

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

IN THE MATTER OF
TYLER GOODNEY

)
)

Case No. 2026-023
(MPTC ID 2312-1107)

ORDER ON SUSPENSION

On April 13, 2026, the Executive Director, pursuant to a delegation of authority by the Massachusetts Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission (“Commission”), and on its behalf, immediately imposed the suspension of Respondent Tyler Goodney’s certification as a law enforcement officer, in light of evidence that the Respondent engaged or may have engaged in criminal conduct. See M.G.L. c. 6E, § 9(a). Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 9(a)(5), “[a] suspension order of the commission issued pursuant to [Section 9(a)] shall continue in effect until issuance of the final decision of the commission or until revoked by the commission.”

In April 2026, the Respondent requested a hearing before a Single Commissioner to stay the suspension of his law enforcement certification and requested that the hearing not be held until [REDACTED]. Commissioner Marsha V. Kazarosian, Esq., serving as the Single Commissioner, ordered that the Respondent needed to confirm in any future hearing request whether the hearing should proceed before a single commissioner for a stay of the suspension or the full Commission for a lifting of the suspension, citing M.G.L. c. 6E, § 9(a)(5) and 555 CMR 1.09.

Stating that [REDACTED], on July 29, 2026, the Respondent requested a hearing before the full Commission. On September 24, 2026, that hearing was conducted before the full Commission in Executive Session.

The Commission may lift the suspension of an officer’s law enforcement certification, issued pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 9(a), if the Commission determines by a preponderance of the evidence that such action is warranted before the Commission enters a final decision in the disciplinary matter involving the conduct that led to the suspension. See Craven v. State Ethics Comm’n, 390 Mass. 191, 200 (1983) (noting that “[p]roof by a preponderance of the evidence is the standard generally applicable to administrative proceedings,” that it has been applied by the Supreme Court to “an order permanently barring [an individual] from practicing his profession,” and that a higher standard has been applied only in certain exceptional circumstances); see also 555 CMR 1.09(6)(a) (stating that preponderance of the evidence is the standard of review in cases before a Single Commissioner where the officer is requesting a stay of an immediate suspension). The burden of proof is on the Respondent, as the party seeking immediate relief. See Gerald A. McDonough, 38 Mass. Prac., Administrative Law and Practice § 7:6 (2025 ed.) (determining the burden of proof by considering “which party would be legally entitled to prevail in the adjudicatory proceeding if no evidence were introduced by any party in an effort to persuade the factfinder”).


In light of the evidence presented, the Commission has determined that the Respondent has failed to meet his burden of proof, and, therefore, the Respondent’s suspension should not be

lifted. The Commission's decision is based upon consideration of the totality of the circumstances. Accordingly, the Respondent's suspension will remain in place. See M.G.L. c. 6E, § 3(a)(23) (The Commission has the power to "suspend . . . certifications issued under this chapter.").

This is the **final decision** of the Commission as to the suspension of the Respondent's certification imposed on April 13, 2026. Accordingly, the suspension shall remain in effect until the Commission issues a final decision disposing of all disciplinary matters, and the Executive Director shall keep the Respondent's name published on the list of suspended officers. See M.G.L. c. 6E, § 9(a)(5).

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, must 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).

By majority vote of the Commission on September 24, 2026.



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

Notice: Tyler Goodney, Respondent
Timothy D. Hartnett, Esq., Commission Enforcement Counsel
Division of Police Standards
Shaun Martinez, Esq., Deputy Director, Division of Police Standards
Quinsigamond Community College Police Department, Law Enforcement
Agency
Worcester County District Attorney's Office