

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

IN THE MATTER OF  
JULIO DEJESUS

)  
)

Case No. 2025-043

**RETRAINING ORDER**

The Respondent Julio DeJesus 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 undergo retraining and comply with certain conditions outlined in the Agreement. 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 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 approved;
- (b) The factual findings and conclusions of law set forth in the Agreement are hereby adopted;
- (c) The Respondent shall undergo retraining in a form to be approved by the Commission in consultation with the Municipal Police Training Committee;
- (d) Following completion of the retraining contemplated herein, the Respondent shall provide the Commission with proof of the approved retraining;
- (e) Failure of the Respondent to successfully complete the retraining contained herein shall constitute sufficient grounds to deny, condition, or restrict any application for recertification the Respondent may submit in the future; and
- (f) The Executive Director shall take the necessary steps to publish the Agreement and this Order on the Commission’s website.

By vote of the Commission on November 20, 2025.

*margaret R. Hinkle*

---

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

Notice:                   Julio DeJesus, Respondent  
                          William P. Aiello, Esq., Commission Enforcement Counsel  
                          Division of Police Standards  
                          Shaun Martinez, Esq., Deputy Director, Division of Police Standards  
                          Springfield Police Department, Law Enforcement Agency  
                          Collective Bargaining Unit  
                          Hampden County District Attorney's Office

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING COMMISSION

---

)  
)  
IN THE MATTER OF  
JULIO DEJESUS  
)  
)  
MPTC ID: 4887-2123  
)  
)  
)

Case No. 2025-043

---

**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), 8, and 10, and 555 C.M.R. §§ 1.01–1.10, the Respondent, Julio DeJesus, and the Commission hereby enter into this Disposition Agreement:

**Factual Findings**

1. On July 1, 2021, the Respondent was automatically certified as a law enforcement officer in Massachusetts pursuant to St. 2020, c. 253, § 102, an Act Relative to Justice, Equity and Accountability in Law Enforcement in the Commonwealth. The Respondent’s certification was renewed on July 1, 2024, and remains active.

2. On April 30, 2024, the Respondent was on-duty as a Springfield Police Department (“SPD”) police officer when he and his partner responded to a call for an attempted carjacking at a gas station.

3. At the time they arrived, the officers believed, based on a report from a bystander relayed to the Respondent via dispatch, that the suspect was armed with a knife and that he had attempted to carjack a civilian in the gas station parking lot.

4. Upon arriving at the gas station, the Respondent approached the suspect and requested that he take his hands out of his pockets. The suspect was unresponsive and refused to acknowledge the officers or comply with their commands. The suspect’s hands remained in his pockets as if he were grabbing something. The suspect ignored the Respondent’s command to remove his hands from his pockets and instead turned his back to the officers.

5. The Respondent and his partner attempted to grab the suspect, and the suspect yelled obscenities and shoved the Officers away. The Respondent then attempted to spray the suspect with OC, which proved ineffective against the suspect. The OC spray bounced back at the officers and hit them.

6. Faced with the Respondent's noncompliance with verbal commands and the ineffectiveness of his OC spray, the Respondent and his partner took the suspect to the ground. The suspect refused to take his hands out of his pockets, which further led the Respondent to believe that the suspect was holding a knife. The Respondent and his partner continued to struggle with the suspect, who at that point bit the Respondent on his finger.

7. The Respondent reached for his baton and dropped it. When the Respondent picked up the baton, he grabbed it from the tip and began to administer repeated strikes to the suspect, of which, some strikes inadvertently struck the suspect's head. Despite the strikes, the suspect continued to resist officers' attempts to handcuff him.

8. Once the suspect was placed under arrest, Officers noticed he was injured. The baton strikes caused a laceration on the suspect's head. The Respondent rendered first aid to the suspect before he was sent to the hospital.

9. SPD completed their internal affairs investigation related to the April 30, 2024, incident and submitted their report to the Commission. SPD sustained policy violations deeming the Respondent's use of force to be "unreasonable under the circumstances, but not brutal or excessive," for which the Respondent was suspended for five days.

10. On September 24, 2024, the Commission, pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 8(c)(1)(iii) and (c)(2) and 555 C.M.R. § 1.02(2) and (4), authorized the Division to conduct a preliminary inquiry into the allegations of misconduct described above.

11. Except for the incident described above, the Respondent has no sustained allegations of misconduct while serving as a law enforcement officer.

12. On June 26, 2025, the Commission authorized the initiation of disciplinary proceedings against the Respondent. M.G.L. c. 6E, § 8(c)(1)(iii).

### **Legal Conclusions**

13. 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; . . .

14. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(d)(iv), "[t]he [C]ommission may [...] 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,"

15. 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 from their job performance if retrained.”

16. Pursuant to 555 CMR 6.04:

(1) A law enforcement officer shall not use force upon another person, unless de-escalation tactics have been attempted and failed or are not feasible based on the totality of the circumstances and such force is necessary and proportionate to:

- (a) effect the lawful arrest or detention of a person;
- (b) prevent the escape from custody;
- (c) prevent imminent harm and the amount of force used is proportionate to the threat of imminent harm, while protecting the safety of the officer or others; or
- (d) defend against an individual who initiates force against an officer.

17. In the incident described above, although the Respondent was authorized to employ force based on the totality of the circumstances, his use of the baton failed to comply with established procedure, in violation of 10(d)(iv). For this reason, the Respondent would benefit in his job performance if retrained. See 10(d)(ix).

18. 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.

19. 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**

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:

20. The Respondent acknowledges that, once this Agreement is executed, the Commission will issue an Order of Retraining adopting all of the factual findings and conclusions of law set forth in this Agreement.

21. The Respondent agrees to the entry of an order, by the Commission, finding substantial evidence of the violations described herein, and directing him to undergo retraining in a form to be approved by the Commission in consultation with the Municipal Police Training Committee (MPTC), pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, §§ 3(a), and M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(d) (iv), and (ix).

Following completion of the retraining contemplated herein, the Respondent shall provide the Commission with proof of the same.

22. The Respondent agrees that, if he should fail to successfully complete the retraining contemplated herein, said failure shall constitute sufficient grounds to deny, condition, or restrict any application for recertification the Respondent may submit in the future. *See* M.G.L. c. 6E, § 3(a)(4); 555 CMR 7.05.

23. 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.

24. 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.

25. The Respondent acknowledges that, once this Agreement is executed, it and any Order of Retraining 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.

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

11/13/25  
Date

*John J. D. Jesur Jr.*  
Respondent

11/20/2025

Date

*Margaret R. Hinkle*

Margaret R. Hinkle, Chair