

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

IN THE MATTER OF
SEAN COOSE

)
)

Case No. 2025-056

DISPOSITION ORDER

The Respondent Sean Coose has entered into a Disposition Agreement (“Agreement”) with the Massachusetts Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission (“Commission”), attached hereto and incorporated herein, under which he has agreed to accept certain conditions outlined in the Agreement and listed below. See M.G.L. c. 6E, §§ 3(a) and 10; M.G.L. c. 30A, §§ 10 and 13.

Failure of the Respondent to abide by any of the terms and conditions of the Agreement shall result in the Agreement becoming void and may result in the Commission initiating adjudicatory proceedings against the Respondent; and seeking discipline against the Respondent based on any ground supported by the evidence obtained in a preliminary inquiry, whether or not it was covered in the Agreement, up to and including the possible revocation of the Respondent’s certification and entry of his information into the National Decertification Index. The Respondent has waived all rights to contest, in this or any other administrative or judicial proceeding to which the Commission is or may be a party, the factual findings, conclusions of law, terms and conditions, and other provisions contained in the Agreement.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that, for the reasons stated in the Agreement:

- (a) The Agreement is hereby approved;
- (b) The Commission will issue a Written Reprimand adopting all the factual findings and conclusions of law set forth in the Agreement;
- (c) Should the Respondent commit any violations similar to those alleged in the future, said violation(s) shall constitute sufficient grounds for the Commission to deny any application for recertification the Respondent may submit in the future; and
- (d) The Executive Director shall take the necessary steps to publish a copy of the Agreement, this Order, and the Written Reprimand on the Commission’s website, and to publish the Respondent’s name and certification status in any publicly available lists and databases published by the Commission.

This concludes all disciplinary matters before the Commission.

By vote of the Commission on November 20, 2025.

margaret R. Hinkle

Hon. Margaret R. Hinkle (Ret.), Chair

Notice: Sean Coose, Respondent
William P. Aiello, Esq., Commission Enforcement Counsel
Division of Police Standards
Shaun Martinez, Esq., Deputy Director, Division of Police Standards
Curry College Police Department, Law Enforcement Agency
Collective Bargaining Unit
Norfolk County District Attorney's Office

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF

SEAN COOSE
MPTC ID: 5322-9134

Case No. 2025-056

DISPOSITION AGREEMENT

In the interest of resolving the above-captioned matter and consistent with the public interest and laws and regulations governing the Massachusetts Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission (“Commission”), including M.G.L. c. 6E, §§ 3(a), 12, and 555 C.M.R. §§ 1.01–1.10, the Respondent, Sean Coose, and the Commission hereby enter into this Disposition Agreement:

Factual Findings

1. The Attleboro Police Department (“APD”) hired the Respondent on November 5, 2023, prior to his attendance of the police academy. On January 25, 2025, the Respondent resigned from the APD.
2. The Commission issued a three-year law enforcement certification to the Respondent on July 23, 2024, pursuant to M.G.L. 6E §§ 3(a), and 555 C.M.R. §§ 9.01–9.12. His certification is currently active.
3. On January 22, 2025, the Respondent responded to a report of a larceny at a store in Attleboro. The Respondent interacted with an employee during his response. The employee told the Respondent details about the larceny and then gave their contact information to the Respondent for follow-up investigation. A few days later, on January 25, 2025, the employee received a telephone call at their residence at approximately 1:00 a.m. Upon answering, the Respondent identified himself and said “[p]lease don’t hang up. I hope this isn’t uncomfortable for you.” The Respondent then asked the employee if there were people at their house.
4. The employee told the Respondent that they were sleeping and that it was 1:00 a.m. The Respondent asked if he could come over, which caused the employee to hang-up the phone. The Respondent was persistent and phoned back several times; the employee ignored his call each time and then, ultimately, the employee contacted the APD at 1:30 a.m., to file a complaint.

5. After the APD Chief learned of the Respondent's conduct, the Chief notified the Respondent that he violated APD policies and that the Chief was likely to recommend termination. In response, the Respondent resigned from the APD on January 25, 2025, prior to the imposition of any discipline. After completing an internal investigation, APD sustained a charge of Conduct Unbecoming an Officer.

6. Other than the incident described herein, the Respondent has no prior instances of sustained internal affairs charges.

7. On March 20, 2025, the Commission directed its Division of Police Standards to open a preliminary inquiry to investigate the above-described allegations against the Respondent. On June 26, 2025, the Commission approved the initiation of adjudicatory proceedings against the Respondent.

Legal Conclusions

8. 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 commission deems reasonable; . . .
- (23) restrict, suspend or revoke certifications issued under [chapter 6E];
- (24) conduct adjudicatory proceedings in accordance with chapter 30A; . . .

9. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(d)(iv), “[T]he [C]ommission may, after a hearing, order retraining for any officer if the [C]ommission finds substantial evidence that the officer [...] failed to respond to an incident according to established procedure.”

10. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(d)(ix), “[T]he [C]ommission may, after a hearing, order retraining for any officer if the [C]ommission finds substantial evidence that the officer [...] would benefit in [his] job performance if retrained.”

11. Based upon his above-described January 25, 2025, conduct, the Respondent failed to respond [to] an incident according to established procedure and would benefit in his job performance if retrained.

12. 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 on the alleged misconduct.

13. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 30A, § 10, “[u]nless otherwise provided by law, agencies may . . . make informal disposition of any adjudicatory proceeding by stipulation, agreed settlement, consent order or default.”

Resolution

14. In view of the foregoing, the Commission has determined that the public interest would best be served by the disposition of this matter without further enforcement proceedings, on the basis of the following terms and conditions which have been agreed to by the Respondent:

15. The Respondent acknowledges that, once this Agreement is executed, the Commission will issue a Written Reprimand adopting all of the factual findings and conclusions of law set forth in this Agreement.

16. The Respondent agrees that, if he should commit any similar violations to those alleged in the future, said violation(s) shall constitute sufficient grounds for the Commission to deny any application for recertification the Respondent may submit in the future. *See 555 CMR 7.05.*

17. The Respondent agrees that, if he should fail to abide by any of the terms and conditions of this agreement, this agreement shall become void, and the Division may, without prior notice to the Respondent, take the following steps:

- a. initiate adjudicatory proceedings against the Respondent;
- b. seek discipline against the Respondent based on any ground supported by the evidence in its preliminary inquiry, including grounds beyond those covered by this agreement; and
- c. seek any level of discipline supported by the evidence, up to and including the revocation of the Respondent's certification and the entry of his information onto the National Decertification Index.

18. The Respondent waives all rights to contest the factual findings, conclusions of law, terms and conditions, or other provisions contained in this agreement in any administrative or judicial forum to which the Commission is or may be a party.

19. The Respondent acknowledges that, once this Agreement is executed, it and a copy of the Written Reprimand issued by the Commission will be public documents and will be published on the Commission's website pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(g). Furthermore, the status of the Respondent's certification will be publicly available on certain lists and databases published by the Commission.

20. This Agreement shall be effective as of the date it is approved by the Commission.

10/08/2025
Date

Gen Cook
Respondent

11/20/2025
Date

Margaret R. Hinkle
Margaret R. Hinkle, Chair



MASSACHUSETTS PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS & TRAINING COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF SEAN COOSE

Case No. 2025-056

PUBLIC REPRIMAND LETTER

November 20, 2025

Via Electronic and First-Class Mail

Sean Coose

[REDACTED]

Dear Officer Coose:

As you know, the Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission ("Commission") conducted a preliminary inquiry into allegations that, while on duty as a law enforcement officer, you responded to a service call for a larceny, you acquired a witness's telephone number, and then used that information collected for official purposes to contact that witness in a way that bore no connection to your official duties, was inappropriate and unprofessional.

On June 26, 2025, the Commission found sufficient cause to initiate adjudicatory proceedings against you. The Commission has since determined that the public interest would be best served by issuing you this Public Reprimand Letter discussing the facts revealed by the preliminary inquiry, and explaining the application of M.G.L. c. 6E, §§ 3 and 10(d)(iv) and/or 10(d)(ix) to those facts. By resolving this matter through this Public Reprimand Letter, the Commission seeks to ensure that you and other law enforcement officers in circumstances similar to those described below will have a clearer understanding of the applicable law and how to comply with it.

The Commission and you have agreed that this matter will be resolved publicly with this Public Reprimand Letter and that there will be no formal proceedings against you. You have chosen not to exercise your right to a public hearing before the Commission.

Facts

The Attleboro Police Department (“APD”) hired you on November 5, 2023. On January 22, 2025, you responded to a report of a larceny at a store in Attleboro. You interacted with an employee while there. The employee told you details about the larceny and then they gave their contact information to you for follow-up investigation. A few days later, on January 25, 2025, the employee received a telephone call at their residence at approximately 1:00 a.m. Upon answering, you identified yourself and said “[p]lease don’t hang up. I hope this isn’t uncomfortable for you.” You asked the employee if there were people at their house. The employee told you that they were sleeping and that it was 1:00 a.m. You then asked if you could come over, which, caused the employee to hang-up the phone. You were persistent and phoned back several times. The employee ignored your call each time and then ultimately contacted the APD at 1:30 a.m., to file a complaint against you. The APD ultimately sustained a charge of Conduct Unbecoming of an Officer against you for your behavior. On January 25, 2025, you resigned from the APD to avoid discipline.

Legal Discussion

Pursuant to § 10(d)(iv) and (ix), “[t]he [C]ommission may, after a hearing, order retraining for any officer if the [C]ommission finds substantial evidence that the officer . . . failed to respond [to] an incident according to established procedure . . . [and/or] would benefit in [his] job performance if retrained.”

The conduct described above is unprofessional, is outside of established procedure, and warrants retraining. You obtained a store employee’s personal phone number while taking a witness statement and then used that number to place a telephone call that was highly inappropriate. You asked the witness, at 1:00 a.m., if anyone was home with them and if you could come over to their house. After the employee denied your advances and ended the call, you called back numerous times.

Disposition

Based upon its review of this matter, and pursuant to §§ 3 and 10(d)(iv) and (ix), the Commission finds that the public interest would be best served by the issuance of this Public Reprimand Letter to you. In reaching this disposition, the Commission has taken into account the fact that, other than the incident described above, you have no prior instances of sustained internal affairs charges. The Commission trusts that your receipt of this letter will be sufficient to ensure your understanding of and future compliance with the Commission’s regulations.

Sincerely,

margaret R. Hinkle