

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

IN THE MATTER OF
IMARI SOARES

)
)

Case No. 2024-025

FINAL DECISION

Pursuant to 555 CMR 1.10(1), a Hearing Officer was assigned to conduct an adjudicatory proceeding regarding this matter on behalf of the Massachusetts Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission (“Commission”). The Division of Police Standards (“Division”) filed a Motion for Summary Decision, contending that there is no genuine dispute as to the fact that the Respondent Imari Soares had been [REDACTED] and that the Commission should offer her an opportunity for a non-evidentiary hearing before it issues a final decision revoking her law enforcement certification. The Respondent requested that the Commission defer a final decision until after the resolution of her [REDACTED] case. See M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(h). While she initially requested a hearing, she later decided not to move forward with it, and she neither responded to a notice about a status conference nor appeared at the conference.

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 Orders recommending that the Division’s Motion for Summary Decision be granted and the Respondent’s Motion for Stay be denied. The Hearing Officer further recommended that the Commission issue a final decision revoking the Respondent’s certification. The Respondent had thirty (30) days to provide the Commission with written objections. No objections were received.

After careful review and consideration, the Commission voted to affirm and adopt the Initial Decision of the Hearing Officer **allowing** the Division’s Motion for Summary Decision and finding that 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”), § 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 . . .”), incorporated by reference in M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(f) and 555 CMR 1.10(4). The Hearing Officer correctly determined that there is no basis for a stay of these proceedings or delaying the resolution of this matter “where the statutory mandate to revoke the [Respondent’s] certification clearly applies.” See Kobrin v. Bd. of Registration in Med., 444 Mass. 837, 846 (2005) (“[N]either the statute nor due process required the board to hold a hearing to take evidence concerning undisputed facts. Such a hearing would be a meaningless exercise.”); Mass. Outdoor Advertising Council v. Outdoor Advertising Bd., 9 Mass. App. Ct. 775, 789 (1980) (“[T]he Board’s summary disposition procedures . . . are

structured in a fashion which does not offend the hearing requirements of [M.G.L. c. 30A, § 13], because they deprive applicants only of meaningless hearings and, . . . do not deprive them of meaningful ones.”).


The Commission finds, by clear and convincing evidence, that the Respondent has been [REDACTED] See M.G.L. c. 6E, [REDACTED] **Thus, the Respondent’s certification is hereby revoked.**

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 December 18, 2025.

In accordance with M.G.L. c. 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).



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

Notice: Imari Soares, pro se, Respondent
Timothy D. Hartnett, Esq., Commission Enforcement Counsel
Division of Police Standards
Shaun Martinez, Esq., Deputy Director, Division of Police Standards
New Bedford Police Department, Law Enforcement Agency
Collective Bargaining Unit
Bristol County District Attorney's Office

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

IN THE MATTER OF
IMARI SOARES

)
)

Case No. 2024-025

**INITIAL DECISION AND ORDERS ON DIVISION'S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY DECISION
AND RESPONDENT'S MOTION FOR STAY**

The Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission ("Commission") Division of Police Standards ("Division") has filed a Motion for Summary Decision on the grounds that there is no genuine issue of disputed fact that would warrant an evidentiary hearing. Imari Soares ("Respondent") has requested "that the Commission defer any final decision until [her] case is resolved." These Orders on the Division's Motion for Summary Decision and Respondent's Motion for Stay shall constitute the Initial Decision of the Hearing Officer.

Procedural History

The Division filed a Motion for Summary Decision maintaining that there is no genuine issue of disputed fact that the Respondent has been [REDACTED], and that after granting this motion, the Commission should offer the Respondent an opportunity for a non-evidentiary hearing. Upon receipt of the Division's motion, the Respondent formally requested a hearing and asked that the Commission defer ruling on this matter until after her case is resolved. Her request for a hearing was granted and her request that the matter be deferred was treated as a Motion for a Stay. The Respondent later informed the Division that she did not wish to move forward with the scheduled hearing, and she failed to appear at the Status Conference.

The Respondent began her service as a police officer for the New Bedford Police Department in 2019. On July 1, 2021, she was automatically certified as a law enforcement officer pursuant to St. 2020, c. 253, § 102, *An Act Relative to Justice, Equity and Accountability in Law Enforcement in the Commonwealth*. On June 24, 2024, the Commission suspended her certification pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, [REDACTED] and 555 CMR [REDACTED] Attachment 1.

On July 18, 2024, the Commission directed its Division to open a preliminary inquiry into the allegation that the Respondent was charged with one or more [REDACTED] Attach. 2. *See* M.G.L. c. 6E, [REDACTED]; 555 CMR [REDACTED]. Following a preliminary inquiry into her alleged misconduct, the Division served an Order to Show Cause ("OTSC") upon the Respondent on August 6, 2025. Attach. 2. Among other things, the OTSC alleges that the Respondent was [REDACTED]

Indeed, on June 13, 2025, the Respondent [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Respondent received [REDACTED]

This
The

[REDACTED]

On September 4, 2025, the Respondent responded to the OTSC. She maintained that: [T]he underlying case referenced in the [OTSC] is currently subject to a deferred entry of judgment and is scheduled to be dismissed on June 14, 2027, provided [she] remain[s] in compliance with the conditions of probation . . . [b]ecause [REDACTED] Attach 3.

The Respondent then requested that the Commission defer any final decision until the [REDACTED] is resolved.

On September 10, 2025, the Division filed a Motion for Summary Decision pursuant to 801 CMR 1.00 *et seq.* Attach. 4. The Division's motion argued that because there can be no genuine dispute as to the fact that the Respondent has been [REDACTED], the Commission should grant the motion for summary decision, and, after offering the Respondent an opportunity for a non-evidentiary hearing before the Commission, issue a final decision revoking the Respondent's law enforcement certification.

On September 12, 2025, the Respondent emailed the Commission to formally request a hearing. Attach. 5. Five days later, she confirmed with the Commission that she would be available for a Pre-Hearing Conference held via Zoom on any of these dates and times: October 3, 2025, 10:00 AM; October 6, 2025, 10:00 AM; and October 14, 2025, 10:00 AM. Attach. 6. On September 22, 2025, the Commission sent the parties a Notice of Pre-Hearing Conference via Zoom scheduled for October 14, 2025, at 10:00 AM. Attach. 7. The Respondent confirmed receipt of this notice on September 23, 2025. Attach. 8.

However, on October 4, 2025, the Respondent messaged the Division: "[a]fter consideration, I have decided to not move forward with the hearing." Attach 9. The Division's enforcement counsel forwarded the email to the Commission, which prompted the Commission to alter the Pre-hearing Conference into a "Status Conference" for the same time, with notice sent to the parties on October 11, 2025. Attach. 10. The Respondent failed to respond to the notice and did not appear at the scheduled conference.

Discussion

In 2021, the Commission was established to certify and decertify all police officers in Massachusetts. The Commission was also authorized to revoke or suspend an officer's certification or order retraining for an officer. *See* M.G.L. c. 6E, § 3.

The Division maintains that pursuant to 801 CMR 1.01(7)(h), a summary decision is warranted in this case because there is no genuine issue of material fact relating to its claim or any defense raised by the Respondent, and that it is entitled to prevail as a matter of law. The Division relies on M.G.L. c. 6E, [REDACTED] which mandates that the Commission "revoke an officer's certification if the [C]ommission finds by clear and convincing evidence that . . . [REDACTED]

Here, the [REDACTED] case is resolved as the Respondent has [REDACTED]

for the purposes of the Commission. Under its statutes and its regulations, the Commission defines [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] By including these outcomes in the definition, the legislature made clear that [REDACTED] as well as the related [REDACTED] must be treated [REDACTED] for purposes of the Commission and its discipline.

In her request for a hearing, the Respondent asserts that she expects that her case will be dismissed after the satisfactory completion [REDACTED]. However, she would have to acknowledge that her case has been fully adjudicated, meaning there are no pending issues in the [REDACTED] and it is not dismissed at this time. Moreover, when a court resolves [REDACTED], the judge does not suspend the process of adjudication; rather, “the judge [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] constitute a final judgment in [REDACTED], at which point consequences may be imposed on the defendant. [REDACTED]

Accordingly, there is no basis for a stay of these proceedings or delaying the resolution under M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(h) or 555 CMR 1.10(2)(c), where the statutory mandate to revoke the officer’s certification clearly applies. *See Kobrin v. Bd. of Registration in Med.*, 444 Mass. 837, 846 (2005) (“[N]either the statute nor due process required the board to hold a hearing to take evidence concerning undisputed facts. Such a hearing would be a meaningless exercise.”); *Massachusetts Outdoor Advertising Council v. Outdoor Advertising Bd.*, 9 Mass. App. Ct. 775, 789 (1980) (“[T]he Board’s summary disposition procedures . . . are structured in a fashion which does not offend the hearing requirements of [M.G.L. c. 30A, § 13], because they deprive applicants only of meaningless hearings and, . . . do not deprive them of meaningful ones.”).

Recommendation

Based on the undisputed evidence and the applicable statutes and regulations, the Hearing Officer finds by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent has been [REDACTED]. Accordingly, the Hearing Officer recommends that the Division’s Motion for Summary Decision be **GRANTED** and the Respondent’s Motion for a Stay be **DENIED** and further recommends that the Commission issue a final decision revoking the Respondent’s certification. *See* 555 CMR 1.08(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.

NOTICE OF 30-DAY RIGHT FOR REVIEW BY THE COMMISSION

Pursuant to 555 CMR 1.10(4)(e)2.b., “[u]pon receipt of the [P]residing [O]fficer’s initial decision, if there is objection by the officer in writing to the [E]xecutive [D]irector regarding the [P]residing [O]fficer’s findings and recommendations, the [C]ommission shall set dates for submission of briefs and for any further hearing which the [C]ommission in its discretion deems necessary. The [C]ommission shall review, and may revise, the findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation of the [P]residing [O]fficer, giving deference to the [P]residing [O]fficer’s evaluation of the credibility of the testimony and other evidence presented at the hearing. Failure by the officer to object to the [P]residing [O]fficer’s initial decision within 30 days shall constitute a waiver of the officer’s right to appeal under M.G.L. c. 30A, § 14.”



Hon. Barbara Dortch-Okara (Ret.)
Hearing Officer

Date: October 30, 2025

Notice: Imari Soares, pro se, Respondent
Timothy D. Hartnett, Esq., Commission Enforcement Counsel
Division of Police Standards
Shaun Martinez, Esq., Deputy Director, Division of Police Standards
New Bedford Police Department, Law Enforcement Agency
Collective Bargaining Unit
Bristol County District Attorney's Office