? What time was that? How long was the conversation? I would sit before you and say, okay, well I normally call him, so I called him. But to say that he is not aware, I would never say, no, he was not aware, I would never say, no, he was not, he was not aware. So that’s the answer to your question.” Sergeant Kendall seemed very upset at this point and refused to listen to Lt. Colon when she attempted to deescalate her behavior. Therefore, I simply replied, “Okay” to which Sergeant Kendall replied, “At length.”

I said to Sergeant Kendall, “I want you... you seem upset. I want you to understand there’s a reason why I’m asking.” Sergeant Kendall replied by saying, “No, I understand that. Listen, what’s upsetting is this process, if that’s what you want to call it, right? Because it’s not consistent and it’s not equal and I’ve seen it and you’ve all seen it, but because you sit in these positions, you are not the person who it’s bestowed upon. So, so my... me being upset personally regarding what you, you have to do, that doesn’t exist. The process is upsetting. Again, and that’s pushing it.” Sergeant Kendall still seemed very upset and had been speaking loudly. I asked Sergeant Kendall, “Do you want a minute or...” Sergeant Kendall interrupted “No, I don’t need a minute, no.” Sergeant Kendall seemed upset that I asked her this question, so I responded, “I’m, I’m, I’m just, I’m asking.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, no. Not at all.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if there was any way that the phone call with Lt. Maturo could be confirmed. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Again, I, I will re-, if you want me to repeat the entire thing that I said.” I replied to Sergeant Kendall by saying, “No, no. I, I, I understand what you said.” Lt. Colon explained to Sergeant Kendall that the issue had been raised recently by the union attorney regarding personal phone records. Lt. Colon said “At the... yes. So, this is why we want to make sure that we treat every investigation. If someone asks us or we have, uh, a complaint and we think personal phone records are required because someone is saying that I called such and such... Just like it was brought up in Sergeant Sanders’ investigation. Lt. Colon explained to Sergeant Kendall that during a recent and separate disciplinary
hearing with the Civilian Board of Police Commissioners, it was recommended that internal affairs investigators request officers to voluntarily provide personal cell phone records in attempt to clarify inconsistent information during administrative investigations.

That’s why we’re bringing it up. The union opened the door and now we will have to ask these questions. It’s not because we’re asking that, you know, we obviously we have the work phone records. Now, we’re asking if you…possibly when you say you called from personal, well, you can provide your personal record voluntarily. That’s all that was. Okay?” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Exactly. And even with that, that only started because of this. Because there was a supervisor who was willing to give those records to the union who’s representing her. But, prior to that, not…you, you guys didn’t ask for that. So, to say we want to be consistent, well, that just started two weeks ago.” Lt. Colon replied, “That’s right. And that’s…that’s why we want to make sure that we have the opportunity to ask these questions and that’s why we brought it up.”

I told Sergeant Kendall, “Cause in case there’s any evidence that we have that can support your statement.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Okay.” I told Sergeant Kendall, “uh, so Lt. Maturo’s phone records revealed that he did not receive a phone call from your telephone number on the date of July 7th, 2021. Uh, that would a-, appear to indicate that your initial statement is not accurate, I know you covered it saying that, you know, it’s been back in, in July. Could you please provide an explanation?” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yes, absolutely. So again, like I said, this is something that occurred in July. Me notifying Lt. Maturo that I was going to be late. He was aware on that date that I was going to be late. When you ask me, well, did you call him, did you text, what-, whatever it is that you, you did, I’m telling you that one, Lt. Maturo was aware of me being late and he was aware of this, of this encounter. Why? Because it was necessary because I do not fit the, the, the, exterior, uh, the exterior position to not worry about encounters like this because, again, I challenge these exact things that are occurring because of the inconsistencies and lack of, lack of equity that Internal Affairs has been a vice to create barriers and prohibitions for advancement for people of color. Again, I say to you, you’re asking me for something in July. Was Lieutenant made aware that I was gonna be late? Yes. Can you say…can I say with 100% certainty,
okay, well, I called him this morning...that morning. I can’t, I can’t say that, okay, with 100% certainty. Most of the time, I will call him in the morning. I will notify him, again, in person, via text message, but he is made aware. So, he was aware that I was late. If you’re saying, okay, well, I didn’t call that morning. Okay, well, the bottom line is did he know that I was gonna be late? Did he know about this encounter? Yes, he knew about this encounter. Why? Because I told him about it.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall how she told Lt. Maturo about the incident. Sergeant Kendall replied, “It could have been over the phone.” I asked Sergeant Kendall when she notified Lt. Maturo of the incident, if it was the same day, immediately after? Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, I can’t remember..if this..I can’t remember. I don’t think it was the same day. But, then again, I can’t remember...You know? I, I can’t remember if it was that day. And, as I said initially, this is so insignificant. You’re asking me to remember something as though, you know, like I, I, actually had, like, an encounter that lasted and there was, you know, this, this actionable o-, occurrence that would trigger my memory. This was something that was so insignificant. Checking on someone, making sure that they were okay. So I don’t remember if I called him that day, if I called him the next day or two days from then. But he was made aware of it.” I replied to Sergeant Kendall by saying “No, I understand that it’s insignificant to you, but the complainant was very adamant and very upset that she feels like she was unlawfully detained.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Mm hmm. What, what was the complainant? What was her ethnic background?” I replied, “Oh, I didn’t ask her.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Oh, it’s not on there?” I replied, “I don’t believe it’s on the complaint...but I could show it to you.” I provided Hawthorne’s civilian complaint form for Sergeant Kendall to review which did not contain the complainant’s racial/ethnic background. It should be noted that the current New Haven Police Civilian Complaint Form does not have a space for the complainant to identify their race and/or gender.

Sergeant Kendall said “So as I mentioned initially, she...what her complaint form reads that she thought that, you know, she would be shot. One, why would, you know, wh-, why would you even think that? Two, I’m having a conversation asking if you are okay. Literally, okay? Again, wh-, when have we gotten to the place of that being something that’s so bad and then
we wonder why there’s this dichotomy of people not doing anything because of this, because of this. This, this individual seemed annoyed at the presence. There was no fear there. There was nothing that was indicative that she wrote in this document that was observed by me. As I said in my initial interview, she seemed like I was wasting her time. All in the notion of checking on her.” I said to Sergeant Kendall “But I w-, want you to understand that…” Sergeant Kendall interrupted me by saying, “No.” I continued, “...th-, this is a complaint from a civilian.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “I understand.” I told Sergeant Kendall, “And when somebody alleges an illegal detention or illegal stop, that’s something that we have to investigate…because it’s, it’s in our general order. Like, it’s a-, it’s an amendment violation.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “I’m. I’m f-, very familiar with the general order. I’m also very familiar…”

I told Sergeant Kendall, “Well, I’ve, I’ve, I’ve explained to you, because I know you feel that, that it’s unfair that you’re here.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, no, no, no. Nope.” I told Sergeant Kendall, “No, I want to, I want to make sure that we understand each other.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Oh, yeah, No. no, no. I’m not saying it’s unfair.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she was the Commander of the Police Academy for that week due to the fact that Lt. Maturo was off on vacation. Sergeant Kendall replied, “I, I maintain the same role that I maintain.” I explained to Sergeant Kendall that I was asking if she was covering Lt. Maturo’s responsibilities in his absence. Sergeant Kendall replied, “When you say I was covering him, I don’t remember going to, any meetings or anything, um, while he was there. Um, if there was, like, a COMPSTAT or something, I may have attended or not attended. But even on vacation Lt. Maturo is very good at still, um, addressing communication that may come his way and if there’s a task or an assignment that he requires me to complete, then I’ll do it. So, unless he’s actually fully out away, you know, from phone communication, etcetera, um, I wouldn’t say that I was the commander during that time.”

Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall if Lt. Maturo sent any email notifications to members of the police department advising them to contact her in his absence while he was on vacation. Sergeant Kendall replied, “So, I will say yes, based on that’s his practice. Not because I remember it happening.” I explained to Sergeant Kendall that Lt. Maturo was on vacation
from June 25, 2021, to July 11, 2021. Sergeant Kendall said, “You, you asked me a question was I the commander during that time and I’m telling you no, I wouldn’t consider myself being the commander during that time, but if there was things that needed to get done that I could do, then I would, then I would do it. He was still, um, very involved with, you know for instance if Zannelli called him or, you know, the chief called him. Um, so yeah, I, I, I don’t...I didn’t think that our assignments changed on vacation.” Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall, “the reason why we’re asking is because the lieutenant went on vacation. You were tasked or left in charge trying to figure out...You might have control of your schedule at that point. At which point did you have to tell him that you were running late? That was the point of finding out the schedule and where he was and what might have led you to contact him to say that you were running late. At, at which point? Before vacation, during vacation, after vacation. That was the point also of the phone records.”

Sergeant Kendall replied “Okay. Okay. That’s fine....So, again, I will say, unfortunately, I don’t sit in the position where I have the ability, as some do, to make their own schedule and come in late at their choosing. Um, so, therefore, um, again, asking me when or however, um, I still kept Lt. Maturo in the loop, even if he is on vacation but that’s just, uh, the leadership that he has and the relationship that we built working together.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if there was anything in her initial statement that she wished to clarify. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. Other than you saying that, you know, I said it was a call. Um, clearly, it, it wasn’t a call, but n-, notification was made to him. Again, you’re asking me back in July. Notification was made to him that I would be late and you’re asking when that was? A week, last week? I can’t say. Um, but was he aware? Yes, he was aware.”

I asked Lt. Colon if she had anything to add. Lt. Colon asked me if she could view the work phone records for Sergeant Kendall. Lt. Colon told Sergeant Kendall that Hawthorne indicated in her civilian complaint form that she thought Sergeant Kendall may have been distracted. Lt. Colon told Sergeant Kendall that at 07:11 AM her work phone records indicated that she was on a phone call for 120 minutes. Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall if she remembered stating that she did not know who that phone number belonged to and that it was not saved in her cell phone in her initial internal affairs interview. Lt. Colon explained to
Sergeant Kendall that the telephone number, listed on her department issued cell phone records, which started at 7:11 AM and lasted 120 minutes on July 7th, 2021, was searched through Telestaff. The search yielded a positive result and revealed that telephone number belonged to Officer Hoffman.

Lt. Colon told Sergeant Kendall that Sergeant Kendall had stated in her initial internal affairs interview that she did not know who that number belonged to. However, this same telephone number was again listed at 3:40 PM on July 7th, 2021 on Sergeant Kendall’s department issued cell phone records. Lt. Colon told Sergeant Kendall that internal affairs investigators spoke with Officer Hoffman as a part of this investigation to clarify some of the information presented. Lt. Colon told Sergeant Kendall that in her initial internal affairs interview Sergeant Kendall stated that she stopped the vehicle for medical reasons to check on the well-being of the operator. Lt. Colon said, “That’s not what we got from the interview with Officer Hoffman so there, you know, there’s some discrepancies in that as well. And we want to give you the benefit of the doubt to c-, tell us i-, i, you know, what you said in your first statement is what you’re, what you will say now. So, um, Officer Hoffman’s statement said that she overheard the conversation.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Mm hmm.” Lt. Colon continued, “Not the lady, but you.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Mm hmm.” Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall, “Do you remember this conversation?” Sergeant Kendall replied, “I do not.”

Lt. Colon continued “Okay do you remember her being on the phone with you and you putting the phone down to talk to this, this lady right here?” Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. I don’t remember physically putting the, putting the phone down.” Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall “Yeah, or, like, you know, putting the phone on the seat or whatever the case may be.” Sergeant Kendall said “Yeah.” Lt. Colon continued, “What I’m asking is, do you remember the phone call with her while you had the lady…” Sergeant Kendall said, “I do not remember the phone call with her. I do remember talking to Hoffman. Again, that day? No. Hoffman calls me quite often.” Lt. Colon said, “Okay. All right. So in her interview, she stated that you mentioned something about speeding.” Sergeant Kendal replied, “Mm hmm.” Lt. Colon continued, “Or the person was beeping and speeding and zoom, zooms past you
and aggressively... zooms past you and aggressively drives off or zooms off.” Sergeant Kendal said, “Mm hmm.” Lt. Colon continued “at that point, she says that you put on your 21’s to...which you already did.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Mmm hmm.” Lt. Colon said to Sergeant Kendall, “You told us that.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Right.”

Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall “Um, and she h-, she doesn’t hear anything about medical or offering help or any of that. Can you just explain that part, like, why that is differentiating from what you’re saying to what she says?” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yeah, it...that’s very simple. So, first of all, I would like to acknowledge. So during this encounter...” Lt. Colon replied, “Mm hmm.” Sergeant Kendall continued “um, you actually asked who was the number before that which I indicated was my fiancée’s, which you guys left it at that. So, um, as far as this was concerned in my initial, uh, statement, I did say, uh, I described her as pressuring, pressuring drivers, um, that were in front of her. So I, you know, as far as the language or the, or the terminology, um, that was indicative of her...me thinking that something was wrong.” Lt. Colon replied, “Mm hmm.” Sergeant Kendall continued, “Um, because Hoffman didn’t hear me saying that. I mean, I don’t, I don’t know, you know, I don’t know what to make of that or, you know, anything to, to further explain if it’s not heard. Um, so, no, I don’t.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if all of the answers she provided in her initial IA interview were truthful and complete. Sergeant Kendall replied, “To the best of my knowledge, yes.” I explained to Sergeant Kendall that she mentioned the first number I asked her about from her phone records was her fiancée, [redacted]. I asked Sergeant Kendall if she believed she was on the phone with her fiancée at the time of the incident with Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall replied, “You told me that I was. In the initial interview, you said this time, that this lady is indicating, matches up with...” I stated to Sergeant Kendall, “The timeframe.” Sergeant Kendall continued, “and you told me this number, the timeframe. You said, who was that? And I said, I could tell you whose number that is. That’s my fiancée.” I replied to Sergeant Kendall, “Yeah, so the timeframe matches up to both numbers so where the GPS coordinates time. That’s why I was asking you” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Okay.” I continued, “for both phone numbers. What I’m trying to find out is, is do you feel that
there'd be any benefit to contacting to see if he h-, overheard the..." Sergeant Kendall interrupted saying, "Well, you wouldn't contact him. It would have to go through me." I replied, "Well, that, that's, what I'm saying. Do you think that, that's beneficial?" Sergeant Kendall replied, "Yeah. He hasn't said anything to me, as I said in my initial interview. He hasn't said anything. I replied, "Okay."

Sergeant Kendall said, "You know, I just wanted to clarify because we were talking about numbers adding up and locations. I didn't want to...I'd be remiss to now acknowledge what was acknowledged in the first interview..." I replied, "Yes." Sergeant Kendall continued, "...which leads back." I said to Sergeant Kendall, "The motor vehicle stop occurs between that timeframe." Sergeant Kendall replied, "Mm hmm." I continued, "Both of those phone calls are placed in that timeframe." Sergeant Kendall said, "Okay. And let's not...it wasn't a motor vehicle stop, (INAUDIBLE), that would be something that would look completely different, so..."

I replied, "Well, the, the lights are activated. Your lights are activated. She pulls over to the side of the road." Sergeant Kendall replied, "Okay. And that's based on what, though?" I replied, "It's based upon her statement." Sergeant Kendall replied, "Right." I said to Sergeant Kendall, "And it's on your statement that..." Sergeant Kendall said, "That..." I continued, "you activated your lights when you, when you performed a U-turn." Sergeant Kendall replied, "So I...correct. Which was away from her. The U-turn was because of the construction zone and people were still traveling. That was, that was on Crescent, away from her. When you asked me if I re-engaged my lights, I said no, and I don't remember re-engaging my lights." Lt. Colon stated "All right. Could, can you go back to your initial question that you had asked? We, we didn't get the answer to that. It was right around the timeframe when it...your fiancée" Sergeant Kendall replied, "Mm hmm." Lt. Colon continued, "and, uh, this number right here, which is Hoffman's." Sergeant Kendall replied, "Mm hmm." Lt. Colon continued, "Initially, we didn't know the number." Sergeant Kendall replied, "Mm hmm." Lt. Colon said to Sergeant Kendall, "So now we knew and then, that's why we were able to talk to her and, and find out." Sergeant Kendall replied, "Sure." Lt. Colon continued, "The part of the question was, um, if, at any point, your fiancée might have
heard...and to your benefit, this is to your...it...is there any...it...would he have any useful information?” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Again, he has not said any...” Lt. Colon said to Sergeant Kendall, “Yes or no.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, it’s not a yes or no, ‘cause I would have to ask him.” Lt. Colon replied, “Right.” Sergeant Kendall continued, “Because this isn’t something that he would say, “Hey, listen, wh-, what happened?” It wasn’t something that...” Lt. Colon replied, “Okay.” Sergeant Kendall continued, “you know, it, it, it wasn’t something that was, again, significant enough...for that, so I would...the-, that would provoke, uh, asking him.” Lt. Colon replied to Sergeant Kendall, “Okay. All right. And you, you can get back to us if you like.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yeah.” (It should be noted that members of the Internal Affairs Division have not heard back from Sergeant Kendall regarding whether or not her fiancée overheard any part of her conversation with Hawthorne as of the date of this report).

Lt. Colon requested to review the GPS coordinates for Sergeant Kendall’s vehicle. Lt. Colon said to Sergeant Kendall, “So the speed at one point goes from 25 to 53 or something like that.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Okay.” Lt. Colon continued, “In that area. Did you have to accelerate to get to, um, that c-, that car?” Sergeant Kendall responded by saying, “So as I mentioned in my initial interview, I don’t remember accelerating. I remember making my U-turn and then you obviously, in your normal driving capacity, put your foot on the gas if you’re not going 15 miles an hour.”Lt. Colon replied, “Mm hmm.” Sergeant Kendall continued, “Um, so again, I don’t remember accelerating to reach where she was. She didn’t, she didn’t, that I remember, um, seem to be too far away.” Lt. Colon replied, “Okay.” Sergeant Kendall said, “So, um, that’s, that’s t-, the initial information that I had given to you.”

I directed Lt. Colon to the GPS records. I said, “That’s the average speed and that’s the current speed” pointing to a row of information. I continued, “So the GPS coordinates update approximately every one-minute one-second. Like you see this one is 07:09.” I continued saying, “and this is 0710 and 13 and the next one will be 07:11 and 14, So it’s like, every minute, and, um, one second, the GPS sends out the signal. But that’s, that’s the speed for Ella Grasso Boulevard” pointing to the GPS records. Lt. Colon looked at the GPS records
and said, “Okay. All right. So it was 56 (MPH) at one point, and you even said you had to make the U-turn to… in order to get to her to ask her those questions.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yes, I made a U-turn on Crescent.”

I asked Sergeant Kendall if she had discussed this internal investigation with any sworn or unsworn members. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yes.” I asked Sergeant Kendall, “And who would that be?” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Uh, my fiancée.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if that was the only person. Sergeant Kendall replied, “And. Lt. Maturo. I told him about the situation that I had to go to Internal Affairs.” I asked Sergeant Kendall, “Okay. Anybody else you could think of?” Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, not off the top of my head.” I asked Sergeant Kendall, “Okay. Is there any relevant, anything relevant to this incident such as evidence or witnesses that I haven’t asked you about?” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Not that I’m aware of at this point.” Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall, “Is there, uh, anyone else that can help us in this on your behalf in this investigation.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Helping you do what?” Lt. Colon replied, “To talk about this incident. To corroborate your side of the story?” Sergeant Kendall said, “Anything I, I couldn’t, I couldn’t tell you. Just now anyway.”

Lt. Colon said to Sergeant Kendall, “Okay. So throughout this investigation and talking to individuals and getting records from the first time we spoke with you now, I know that you clarified some things and, um, you said some things that were expound upon this, uh, interview. Do you… are you able to give us an explanation or point us in the right direction why it didn’t… initially you told us that you called from your personal phone to now we have a record from, um… can you pull this phone record from Lt. Maturo that doesn’t show that you contacting at all as in call, um, July 9.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Well, that, would that show the text messages anyway?” Lt. Colon replied, “Okay.”

Sergeant Kendall said, “Um, wh— again, what I said was, um, was Lt. Maturo made aware? Yes. Um, I’m sure throughout your investigation you should have confirmed that. Um, so, again, trying to narrow down did I place a call at 6:52 in the morning is something that I cannot give you. Um, historically, our practices have been I will place calls to him or, you know, text him or in person let him know what my whereabouts are. So during the first
interview, uh, when I said that I called him was based on what I would typically do, uh, if I obviously was not in front of his face or he wasn’t, you know, in the building. Um, so no, I don’t, I can’t tell you oh, okay, well, you know, it, it, it, wasn’t that day I actually called him. But again, phone records is not gonna show you text messages or show you if, you know, um, if we talked in person, but I can’t tell you if it was that day, uh, a week ago. Um, when I have appointments usually you know, um, in advance or obligations. So, um, was he aware? The answer would be yes. If you’re trying to get me to narrow down at which point, I, you know.” I said to Sergeant Kendall, “I’m just trying to clarify the method of communication, so I know he wasn’t there for that week and part of the week before, and that there was no phone records. So, what I’m trying to do is just confirm all the communications.”

Sergeant Kendall said, “Yeah. That’s, that’s fine and I, and I’m telling you I, I, I can’t tell you, uh, definitively what method of communication that I had with him, Um, but I think what is, uh, what your question is, is whether or not he was aware and he was aware, which would show that I was not on duty at the time during this encounter. Um, so, you know, throughout this, you, you, you, your preamble indicates, um, you’ll be asking about, uh, on-duty questioning and the first interview I, you know, it, it, was one, courteous to still answer questions re-, regarding off-duty, um, conduct. Uh, I will say that, you know, during this time and, and the understanding that I have of this being personal, um, you know, I…the, the, the information that is relevant is him being aware, Um, so, you know, to your questioning, I can’t give you an exact time or method of contact that I can confirm, um, from back when July, July 7th.”

I said to Sergeant Kendall, “Okay. Well, these are all things that, questions that’ll be asked to me as the investigator, so I need to run through thoroughly everything.” Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yeah, absolutely. But I want to make sure that you’re, that you’re hearing what I’m saying just as thoroughly. My responses are just as thorough as, as yours.” I said to Sergeant Kendall, “Um, I would say, though, that it, I would consider this on-duty conduct that the lights are activated and a civilian pulls over in deference to the authority of the lights. So once we activate our lights, we’re acting under the color of law. That’s why this is, the interview is being conducted in the way that it is, ‘cause it’s considered on-duty when we act
in the capacity of a police officer."

Sergeant Kendall replied, "Okay. But now, again, this is, this is what the civilian’s saying and, and what I’m saying. Again, there was no, that I remember, a re-engagement of my lights. And when my lights were, um, activated, it was not even in the vicinity of where she was. So, um, th-, I think that’s, that’s the, that’s the difference that we, that, you know, that we run into right now. Um, again, you know, we, we go from making, making sure that someone is, is okay by, you know, when I indicated to you that her driving was, that she was pressuring, uh, other drivers and what you’re saying the language is at variance when it came to your interview with Karyn Hoffman and her not hearing any more of the conversation is literally a difference in, in the interpretation of language. Um, but ultimately, what her complaint is reading and what her responses were as far as her behavior were, to me, were annoyance. M-, everything at variance with what this is, so I just want to make sure that, that’s clear as well."

I told Sergeant Kendall "Well, that’s what we’re trying to clarify. The, the 17 (New Haven Police radio code for complainant) who is the complainant on this has her statement of what happened, you have your statement of what happened." I told Sergeant Kendall "In o-, order to, to you know, ‘cause we either have to dispel or confirm." Sergeant Kendall replied, "I, I understand." I asked Sergeant Kendall, "Is there anything else you would like to add that could aid me in this investigation?" Sergeant Kendall replied, "No. I don’t think so." I asked Sergeant Kendall, "Are you aware that intentionally misleading investigators or answering untruthfully may result in criminal charges as defined under United States versus Veal which defines the scope of Garrity Rights?" Sergeant Kendall replied, "Yes." I asked Sergeant Kendall, "Are all the answers you have given me truthful and complete to the best of your knowledge?" Sergeant Kendall replied, "To the best of my knowledge, yes." The interview with Sergeant Kendall ended at 8:39 AM.
Sergeant Kendall – Department Issued Key Card Records:

On December 13, 2021 at 10:27 AM I sent an email to Sergeant Hawley, CAD/RMS System Administrator, requesting department issued key card activity records for Sergeant Kendall for the dates of June 25, 2021 through July 12, 2021. This was the same timeframe when Lt. Maturo was on vacation leave.

In her second audio recorded internal affairs interview, Sergeant Kendall made statements indicating that she believed that she was being individually targeted due to “personal avarice.” Sergeant Kendall also stated in her second internal affairs interview, “Because I don’t sit in the seat of position where I have the luxury of doing that where there are other people who do”, “But I’m telling you, there’s not one single time that I was late or otherwise that my Lieutenant was not informed” and “I’m telling you that one, Lieutenant Maturo was aware of me being late and he was aware of this encounter. Why? Because it was necessary because I do not fit the, the, exterior, uh, the exterior position to not worry about encounters like this, because again, I challenge these exact things that are occurring because of the inconsistencies and lack of, lack of equity that Internal Affairs has been a vice to create barriers and prohibitions for advancement for the people of color.” It should be noted that Sergeant Kendall did not make any of these comments during her first internal affairs interview.

On December 14, 2021 I received the requested keycard records from Sergeant Hawley. These records revealed that Sergeant Kendall’s department issued key card accessed 710 Sherman Parkway (the New Haven Police Academy) First Floor side entrance after 7:00 AM on nearly all of her scheduled workdays from June 25, 2021 through July 12, 2021 while Lt. Maturo was on vacation leave. Sergeant Kendall is currently assigned as the Deputy Commander of Training at the New Haven Police Academy and is scheduled to start her shift at 7:00 AM at 710 Sherman Parkway on a Monday through Friday rotation. According to Telestaff records, Sergeant Kendall was not on any scheduled days or time off during this same date range. It should be noted that the first-floor side entrance area of 710 Sherman Parkway is closest to where Sergeant Kendall’s office at the New Haven Police Academy is
located. Below are the records of Sergeant Kendall’s department issued key card activity for June 25, 2021 through July 12, 2021 while Lt. Maturo was on vacation. This information suggests that Sergeant Kendall arrived late for duty often while Lt. Maturo was on vacation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Company ID</th>
<th>Partition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/13/2021 13:11:20</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/2021 13:57:46</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/2021 14:20:36</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/2021 22:22:28</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2021 19:24</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2021 22:10</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/2021 08:19</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/2021 15:11</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/2021 19:32</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/05/2021 22:23</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/2021 15:19</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/05/2021 11:00</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/2021 18:35</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/2021 19:32</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/2021 21:33</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2021 07:23</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2021 19:07</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/2021 11:58</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/25/2021 07:10</td>
<td>Access granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On December 16, 2021 I sent an email to Sgt. Hawley to request department issued key card activity records for Sergeant Kendall for the dates of June 14, 2021 through June 29, 2021. These records capture Sergeant Kendall’s department issued key card activity approximately two weeks prior to Lt. Maturo’s scheduled vacation and gives a baseline for when Sergeant Kendall regularly arrives for duty. Below are the keycard activity records for Sergeant Kendall which I received from Sgt. Hawley on December 16, 2021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Company ID</th>
<th>Partition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/29/2021</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:11</td>
<td>granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/25/2021</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:39</td>
<td>granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/24/2021</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:19</td>
<td>granted</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>710 Sherman PKWY - 1st Floor Side Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Access Location</td>
<td>Time Code</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/23/2021</td>
<td>15:12</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SHAYNA</td>
<td>1 Union - Major Crimes Main Entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/23/2021</td>
<td>14:50</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>1 Union - Main Elevator Garage Level</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/23/2021</td>
<td>13:43</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>1 Union - Controller Garage Level</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/2021</td>
<td>7:09</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/2021</td>
<td>7:32</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>1 Union - Controller Garage Level</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/21/2021</td>
<td>7:10</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/2021</td>
<td>14:28</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/2021</td>
<td>10:39</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/2021</td>
<td>7:54</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/18/2021</td>
<td>7:14</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/17/2021</td>
<td>7:21</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/2021</td>
<td>7:17</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>Entrance Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/2021</td>
<td>14:39</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>1 Union - Female Locker North Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/2021</td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>KENDALL</td>
<td>1 Union - Female Locker North Door</td>
<td>12_3312</td>
<td>Mast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above listed key card activity records infers that Sergeant Kendall often arrives to work late when scheduled, contrary to the statement she gave during her discrepancy interview in internal affairs.

**Virginia Hawthorne Telephone Update:**

On December 13, 2021, at 11:23 AM I called Hawthorne and provided her with an update of the case progress. While on the phone, I asked Hawthorne if Sergeant Kendall offered her medical assistance when she pulled over her vehicle. Hawthorne replied, “Oh no, God no. She pulled me over because I beeped at her. That’s why she pulled me over. She made a U-Turn and came back. It wasn’t like she was following me she was in front of me.” Hawthorne stated that, “There was no need for medical assistance I was on my way to the hospital.” Hawthorne had previously told me that she works as a Registered Nurse for Yale New Haven Hospital.

I asked Hawthorne if she was related to any officers who were employed by the New Haven Police Department. Hawthorne replied, “Of course I am, My son Justin Harpe.” Hawthorne continued saying, “He asked me not to do this” referring to Hawthorne making a civilian complaint. Hawthorne stated that he was afraid of “retaliation” for Hawthorne making a complaint. I explained to Hawthorne that the investigation had been granted an extension and
I apologized for the delay. I explained to Hawthorne that more information had presented, and I wanted to ensure that the investigation was thorough and complete since she was so negatively affected by the interaction with Sergeant Kendall. Hawthorne stated, “That’s not the way you treat people when you’re a public servant. That’s a disgrace as far as I’m concerned.” I concluded the conversation with Hawthorne. This conversation was recorded utilizing AXON capture and uploaded to evidence.com.

**Credibility Assessments:**

**Sergeant Kendall and Virginia Hawthorne:**

Due to conflicting statements, and because some of the evidence collected during the course of this investigation did not corroborate a portion of the statement(s) given by Sergeant Kendall, a credibility assessment was conducted on the complainant, Virginia Hawthorne, and Sergeant Kendall. A search in Lexus Nexus Accurint, a Hamden Police records check (Hawthorne’s town of residence), and a New Haven Police in-house database check all failed to reveal any documented incidents where Hawthorne was found to be untruthful or dishonest in an official incident. Hawthorne, a registered nurse at Yale-New Haven Hospital, has never made a previous civilian complaint against any New Haven Police Officer before this incident. In addition, a social media/internet query for Hawthorne did not reveal any adverse information. She is the mother of current New Haven Police Officer J. Harpe.

During Sergeant Kendall’s discrepancy interview at internal affairs, Sergeant Kendall stated “I’ve never once had to sit in this seat to discuss anything about any discrepancies that I’ve ever had or any misconduct on this job, and I’ve been on since 2009.”

I reviewed Sergeant Kendall’s Internal Affairs file. Within the file were several documents from POSTC. One of the documents was a memo from then the Director of Basic Training dated July 25, 2007 to Chief Thomas Flaherty. In this memorandum, it was documented that Sergeant Shayna Kendall was, at that time, a recruit at the POSTC training academy in Meriden for the New Haven Police Department. The memorandum documented that recruit Kendall told Training Officer Gary Fredricks that she had lost her license. The memorandum
documented that recruit Kendall was advised that she would need to obtain a duplicate license at the first opportunity, which was documented as July 19, 2007. The memorandum documented that recruit Kendall completed a permission slip in order to obtain a duplicate license and be excused from the POSTC academy on July 19, 2007.

The memorandum documented that on July 20, 2007 Captain Aresenault obtained a copy of Sergeant Kendall’s driver’s license from POSTC files and it was “very evident that it was not marked by DMV anywhere that in fact it was a duplicate. This raised serious questions as to whether or not Recruit Kendall had indeed lost her license as she had stated.” The document continued, “On Monday July 23, 2007, Kay Kodish, Training Director for the City of New Haven as well as Sgt. Reddish from the New Haven P.D. came to the academy to discuss various issues involving Recruit Kendall. As a result of their questioning of her, it was determined that she had lied about the loss of the license. It had never been lost and she had falsified a permission slip, asking to leave the Academy to obtain a duplicate license when all she did was go home. It was also learned from those in attendance that Recruit Kendall frequently during the meeting referred to Academy staff members including me, by their last name.” The memorandum continued, “It was therefore also determined that Recruit Kendall had falsified the permission slip, in that she never intended to go to the DMV to obtain a duplicate license as she knew that her original had never been lost or misplaced.

The memorandum continued, “Recruit Shayna Kendall has been found to have violated the following Recruit Rules and Regulations:

C. Conduct: Section 3 Dishonesty

b. Other offenses: Section 1 Proper Demeanor, Section 4 Addressing Academy Staff, Section 7 Profanity.

L. Leaving Academy grounds: Section g tampering with a permission slip.
Recruit Shayna Kendall has committed two violations of the Recruit Rules and Regulations which can result in immediate dismissal from the Academy. Recruit Kendall has violated the core tenets of what a Police Officer is and must be. Police Officers must have the highest integrity and must also be honest. Police Officers must always act in an ethical manner as well.

I therefore recommend that Recruit Shayna Kendall be dismissed the Academy immediately.”

This document from POSTC indicates that Sergeant Kendall has a documented history of being untruthful and had falsified a document, a permission slip, while attending the POSTC academy, calling into her question her integrity. As a result of these violations, then recruit Kendall resigned from the POSTC Academy when the POSTC academy moved to dismiss her from the academy for dishonesty. Sergeant Kendall subsequently filed complaint(s) alleging that the POSTC academy staff’s actions were racially bias and discriminatory. Sergeant Kendall was later rehired as a New Haven Police Officer.

In addition, Sergeant Kendall had a disciplinary write up from then Captain Duff for a hostile work environment incident with another sworn member of the New Haven Department of Police Service. There were other disciplinary documents within Sergeant Kendall’s file, but none that listed violations against her for dishonesty/untruthfulness.

**POSTC Instructor Certifications for Sergeant Kendall:**

This investigation revealed that Sergeant Kendall is certified by the Police Officer Standards and Training Council (POSTC) to instruct police officers in a multitude of subject areas. The following is a list of all the subject areas that Sergeant Kendall is certified to teach through POSTC:

110-A Orientation to Basic Training
102-Police Ethics and Moral Issues
209-Use of Force
301-Firearms
301A-Decision Shooting
307-Practical Skills Day
404-Juvenile Law/Dealing with Juveniles
411-Conflict Management
412-Cultural Awareness and Diversity
414-Blue Courage
416-Procedural Justice
419-Implicit Bias
512-Sexual Assault/Rape Crisis
524-Crimes Motivated by Bigotry and Bias
607-Domestic Violence
617-Civil Complaints and Service Calls
618-Note Taking and Report Writing
705-Field Training Responsibility

This information suggests that Sergeant Kendall is well versed in New Haven Police policy, police tactics and procedures and current police training trends as a police instructor and police supervisor.

**Disciplinary Records for Officer Hoffman and Officer Harpe:**

On January 13, 2021, I checked RMS for any inspection reports, along with Internal Affairs and Patrol Division disciplinary records and could not find any documentation of Sergeant Kendall taking any disciplinary or corrective action against Officer Hoffman or Officer Harpe at any time. They had no disciplinary files that called into question their truthfulness or integrity.
Public Works Milling- Crescent Street/Ella T. Grasso Boulevard:

On January 20, 2022 Lt. Colon confirmed that the roadway in the area of Crescent Street and Ella T. Grasso Boulevard had been recently milled in July of 2021, but no active construction/milling was occurring on the date of July 7th, 2021, contrary to what Sergeant Kendall stated and corroborating Hawthorne’s statement. Lt. Colon confirmed this information with Rich Christianson from Public works, who confirmed that there was no active construction at Crescent St and Ella Grasso Blvd on July 7, 2021. Christianson stated New Haven public works milled Crescent St./Ella T. Grasso Blvd on July 6, 2021 (day prior to the incident with Hawthorne) and worked their way to the Crescent St and Munson St area and ended on Dyer St, where they left their milling equipment and trucks. On July 7, 2021, his crew milled the Henry St/Orchard St area’s. This conversation was captured on Lt. Colon’s body worn camera. In addition, the New Haven Police extra duty job detail for July 7th, 2021 indicated that there was no extra duty officer hired for construction in the area of Crescent Street and Ella T. Grasso Boulevard where the incident with Hawthorne occurred.

Referral to The States Attorney Office GA 23:

This investigative file has been forwarded to Supervisory Assistant States Attorney Strollo at GA 23 for further review.
Conclusion:

On July 8th, 2021 the Office of Internal Affairs of the New Haven Department of Police Service received a civilian complaint form from Virginia Hawthorne. Hawthorne alleged that on July 7, 2021 at approximately 7:07AM she was traveling on Crescent Street (east bound) and stopped at a red traffic light at the intersection of Ella T. Grasso Blvd directly behind a silver GMC Acadia. At this time, the silver GMC Acadia was stopped at the red traffic light in front of Hawthorne’s vehicle at the intersection. When the traffic light turned green, Hawthorne alleged that the operator of the silver GMC Acadia did not move and after waiting several seconds, Hawthorne tapped her vehicle’s horn and beeped at the silver GMC Acadia. Hawthorne documented on her civilian complaint form that the operator appeared “distracted.”

Hawthorne documented that the silver GMC Acadia then continued on Crescent Street (east bound) and Hawthorne made a right (south bound) onto Ella Grasso Blvd to head to Yale-New Haven Hospital where she is currently employed as a registered nurse. Hawthorne documented that she observed the silver GMC Acadia making a U-turn and begin following behind her vehicle so closely that she could not see the “grill” of the silver GMC Acadia. Hawthorne alleged that she observed emergency lights activate in the silver GMC Acadia while it traveled behind her. That Hawthorne hesitated before eventually pulling over to the side of the road since Hawthorne alleged she did nothing wrong to be pulled over. Hawthorne also claimed to be fearful of the silver GMC Acadia and of being “shot” for beeping her horn at the vehicle. Hawthorne documented that many vehicle’s in New Haven have “novelty lights” installed and the silver GMC Acadia had no markings identifying it as a police vehicle. Hawthorne alleged that the female operator of the silver GMC Acadia pulled alongside her vehicle, not behind, in side-by-side fashion but never exited the vehicle. Hawthorne alleged that the female operator identified herself as a police officer, but did not identify the agency she worked for.

During her audio recorded interview at the Office of Internal Affairs, Hawthorne provided additional details and stated she could not tell if the female officer was in a police uniform or
not because she was too afraid to look and the GMC Acadia had tinted windows. Hawthorne stated that the female officer stated to her “I bet you didn’t know that you were beeping at a police officer.” Hawthorne stated she responded “No, but you were stopped at a green light.” Hawthorne stated that the female officer said, “Well, what’s your hurry?” Hawthorne stated that she told the female officer that she was on her way to work. Hawthorne stated that the female officer replied, “Well now, you’re detained. And you’re not the only one on the road you know.” Hawthorne stated that the female officer told her that it was a construction zone. Hawthorne claimed that there was no active construction zone at the time of the incident and that the roadway had already been milled. Hawthorne also stated that there was no longer a construction sign posted and that the sign hadn’t been displayed for days. That Hawthorne travels this same route from her residence in Hamden to her place of employment at Yale-New Haven Hospital on a daily basis. Hawthorne stated that the female officer never asked her for her license, vehicle registration or insurance and never told her that she was free to leave the scene at any point during the stop.

Hawthorne claimed she apologized several times for beeping her horn at the female officer and that the female officer never moved her vehicle to allow Hawthorne to leave. Therefore, Hawthorne maneuvered her vehicle around the silver GMC Acadia to leave the scene after the encounter. Hawthorne documented in her civilian complaint form that she was “very upset at a police officer exhibiting road rage and, abusing her power. I was harassed and detained.” Hawthorne claimed that she was so upset about the incident that she returned to the area herself to see if she was able to locate any surveillance cameras which may have captured the incident, in addition to calling the New Haven Police Department and Southern Connecticut State University Police Department in attempt to identify which agency/officer ran her marker plate. Hawthorne stated that she was detained for no reason and was further alarmed when she discovered that her marker plate was never queried by law enforcement. The female police officer was not identified by name by Hawthorne in her civilian complaint or during her interview with internal affairs. I was unable to locate any body-worn camera footage, documentation or radio transmissions for this incident after receiving Hawthorne’s civilian complaint. Because of this and based on the serious misconduct allegations made by
Hawthorne in her civilian complaint according to General Order 2.08 “Civilian Complaints,” I was assigned Hawthorne’s civilian complaint to investigate further.

The area of the motor vehicle stop described by Hawthorne (Crescent Street and Ella T. Grasso Boulevard) is located in close proximity to the New Haven Police Academy, located at 710 Sherman Parkway New Haven, CT. It is common knowledge among sworn members of the New Haven Department of Police Service that a silver GMC Acadia is assigned to sworn members of the NHPD who are assigned to work at the New Haven Police Academy. During this investigation, it was confirmed by Glen Oliwa, Project Leader for the New Haven Web Site and Application Support, that a silver GMC Acadia bearing CT marker plate CT 587NH is currently assigned as Sergeant Shayna Kendall’s department issued vehicle and the only GMC Acadia in the New Haven police fleet that was active on the date of July 7, 2021. Sergeant Shayna Kendall is currently assigned as the deputy commander of the New Haven Police Academy.

Oliwa provided GPS records for Sergeant Kendall’s department issued vehicle (CT 587NH) for July 7, 2021. The GPS records confirmed that Sergeant Shayna Kendall’s department issued vehicle was in operation on the date, approximate time and in the location described by Hawthorne. A portion of the GPS records for CT 587NH on July 7th, 2021 showed the following: that the vehicle was located at 83 Wintergreen Ave., New Haven, CT and traveling at Max MPH of 37. The next available GPS coordinates showed that the vehicle was located at 476 Crescent St. New Haven, CT at 07:08:11 AM and traveling at Max MPH of 36. The next available GPS coordinates showed that the vehicle was located at 1768 Ella T Grasso Blvd., New Haven, CT at 07:09:12 AM and traveling at Max MPH of 56. The next available GPS coordinates showed that the vehicle was located at 1702 Ella T Grasso Blvd, New Haven, CT at 07:10:13 AM and traveling at Max MPH at 45. The next available GPS coordinates showed that the vehicle was located at 1807 Ella T Grasso Blvd, New Haven, CT at 07:11:14 AM and traveling at Max MPH at 35. The next available GPS coordinates showed that the vehicle was located at 295 Colony Rd, New Haven, CT at 07:12:14 AM and traveling at Max MPH at 35. Of note was the increase in speed of 56 MPH in the area of 1768 Ella Grasso Blvd at 7:09:12 AM after previously being tracked at 476 Crescent St. New
Haven, CT at 07:08:11 AM and traveling at Max MPH of 36. This information suggests that Sergeant Kendall’s department issued vehicle accelerated slightly for a short moment in time in the approximate area and time of the motor vehicle stop as described by Hawthorne.

During this investigation, I also reviewed cell phone records for Sergeant Shayna Kendall’s department issued cell phone number (475) 331-3251 for the date of July 7, 2021. This review was conducted based on Hawthorne documenting on her civilian complaint form that the female police officer who pulled her over appeared “distracted” at the green light. Sergeant Kendall’s department issued cell phone records revealed that on July 7th, 2021 at approximately 7:07 AM her telephone number was on an active phone call with telephone number [REDACTED] for three minutes in duration. This telephone number was later identified by Sergeant Shayna Kendall as belonging to her fiancé. Sergeant Kendall’s department issued cell phone records also showed that at approximately 7:11 AM Sergeant Shayna Kendall was on an active phone call with telephone number [REDACTED]. The records showed that the phone call with [REDACTED] lasted 120 minutes in duration on July 7th, 2021. Both of these calls occurred at the approximate time of the motor vehicle stop according to Hawthorne. The work phone records also showed that Sergeant Kendall communicated with telephone number [REDACTED] one additional time on July 7th, 2021 after this 120 minute call. In addition, work cell phone records showed that Sergeant Kendall communicated with [REDACTED] frequently on her department issued cell phone. Telephone number [REDACTED] was later confirmed as belonging to Ofc. K. Hoffman based on Telestaff records.

Based on the above information, Lt. Manmeet Colon (OIC) of the Internal Affairs Division and I conducted an audio recorded interview with Sergeant Kendall in the Office of Internal Affairs. Sergeant Kendall read, signed, and acknowledged that she understood both the False Statement form and Internal Investigation form prior to the interview commencing. During her interview Sergeant Kendall stated, among other things, that she remembered the incident with Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall confirmed that she was operating her department issued vehicle, a silver GMC Acadia, on July 7th, 2021 and self-initiated the encounter with Hawthorne in the area of Crescent Street and Ella T. Grasso Boulevard. Sergeant Kendall
confirmed that her body-worn camera was never activated and that she did not complete any
documentation, traffic forms or infractions, nor did she notify dispatch of the stop with
Hawthorne. It was confirmed during the course of this investigation that Sergeant Kendall
was issued and trained on using a body-worn camera.

Sergeant Kendall stated the reason she did not do any of the above was because she was not
“on-duty” at the time. This was an unusual response for a veteran police supervisor who has
received extensive training as a police instructor on police tactics, New Haven police policy
and is currently assigned as the deputy commander of the New Haven Police Academy.
Sergeant Kendall provided responses to certain questions during her internal affairs interview
that were inconsistent with Hawthorne, Lt. Maturo and Ofc. Hoffman’s statements and also
conflicted with the facts and evidence collected during this investigation. However, she made
statements which corroborated portions of their accounts of the incident while being
questioned at lesser key moments.

Regarding Sergeant Kendall’s statements to internal affairs that she was not on-duty at the
time she self-initiated the encounter with Hawthorne:

During her internal affairs interview I asked Sergeant Kendall if she could explain why she
felt she was not on duty at the time of the encounter with Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall
replied, “Yes. Because I was running late. So, I had notified my, uh, my lieutenant,
Lieutenant Maturo at the time that I would be late arriving and that I would let him know
when I got there.” During her internal affairs interview, I asked Sergeant Kendall if she
notified dispatch of her location of the motor vehicle stop. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No, I
was not on duty. I...my primary concern was to make sure that whoever was in the vehicle
was okay ‘cause I thought emer-, uh, di-, initial thought was emergency. If there is an
emergency, then there’s something that I can do obviously to help, but it wasn’t you know,
enforcement action or to address, um, any motor vehicle violations. Like I said, I was not on
duty, Um, I literally was in sweats and a, and a t-shirt in the ca-, in the vehicle, um, and so
once, you know, the assessment was made that she didn’t need any medical attention, then
there was no need for me to continue my conversation with her.” The above statement by
Sergeant Kendall about being off-duty at the time she self-initiated the encounter with Hawthorne was proven to be inaccurate.

Department records confirmed that Sergeant Kendall was scheduled for duty on July 7th, 2021 from 7:00AM to 3:00PM. In her civilian complaint form, Hawthorne documented that on July 7th, 2021 “I was driving down Crescent St at about 0707.” GPS coordinates of Sergeant Kendall’s department issued vehicle position her silver GMC Acadia in the area of the motor vehicle stop location at the approximate times of 7:08:11 AM and 7:09:12 AM on July 7th, 2021, after her 7:00 AM scheduled start time, which corroborates Hawthorne’s account of the approximate time of the stop.

Furthermore, during her internal affairs interview, when asked if she activated her department issued vehicles’ emergency lights, Sergeant Kendall stated “So my lights were activated when I made the U-turn. I don’t know if they were still on when she pulled over, but I don’t recall, like, reactivating them.” Sergeant Kendall also stated “when I made the U-turn on Crescent almost like I’m going to work, um, when I made the U-turn, I can’t tell you if I immediately turned them off. So if...so there is a possibility that my lights were still on when I had got up to her but I can’t...I don’t remember, like, re-engaging my, my lights.” Sergeant Kendall stated she then pulled up alongside of Hawthorne’s vehicle to check on Hawthorne and ensure there was not a medical emergency or other issue occurring within Hawthorne’s vehicle, not to take enforcement action.

I asked Sergeant Kendall how she thought Hawthorne was able to identify her as a police officer. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Because I had lights, yeah.” Sergeant Kendall stated she did not specifically identify herself as a police officer during the stop, although this was disputed by Hawthorne alleging that Sergeant Kendall stated, “You didn’t realize it was a police officer in front of you.”

Based on Sergeant Kendall’s statements above, she believed Hawthorne identified Sergeant Kendall as a police officer as a result of Sergeant Kendal activating her department issued vehicles’ emergency lights. Sergeant Kendall also stated during her interview that “there is a possibility that my lights were still on when I had got up to her but I can’t...I don’t
remember.” Hawthorne stated during her internal affairs interview that after making the U-turn on Crescent Street, the silver GMC Acadia began following behind Hawthorne’s vehicle closely. Hawthorne stated she saw emergency lights flash behind her vehicle and hesitated before finally pulling over.

During Officer Hoffman’s interview, she was asked how she knew Sergeant Kendall signaled for Hawthorne to pull over and conduct the motor vehicle stop. Officer Hoffman responded, “Well, she told me she did and, you know, a normal person is not gonna just pull over because you’re behind them.” Officer Hoffman also stated that she believed that she met Sergeant Kendall at the gym to work out together early on July 7, 2021. Officer Hoffman did not state which gym they went to. It was later confirmed that Sergeant Kendall has a gym membership at Powerhouse gym located at 31 Bernhard Road in North Haven, CT. GPS records for Sergeant Kendall’s department issued vehicle showed her vehicle in this area at 5:38 AM on July 7th, 2021. This information corroborates Officer Hoffman’s statement to internal affairs.

By activating her department issued vehicles’ emergency lights for a law enforcement purpose, which includes stopping a car that appears to be driving erratically to determine if a medical emergency is occurring, Sergeant Kendall invoked her official capacity as a sworn police officer and put herself on-duty by self-initiating a motor vehicle stop on Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall activating her vehicles’ emergency lights is what signaled for Hawthorne to pull over according to Hawthorne and Officer Hoffman. A police officer signaling for a motor vehicle to stop and pull over by the activation of emergency lights is considered a seizure under the 4th amendment.

U.S. v. Gaines found that by activating police emergency lights the court concluded that “(1) the police officers showed their authority and (2) no reasonable person would have felt free to leave”.

This basic information is taught to police recruits in police academy settings and to sworn officers during annual in-service training. During her internal affairs interview, Lt. Colon
asked Officer Hoffman if she heard an audible siren while on the cell phone with Sergeant Kendall at the time of the stop. Ofc. Hoffman said, “Yeah.” Sergeant Kendall stated she did not remember activating her department issued vehicles’ emergency siren at the time of the motor vehicle stop after making the U turn. Hawthorne stated in her internal affairs interview that she did not remember hearing a siren.

Regarding Sergeant Kendall’s statements to internal affairs that she notified Lt. Maturo via her personal cell phone that she would be arriving late on July, 7th 2021:

Later in the interview I confirmed again that Sergeant Kendall stated that she notified Lt. Maturo that she was late on July 7th, 2021. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Lieutenant, yes.” I asked Sergeant Kendall how she contacted Lieutenant Maturo. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Uh, in…by phone, I remember when I had gotten to the office ‘cause I let him know, Okay. I’m here now.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she contacted Lieutenant Maturo by phone to advise him that she was running late. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Oh, yeah. I let him know, yeah that I’m running late.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if she notified Lieutenant Maturo using her department cell phone. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. That was my personal phone.” This response by Sergeant Kendall was later proven to be untruthful.

Lt. Maturo, New Haven Police Academy Commander and Sergeant Kendall’s direct supervisor at the time of this incident, stated he was not contacted by Sergeant Kendall by cell phone on July 7th, 2021 during his internal affairs interview. For clarification during his interview, I asked Lt. Maturo if there was a phone conversation the morning of July 7th, 2021 between he and Sergeant Kendall. Lt. Maturo replied, “No.” I asked Lt. Maturo if there was any record of the communication between Sergeant Kendall and himself. Lt. Maturo replied, “No.” During his discrepancy interview, Lt. Maturo confirmed that he was not contacted by Sergeant Kendall on July 7th, 2021, stating, “Not on a cell phone or a landline.” These responses were supported by both Lt. Maturo’s work and personal cell phone records, which he voluntarily provided to Internal Affairs upon request. Both Lt. Maturo’s department issued cell phone and personal cell phone records did not show any incoming calls on July 7th, 2021 from either Sergeant Kendall’s personal cell phone number, which was identified by Lt.
Maturo during his interview, or department issued cell phone, as well as police academy land-lines. Furthermore, Lt. Maturo’s key card access confirmed he was not present at the New Haven Police Academy from June 25, 2021 until July 12, 2021. Department email correspondences between Sergeant Kendall and Lt. Maturo were checked and did not reveal any communication about Sergeant Kendall being late on July 7th, 2021.

Lt. Maturo was on a scheduled vacation for the date range of June 25, 2021 until July 12, 2021 according to department payroll records, although he stated he was local. This date range for Lt. Maturo’s vacation was not listed in Telestaff where department members would be able to view it easily, but in payroll records where attendance forms need to be requested for viewing. In an email exchange between Lt. Maturo and Chief Dominguez on June 24th, 2021 Chief Dominguez is informed by Lt. Maturo that he will be on vacation from 6/28-7/12 and Chief Dominguez responded “Enjoy. I will communicate with Sgt. Kendall for any needs. I assume then she is handling Lewis?”

During this timeframe, and specifically on July 7, 2021, Sergeant Kendall was the only supervisor assigned to the New Haven Police Academy and she was without an immediate supervisor. Lt. Maturo stated during his internal affairs interview that he believed they may have spoken together the day before about her arriving late on July 7th, 2021, however his personal cell phone records showed that they spoke together on July 9th, 2021 two days after July, 7th. Lt. Maturo did state that Sergeant Kendall frequently communicates with him when she is late arriving for work at the academy. Key card activity for Sergeant Kendall indicates Sergeant Kendall arrives to work late often. During her discrepancy interview, Sergeant Kendall opted not to provide her personal cell phone records for July 7, 2021. When confronted with the above information, Sergeant Kendall claimed she could not remember specific details of when she spoke with Lt. Maturo about being late to work on July 7th, 2021 since the incident with Hawthorne happened in July of 2021.

Regarding Sergeant Kendall’s statements to internal affairs about using her cell phone during the same time of the encounter with Hawthorne:
During her internal affairs interview I asked Sergeant Kendall if she was on her phone at the time of the encounter with Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No.” This response from Sergeant Kendall was proven to be untruthful based on Ofc. Hoffman’s statement, where she confirmed that she was on an active phone call with Sergeant Kendall at the time Sergeant Kendall was conducting the motor vehicle stop on Hawthorne. This was confirmed by Sergeant Kendall’s department issued cell phone records showing she was on an active phone call with Ofc. Hoffman for 120 minutes and Ofc. Hoffman’s knowledge of the facts of the incident with Hawthorne. After being confronted that her work cell phone records showed that she was in fact on an active phone call with Ofc. Hoffman at the approximate time the stop with Hawthorne occurred, and with Ofc. Hoffman’s statement, Sergeant Kendall then stated she did not remember and that she takes many calls in her position. In her civilian complaint, Hawthorne documented that the operator appeared “distracted” while stopped at the green light at the intersection of Crescent Street and Ella T. Grasso Boulevard. This information substantiates Hawthorne’s claim of Sergeant Kendall possibly being distracted at the intersection.

Regarding Sergeant Kendall’s statements to internal affairs that her intention on conducting the motor vehicle stop on Hawthorne was solely to check if a medical emergency or other unknown issue was occurring with Hawthorne or in her vehicle:

During her internal affairs interview, Sergeant Kendall stated that she asked Hawthorne during the motor vehicle stop “Are you okay? Are you Okay? Where are you going?” Sergeant Kendall stated that she believed Hawthorne told her she was going to work. Sergeant Kendall stated that she again asked Hawthorne, “But are you okay? I saw the way you were driving back in the, um, where they were milling, they’re doing construction. If you don’t have an emergency, are you okay?” Later during the interview, I told Sergeant Kendall that Hawthorne alleged in her interview that she believed Sergeant Kendall made a U-turn to follow Hawthorne’s vehicle after she turned onto Ella Grasso Boulevard because Hawthorne beeped her vehicle’s horn at Sergeant Kendall when she (Kendall) did not proceed through the green traffic control signal. Sergeant Kendall responded by saying, “Oh, okay. Yeah. No. That’s, that’s unfortunate that that’s her interpretation of that a-, um, but no, I, I mean, I’ve
not had an IA complaint and for someone to beep, that’s unfortunate that that’s her perce-, that’s her perception, but my primary reason was to make sure that Shewa-, like, everything was okay in the vehicle.” These statements made by Sergeant Kendall during her internal affairs interview were inconsistent with other statements provided during this investigation.

Hawthorne alleged during her first interview at internal affairs that the female officer who pulled her over said to her “I bet you didn’t know that you were beeping at a police officer” and that she was being “detained.” Hawthorne believed Sergeant Kendall pulled her over as retaliation for beeping her horn at her at the green light. During her discrepancy interview Hawthorne stated that Sergeant Kendall never inquired if she was having a medical emergency or any emergency after pulling her over.

In addition, during Ofc. Hoffman’s internal affairs interview, Ofc. Hoffman confirmed that she was on the phone with Sergeant Kendall at the same time that Sergeant Kendall was conducting the motor vehicle stop on Hawthorne and remembered speaking to Sergeant Kendall directly right after the incident. That it appeared Sergeant Kendall placed her cell phone down while engaging Hawthorne, therefore Ofc. Hoffman could not hear exactly what was said between the two. During the interview, Lt. Colon asked Ofc. Hoffman if she could provide information regarding the incident with Hawthorne and Sergeant Kendall in July. Ofc. Hoffman said, “Okay. S- a while ago. Um, I don’t remember word for word exactly what was discussed, but I do remember she did tell me that she was at a light. I, I believed she started at eight so I don’t know if she was actually on duty or if... I think, I think she was heading to work, but I could be mistaken. Um, but, uh, she was at a stop light. Um, I believe she said there was construction in front of her. Um, a lady was behind her beeping. Um, she said that when...she couldn’t move, I guess, because of the construction and there was traffic, whatever, so when the light changed, uh, she stayed at the intersection and the lady kind of zoomed around her, like, quickly. And she followed the lady and initiated her 21’s (New Haven Police radio code for lights and sirens) and pulled alongside her and kind of asked her where she was going and, if she realized that i: was a construction area and that, you know, the lady can’t be speeding and driving reckless conduct, but that was the gist.
Like, I...we were on the phone and I g-, I’m assuming she put the phone down ’cause I didn’t hear her.

Ofc. Hoffman stated that Sergeant Kendall explained what happened with Hawthorne right after picking her phone back up and continuing their conversation. Lt. Colon asked again what Sergeant Kendall told Ofc. Hoffman. Ofc. Hoffman responded, “It was a construction area, Jam, whatever. The person beep, beep, beep, and zoomed around her fast. Um, so she, you know, I mean she made the stop. Um, and just rolled her window down and spoke to the woman.” Lt. Colon asked Ofc. Hoffman “Did she say anything about, um...you have to be very truthful about this. Did she said anything about offering medical attention to the individual or asking if she was okay?” Ofc. Hoffman replied, “I can’t recall that.” During her interview Ofc. Hoffman was asked how she knew Sergeant Kendall signaled for Hawthorne to pull over and conducted the motor vehicle stop. Officer Hoffman responded, “Well she told me she did and, you know, a normal person is not gonna just pull over because you’re behind them.”

During Lt. Maturo’s internal affairs interview, Lt. Maturo stated that Sergeant Kendall briefly discussed the encounter with Hawthorne with him. Lt. Maturo stated regarding Sergeant Kendall “she said that, you know, a lady was, uh, behind her and she could see that she was going through a construction zone and she could see that she was, uh, kind of moving her car quickly. It brought it to her attention, so it was something that was going on behind her. I said “Okay.” And then, uh, you know, later was beeping her horn, kind of push-, but from what I remember.”

During her internal affairs interview, I told Sergeant Kendall that Hawthorne alleged in her interview that she believed Sergeant Kendall made a U-turn to follow Hawthorne’s vehicle after she turned onto Ella Grasso Boulevard as retaliation for Hawthorne beeping her vehicle’s horn at Sergeant Kendall when she (Kendall) did not proceed through the green traffic control signal. Sergeant Kendall responded by saying, “Oh, okay. Yeah. No. That’s, that’s unfortunate that that’s her interpretation of that a-, um, but no, I, I mean, I’ve not had an IA complaint and for someone to beep, that’s unfortunate that that’s her perce-, that’s her
perception.” The above statements suggest that Sergeant Kendall initiated the motor vehicle stop on Hawthorne for law enforcement purposes beyond solely checking on her medical status, contrary to the responses she gave during her internal affairs interview.

Regarding Sergeant Kendall’s statements to internal affairs about not knowing who telephone number belonged to:

During her internal affairs interview, Lt. Colon asked Sergeant Kendall if she could identify who telephone number belonged to and if that person may have overheard her conversation with Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. I...I don’t even know whose number that is. I’d have to put it in my phone.” At this time Sgt. Kendall was seen checking her work phone, as if she was looking through it for that contact number. Sergeant Kendall continued saying, “No. The number doesn’t even come on in my phone. I don’t know who that is.” Sergeant Kendall continued, “So I can’t tell you, um, are you sure?” I showed Sergeant Kendall her work phone records at this time. Sergeant Kendall looked at the number and said, “That-, that’s right. Um, I, I couldn’t tell you.” Statements and evidence collected during this investigation show that this was an untruthful response by Sergeant Kendall.

During her internal affairs interview, Ofc. Hoffman explained that she and Sergeant Kendall speak often together. That she believed they met at the gym to work out together earlier on July 7th, 2021 prior to Sergeant Kendall’s stop with Hawthorne. Sergeant Kendall claimed she was running late on the morning of July 7th, 2021 but did not provide a reason and was not questioned further. Furthermore, work cell phone records indicate that Sergeant Kendall and Ofc. Hoffman spoke a total of two times on July 7th, 2021 alone, to include one (1) 120-minute conversation. Work cell phone records confirmed that they speak together often, corroborating Ofc. Hoffman.

During her internal affairs interview, Lt. Colon asked Officer Hoffman “Okay. Um, and do you know if your phone number is stored in Kendall’s phone? Like, as in, you know, if I have a contact like, I have your number stored.” Ofc. Hoffman replied, “I’m sure...she was
my supervisor at some point...prior, so, and that was before we had cell phones, so...And b-, that was before we had cell phones so...” One of the locations listed in the GPS records for Sergeants Kendall’s department issued vehicle was for 31 Bernhard Rd., North Haven, CT. Sergeant Kendall’s vehicle was located at this address from 04:11:36 AM to 05:39:05 AM on July 7, 2021. A search of this address revealed that this was the address for the Powerhouse gym. I contacted Powerhouse gym and spoke with “Jerry” in an attempt to corroborate Officer Hoffman's statement. I was told by “Jerry” that he was unable to confirm that Sergeant Kendall was at the gym on July 7, 2021, but that she recently extended her gym membership there.

Regarding Sergeant Kendall’s statements to internal affairs that the roadway on Crescent Street and Ella T. Grasso Boulevard was being actively milled at the time of the incident with Hawthorne:

During her internal affairs interview, I asked Sergeant Kendall if there was construction actively occurring in the area at the time of the incident. Sergeant Kendall replied, “Yes.” I asked Sergeant Kendall if the construction zone was active at the time of the incident or if it had already been milled. Sergeant Kendall replied, “No. it was active so there were trucks out there and cones. But I don’t recall seeing, like, an officer out there so maybe he or she has yet to arrive.”

Hawthorne, during her internal affairs interview claimed that there was no active milling going on in the roadway at the time she was pulled over by Sergeant Kendall. This was corroborated by Lt. Colon in a conversation with City of New Haven Public Works supervisor Rich Christianson who stated the milling was occurring in the area of Crescent Street and Ella T. Grasso Boulevard on July 6th, 2021 (the day prior). Therefore, Sergeant Kendall’s statement about the milling being active in the roadway on July 7, 2021 is considered inaccurate.

During her discrepancy interview at internal affairs, Sergeant Kendall was argumentative when confronted with the inconsistencies in her initial statement and at one point, became
angry and refused to answer a question before being redirected to do so by Lt. Colon. She alleged at this time that the internal investigation and subsequent discrepancy interview was personal from Lt. Colon and Captain Zannelli, although this investigation is being conducted based on Hawthorne’s civilian complaint. Sergeant Kendall did not make these same allegations during her initial internal affairs interview and made them only after being confronted with the contradictions in her initial statement based on the statements and evidence learned during this investigation.

Also, during her discrepancy interview, Sergeant Kendall stated that Hawthorne’s civilian complaint against her was made several months ago and that she could not remember the exact facts of the encounter with Hawthorne or some of her actions on July 7th, 2021. When advised about the discrepancy in when and how she notified Lt. Maturo she would be late on July 7th, 2021 when records showed they didn’t speak via either his personal or work cell phone records and that Lt. Maturo was scheduled for vacation on that day, Sergeant Kendall responded “So I answered the question. I do not remember if it was through text, in person, or call. Most of the time, I would give him a call. But I’m telling you, there’s not one single time that I was late or otherwise that my Lieutenant was not informed.” Sergeant Kendall also stated “I know that I communicate with him very often through phone, whether it’s voice, voice calls or it is text messaging, or it is in person if he is there. There’s not one move that I’ve ever made that I don’t let my superior aware...make him aware of. You want to know why? Because I don’t sit in the seat of position where I have the luxury of doing that where there are other people who do.” Sergeant Kendall’s department issued key card activity/activation into the New Haven Police Academy where she is currently assigned as Deputy Commander of Training and scheduled to start her shift at 7:00AM indicated that Sergeant Kendall is late arriving at the New Haven police academy very frequently when she is scheduled for duty.
Sergeant Kendall often referred to the incident with Hawthorne as “insignificant.” Sergeant Kendall also inquired about the race of Hawthorne during her discrepancy interview, an unusual question for a subject police officer in an administrative interview to ask about a citizen. Sergeant Kendall was advised that New Haven Police civilian complaint forms do not capture the race/ethnicity of complainants and that Hawthorne was never questioned on her ethnicity. Hawthorne is the mother of New Haven Police Ofc. J. Harpe, who has no documented history of ever being disciplined/counseled by Sergeant Kendall or credibility issues, same as Ofc. Hoffman.

Based on the untruthful and inaccurate responses given by Sergeant Shayna Kendall during this internal affairs investigation, and based on her documented history of being deceitful and falsifying a document as a sworn police recruit at POSTC, and based on Hawthorne not having any known issues that would call into question Hawthorne’s integrity, this investigation into Hawthorne’s civilian complaint against Sergeant Shayna Kendall is sustained based on a preponderance of the evidence. Sergeant Kendall is hereby found in violation of the below New Haven Department of Police Service General Orders:

**General Order 1.03 Rules of Conduct.1.03.04 Section One-Principles:**

The following principles of personal and professional conduct have their basis in the general proposition that police officers hold their office in the public trust. Whenever a police officer’s actions, whether on or off duty, have a provable adverse relationship on the officer’s performance, or have a tendency to destroy confidence or respect for the profession, such actions(s) form the basis for a charge of “Conduct Unbecoming an Officer.”
General Order 1.03 Rules of Conduct 1.03.12 Section Two-Rules of Conduct:

Police officers shall not commit any act or action constituting "Conduct Unbecoming an Officer". Conduct unbecoming a police officer shall include conduct which indicates that the officer is unable or unfit to continue as a member of the Department or tends to impair the operation of the Department or its other members. Although it is by no means an exhaustive list, violations of the following rules of conduct shall be considered conduct unbecoming an officer.

7. Employees are expected to be truthful in all matters and shall not knowingly enter or cause to be entered into any Department books, records or reports, any inaccurate, false or improper information.

General Order 1.03 Rules of Conduct 1.03.05 Principle One-Law Abiding:

Police officers shall conduct themselves, whether on duty or when applicable, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the State of Connecticut, and all applicable laws, ordinances and rules enacted or established by legal authority.

Rationale

Police officers conduct their duties pursuant to a grant of limited authority from the community. Therefore, officers must understand the laws defining the scope of their enforcement powers. Police officers may only act in accordance with the powers granted to them. (Refer to the General Order on Department Role and Authority)

1.1 Police officers shall not knowingly exceed their authority in the enforcement of the law.
1.3 Police officers shall not knowingly restrict the freedom of individuals, whether by arrest or detention, in violation of the Constitutions and laws of the United States and the State of Connecticut.

**General Order 1.03 Rules of Conduct 1.03.06 Principle Two-Integrity:**

Police officers shall refrain from any conduct in an official capacity that detracts from the public's faith in the integrity of the criminal justice systems.

**RATIONALE**

Community cooperation with the police is a product of its trust that officers will act honestly and with impartiality the police officer as the public’s initial contact with the criminal justice system must act a manner that instills such trust.

**RULES**

2.1 Police officers shall carry out their duties with integrity, fairness, and impartiality.

2.3 Police officers shall truthfully completely and impartially report, testify, and present evidence, including exculpatory evidence in all matters of an official nature.

2.4 Police officers shall take no action knowing it will violate the constitutional rights of any person.

**General Order 1.03 Rules of Conduct 1.03.08 Principle Four-Trustworthy:**

Police officers shall not, whether on or off duty, exhibit any conduct which discredits themselves, or the Department, or otherwise impairs their ability, or that of other officers, or the Department to provide law enforcement services to the community.
General Order 7.10 Body-Worn Cameras. 7.10.05 Procedures. Use and Activation of an Issued or Approved Body-Worn Camera:

- Police officers issued or assigned a body-worn camera shall activate the camera at the inception of the interaction with the public in a law enforcement capacity. Officers are not required to notify the public when the camera is in use. However, if asked, the Officer will inform the person that they are being recorded.

- For the purposes of this policy, "interacting with the public in a law enforcement capacity," means that a police officer is in personal contact with one or more members of the public, the purpose of which is to conduct a self-initiated investigation into, or to respond to a third-party complaint involving, the possible commission of any offense, violation or infraction.

- In addition, police officers shall record the following:
  - Vehicular pursuits
  - Motorist assists
  - The taking of statements from suspects, witnesses and victims
  - The conducting of interviews with suspects, witnesses and victims

General Order 12.01 Traffic Stop Statistics Form. 12.01.02 Policy:

In accordance with Connecticut General Statutes Sec. 54-1m, the State of Connecticut mandates that all police departments provide statistical data concerning motor vehicle stops.
As such, it is the policy of the New Haven Department of Police Service to operate within the guidelines of state law and to prohibit the stopping, detention, or color, age, gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation and such action would constitute a violation of the civil rights of the person.

**General Order 12.01 Traffic Stop Statistics Form, 12.01.04 Procedures:**

- Persons may only be subjected to stops, seizures or detentions upon reasonable suspicion they have committed, are committing, or are about to commit a crime, violation or infraction.

- Each time a person is stopped, the Officer shall radio to the dispatcher the location and nature of the stop, the number of people in the vehicle, the plate number and description of vehicle.

- Officers are required to provide persons stopped with a notice of their right to complain about or commend the Officer and instruct them to follow instructions on State form provided in order to file such a complaint or commendation.

**Traffic Stop Statistical Requirements:**

Officers are to ensure that the traffic stop form is filled out completely and contains the following information:

- The date and time of the stop

- The specific geographic location of the stop

- The badge number and name of the Officer making the stop
• The race, color, ethnicity, age and gender of the operator of the motor vehicle that is stopped. The identification of such characteristics shall be based on the observation and perception of the Police Officer responsible for reporting the stop

• The nature of the alleged traffic violation or other violation that caused the stop to be made and the statutory citation for such violation.

• The disposition of the stop including whether a warning, citation or summons was issued and the appropriate statute or regulation cited

• Whether a search was conducted, the authority for any search conducted, and the result of any search conducted

• Any other information deemed appropriate

General Order 1.01. Department Mission and Values. 1.01.04 Values:

Values are ethical statements of principle which bind us together as an organization. Values form the ethical basis for our decision making. As outlined in our mission statement, we subscribe to these values:

Honor: We will act with the utmost integrity and be both honest and truthful. We will perform our duties within the confines of the law and treat all those we encounter with Fairness, dignity and respect. We are proud of our badge and will hold ourselves to the highest standards of professional conduct.

Excellence: We will provide the highest level of service possible, exceed the community’s expectations in every interaction and serve as a model Department. We are passionate about our work and seek to continually improve our police services. We will adopt an innovative mindset that encourages creative, flexible and forward-thinking ideas to pursue the best solutions to all problems.

Accountability: We will work with and for the community we serve. Our relationship with the community is based on trust. We will maintain this trust with a commitment to uphold
our values and not abuse our police power or authority. We will communicate with the public to explain what we do, why we do it and the results of our actions. We will use technology to disseminate information and facilitate dialogue.

**Respect:** We value the inherent worth and dignity of all individuals and will act with empathy and compassion regardless of the situation. We embrace diversity and will familiarize ourselves with the cultures, customs and beliefs represented throughout our communities to enhance our ability to communicate with, listen to, and relate to all individuals.

**Tenacity:** We are committed and determined to protect the vulnerable, help others and enforce the law. We will be relentless in our efforts to solve crimes and apprehend offenders to bring justice to our victims. However, we recognize that our work cannot be done alone. We will work collectively with our community and partner agencies to achieve to achieve to achieve our goals.
The investigation determined by a preponderance of the evidence that the misconduct or malfeasance complained of occurred and that it was committed by the subject, of the investigation, Sergeant Kendall. This investigation shall be closed with the official category of **SUSTAINED**.