

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING COMMISSION**

In the Matter of)	Case No. 22-016-SU
)	(PI-2023-09-07-002)
Blake Poore)	

FINAL DECISION

In accordance with 555 CMR 1.10(1), a Hearing Officer was assigned to an adjudicatory proceeding regarding this matter on behalf of the Massachusetts Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission (“Commission”).

Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 30A, §§ 11(7) and (8) and 555 CMR 1.10(4)(e)(2), the Hearing Officer issued an Initial Decision and Order, and Blake Poore (“Respondent”) had thirty (30) days to provide written objections to the Commission. No objections were received.

After careful review and consideration, the Commission voted to affirm and adopt the Initial Decision of the Hearing Officer.

For the above reasons, the Motion for Default and Final Decision filed by the Division of Police Standards is hereby **granted**. See 555 CMR 1.10(4). The Respondent was afforded the opportunity for a full and fair hearing. See M.G.L. c. 30A, § 10 (providing that, “[i]n conducting adjudicatory proceedings,” “agencies shall afford all parties an opportunity for full and fair hearing,” and “[u]nless otherwise provided by any law, agencies may” “place on any party the responsibility of requesting a hearing if the agency notifies [the party] in writing of [the party’s] right to a hearing and of [the party’s] responsibility to request the hearing” and “make informal disposition of any adjudicatory proceeding by” “default” (emphasis added)), § 13 (providing that, “[e]xcept as otherwise provided in this section, no agency shall revoke or refuse to renew any license unless it has first afforded the licensee an opportunity for hearing in conformity with [§§ 10, 11, and 12],” but “[t]his section shall not apply” “[w]here the revocation, suspension or refusal to renew is based solely upon failure of the licensee to file timely reports, schedules, or applications . . .” (emphasis added)), incorporated by reference in M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(f) and 555 CMR 1.10(4).

The Commission finds, by clear and convincing evidence, that the Respondent is not fit for duty as an officer, is dangerous to the public, and has engaged in a pattern of unprofessional police conduct that may escalate. Thus, the Respondent’s certification is hereby revoked. Cf. M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(a)(xvi) (“The [C]ommission shall, after a hearing, revoke an officer’s certification if the [C]ommission finds by clear and convincing evidence that . . . the officer is not fit for duty as an officer and the officer is dangerous to the public, as determined by the [C]ommission.”); M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(b)(iii) (“The [C]ommission may, after a hearing, suspend or revoke an officer’s certification if the [C]ommission finds by clear and convincing evidence that the officer . . . has a pattern of unprofessional police conduct that [the] [C]ommission believes may escalate . . .”).

The Executive Director shall take the necessary steps to publish the Respondent’s name in the

National Decertification Index. See M.G.L. c. 6E, §§ 10(g), 13(b).

This is the final decision of the Commission. M.G.L. c. 30A, § 11(8); 555 CMR 1.10(4)(e).

By vote of the Commission on May 22, 2024.

In accordance with M.G.L. 30A, § 14 and M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(f), the Respondent may commence an appeal to the Superior Court within thirty (30) days to the extent allowed by law. After initiating proceedings for judicial review in Superior Court, the Respondent, or the Respondent's attorney, is required to serve a copy of the summons and complaint upon the Boston office of the Attorney General of the Commonwealth, with a copy to the Commission, in the time and manner prescribed by Mass. R. Civ. P. 4(d).

Notice to: Blake Poore, Respondent
Shaun Martinez, Esq., Commission Enforcement Counsel
Lenox Police Department, Agency
Collective Bargaining Unit
Berkshire County District Attorney's Office

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING COMMISSION**

In the Matter of)	Case No. 22-016-SU
)	(PI-2023-09-07-002)
Blake Poore)	

INITIAL DECISION

(M.G.L. c. 6E, §§ 3(a), 10(a)(xvi), 10(b)(3); 555 CMR 1.10)

I. Introduction

At issue in this matter is whether this proceeding brought by the Massachusetts Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission (“Commission”) should now terminate with a default decision in the Commission’s favor, pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 30A, § 10(2), 801 CMR 1.01(7)(a), and 555 CMR 1.10(4). Blake Poore (“Respondent”) did not answer, appear, and defend the allegations of misconduct against him in the Order to Show Cause (“OTSC”). The Respondent also did not respond to mailings delivered to him by the Division of Police Standards (“Division”). For the reasons stated below, the undersigned recommends that the Commission adopt this Initial Decision as its Final Decision, grant the Division’s Motion for Default and Final Decision (“Motion”), and proceed to determine what discipline should be imposed against the Respondent.

II. Procedural History

1. The Division served the Respondent with an OTSC on January 9, 2024, addressed to the Respondent’s last known home address. (Exs. A – OTSC and B – OTSC United States Postal Service (“USPS”) tracking information). The same order was emailed to the Respondent’s personal email address, on January 9, 2024. (Ex. C – email to the Respondent).

2. The OTSC contained the allegations against the Respondent and notification of the obligation to file an answer or otherwise respond to the allegations within 21 days. (Ex. A). The

OTSC stated that, if a responsive and timely answer was not filed, the Commission may act. (Ex. A). In particular, the Respondent was notified that the Commission would enter a Final Decision and Order that assumes the truth of the allegations in the OTSC and that the Commission may take action against the Respondent's certification, including granting, in full, the action contemplated in the OTSC. (Ex. A). The Respondent failed to file a response to the OTSC in a timely manner. (Ex. D – Motion).

3. The Motion was mailed by the Division to the Respondent by USPS Priority Mail on February 6, 2024, to the same last known address. (Ex. D). By operation of law, the Commission may presume that the Respondent received the Motion, as discussed below.

4. The cover letter of the Motion, dated February 6, 2024, stated that the Motion was enclosed. The undersigned takes administrative notice that the OTSC was attached as an exhibit to the Motion. The Respondent failed to respond to the Motion and the OTSC.

III. Allegations Contained in the OTSC

1. On July 1, 2021, pursuant to St. 2020, c. 253, § 102, an Act Relative to Justice, Equity, and Accountability in Law Enforcement in the Commonwealth, the Respondent was certified as a law enforcement officer. The Respondent was an active law enforcement officer employed by the Lenox Police Department during the time of the below allegations.

2. On or about July 22, 2023, the Respondent publicly posted to social media, in substance, that lysergic acid diethylamide (“LSD”) and psilocybin (“magic mushrooms”) are “extremely beneficial for police officers” in light of the “traumatic scenes” police encounter. The Respondent also stated in substance to another Lenox Police Department officer that he believes that LSD and magic mushrooms are beneficial to police officers and that they do not affect decision making or judgment.

3. On July 22, 2023, the Respondent, while on duty, disclosed to the same officer that he had taken LSD approximately two hours before his shift began.
4. During the corresponding investigation of the above allegations, the Respondent admitted to the chief of the Lenox Police Department that he was using LSD, claiming that he did so while working out problems in his personal life. The Respondent also admitted that he authored the above-described public social media post.
5. On July 25, 2023, the Respondent resigned, in lieu of discipline, from his position as a law enforcement officer with the Lenox Police Department.
6. On August 29, 2023, the chief of the Lenox Police Department issued his final report regarding the above allegations.

IV. Exhibits

In ruling on this matter, the undersigned has considered the Motion filed by the Division and the following exhibits:

- Exhibit A: OTSC, with a certificate of service, dated January 9, 2024.
- Exhibit B: OTSC USPS Priority Mail tracking, dated January 13, 2024.
- Exhibit C: Email to the Respondent, dated January 9, 2024.
- Exhibit D: Motion, dated February 6, 2024.

The undersigned takes administrative notice of all papers filed in this case, as well as Chapter 6E and Commission regulations. See M.G.L. c. 30A, § 11(5).

V. Legal Basis for Commission Disciplinary Action

1. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 3(a):
The [C]ommission shall have all powers necessary or convenient to carry out and effectuate its purposes, including, but not limited to, the power to:
 - (1) act as the primary civil enforcement agency for violations of [Chapter 6E]; . . .
 - (4) deny an application or limit, condition, restrict, revoke or suspend a certification, or fine a person certified for any cause that the [C]ommission deems reasonable; . . .
 - (23) restrict, suspend or revoke certifications issued under [Chapter 6E]; [and]

(24) conduct adjudicatory proceedings in accordance with [C]hapter 30A;

2. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(a)(xvi), “[t]he [C]ommission shall, after a hearing, revoke an officer’s certification if the [C]ommission finds by clear and convincing evidence that . . . the officer is not fit for duty as an officer and the officer is dangerous to the public, as determined by the [C]ommission.”

3. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(b)(iii), “[t]he [C]ommission may, after a hearing, suspend or revoke an officer’s certification if the [C]ommission finds by clear and convincing evidence that the officer . . . has a pattern of unprofessional police conduct that [the] [C]ommission believes may escalate.”

4. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(g), the Commission shall publish any revocation order and findings and shall provide all revocation information to the National Decertification Index (“NDI”).

5. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(h), the Commission may institute a disciplinary hearing after an officer’s appointing agency has issued a final disposition regarding the alleged misconduct.

VI. Notice

The Respondent was notified at his last known address by the OTSC that if he did not file an answer or otherwise respond to the allegations in the OTSC in a responsive and timely manner, the Commission could enter a Final Decision and Order that assumes the truth of the allegations in the OTSC. In addition, the notice informed him that the Commission may take particular action against his certification, including granting in full the relief contemplated in the OTSC. These advisories were sufficient to place him on notice of the consequences of any default. See Lawless v. Board of Registration in Pharmacy, 466 Mass. 1010, 1010 n.1, 1011

(2013) (concluding that pharmacist had “ample notice,” where he was informed that “failure to appear at any hearing would result in entry of default and that, in the event of default, the board could enter a final decision accepting as true the allegations contained in the show cause order”); see also University Hosp., Inc. v. Massachusetts Comm’n Against Discrimination, 396 Mass. 533, 539 (1986) (holding that default provision did not violate due process, as it “afford[ed] the respondent reasonable procedural safeguards for notice and opportunity to be heard”). Despite being afforded the opportunity to do so, the Respondent has failed to file an answer, request an adjudicatory hearing, or otherwise respond.

On February 6, 2024, the Division moved for a default judgment and final decision and served the Motion, with exhibits A, B, and C attached, by USPS Priority Mail with tracking information to the Respondent’s last known address, as indicated by a CLEAR search conducted by the Division. (Ex. D (describing the nature of a CLEAR search)).

The Commission provided sufficient notice by delivering the OTSC and the Motion using USPS Priority Mail. Under Massachusetts case law, there is a presumption that the addressee receives properly deposited mail. See Espinal’s Case, 98 Mass. App. Ct. 152-53, 156 (2020), citing Eveland v. Lawson, 240 Mass. 99, 103 (1921) (“The depositing of a letter in the post office, properly addressed, postage prepaid, to a person at his place of business or residence, is prima facie evidence that it was received in the ordinary course of mails.”); see also Commonwealth v. Crosscup, 369 Mass. 228, 239 (1975) (“Proper mailing of a letter is ‘prima facie evidence’ in civil cases of its receipt by the addressee.” (citations omitted)). Further, nothing in Chapter 6E required the Division to take any additional steps or prohibits the Division from relying on the certification that it mailed the Motion via USPS Priority Mail delivery. See Espinal’s Case, 98 Mass. App. Ct. at 157 (stating that “on other occasions when the Legislature

intended to impose a requirement for notice by certified mail, return receipt requested, it has done so explicitly”). The undersigned may presume that the Respondent received the Motion that was sent through USPS Priority Mail at his last known address.

VII. Discussion

Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 30A, § 10(2), agencies are specifically authorized to “make informal disposition of any adjudicatory proceeding . . . by default.” Lawless, 466 Mass. at 1011-12 (affirming that agency “ha[d] authority, in an appropriate circumstance, to dispose of an adjudicatory proceeding by default,” citing M.G.L. c. 30A, § 10; and concluding that agency’s decision to do so was not shown to be improper, where the party failed to appear after the first day of hearing). According to 801 CMR 1.01(7)(a), a party may request through a motion that the Hearing Officer “issue any order or take any action not inconsistent with [the] law or 801 CMR 1.00.” Therefore, the Commission has the authority to render a default judgment, encompassing both the Hearing Officer’s action on the motion and the Commission’s final decision and order in this matter.

In University Hosp., 396 Mass. at 538-39, the Supreme Judicial Court rejected the notion that due process standards were violated by an agency rule that provided sanctions for a party’s default upon receiving interrogatories. The court found the provisions of the agency rule “afford . . . reasonable procedural safeguards for notice and an opportunity to be heard,” noting that a respondent is given clear notice of the consequences, and has opportunities to object, to obtain an extension of time, to petition for a default to be vacated, and to seek judicial review of the entire proceedings. In the case before the Commission, the OTSC and the Motion (both sent by USPS with tracking) provided the Respondent with notice of the consequences of a failure to appear or defend in this matter, as well as an opportunity to object. The Respondent could have

sought more time to respond under 801 CMR 1.01(4)(e), (7)(a). Therefore, the entry of a default judgment by the Commission is both legal and proper.

By reason of the Respondent's default, and upon consideration of the Division's Motion, the undersigned recommends that the Commission grant the Motion. See Lawless, 466 Mass. at 1010-12 & n.1; University Hosp., 396 Mass. at 538-39; Productora e Importadora de Papel, S.A. de C.V. v. Fleming, 376 Mass. 826, 833-35 (1978) (recognizing that a default establishes the truth of factual allegations). In addition, the undersigned recommends that the Commission find that the allegations in the OTSC and the violations of the statutes and regulations stated therein are deemed admitted and established. See Lawless, 466 Mass. at 1010-12 & n.1; University Hosp., 396 Mass. at 534, 538-39; Productora e Importadora de Papel, 376 Mass. at 833-35. The Respondent was afforded an opportunity for a full and fair hearing as required by M.G.L. c. 30A, §§ 10, 11(1) and 801 CMR 1.01(4)(c).

VIII. Conclusion

The Division's Motion should be granted for the reasons stated above. The undersigned recommends that the Commission find the allegations to be supported, make this Initial Decision final, and proceed to determine what discipline is appropriate. In accordance with the provisions of 555 CMR 1.10(4)(e)(2)(b), each of the parties has 30 days to file written objections to the Initial Decision with the Commission.

SO ORDERED.

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING COMMISSION



Hon. Kenneth J. Fishman (Ret.)
Hearing Officer

Dated: March 15, 2024

Notice to: Blake Poore, Respondent
Shaun Martinez, Esq., Commission Enforcement Counsel
Lenox Police Department
Collective Bargaining Unit