



City of Boston, Massachusetts  
Office of Police Accountability and Transparency  
**Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director**

**CIVILIAN REVIEW BOARD (CRB) - COMPLAINT #243**

**Date of Incident:** August 30, 2023

**Time of Incident:** 4:00 PM

**Location of Incident:** Mattapan, MA 02126

**Date of filing:** September 5, 2023

**Investigator Name:** Michel Toney and Diana Vergara

**BOSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT (BPD) EMPLOYEE:**

Employee Name	District	Employee ID #	Sex	Race/ Ethnicity
Alexis Williams	C-11	133948	F	Black

**CASE PROCEDURAL HISTORY:**

This is the first time this case has been brought before the CRB.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS:**

Note: This case was inherited from former Investigator Michel Toney on August 4, 2024.

On September 5, 2023, Complainant filed a complaint with the Office of Police Accountability and Transparency (OPAT) regarding the Boston Police 911 Operator Alexis Williams, ID #133948. Complainant stated that on August 30, 2023, he called 911 because his son was being assaulted by a group of more than ten youths. During the call, he informed the operator that he intended to go outside with a bat, but the operator advised him against taking any action. He called 911 again and was informed that there was a shift change, and officers would be arriving shortly. In the meantime, the group of youths fled the scene and boarded the Route 28 MBTA bus. Complainant reiterated to the operator that he was going to confront youths who were assaulting his son with a bat, and was readvised not to intervene. The operator emphasized that he needed to remain calm, understand the delay due to the shift change, and wait for police officers to arrive.



City of Boston, Massachusetts  
Office of Police Accountability and Transparency  
**Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director**

## APPLICABLE RULES & LAWS:

1. **Rule 102§4 (Neglect of Duty):** This includes any conduct or omission which is not in accordance with established and ordinary duties or procedures as to such employees or which constitutes use of unreasonable judgment in the exercising of any discretion granted to an employee.
  - a. Complainant alleged that he called 911 multiple times, and during his second call, the operator informed him that because there was a shift change, officers would be arriving shortly. As a result of the delay in officers' arrival, a group of youths who were assaulting Complainant's son fled the scene as they boarded the Route 28 MBTA bus.
2. **Rule 102§9 (Respectful Treatment):** Employees shall, on all occasions, be civil and respectful, courteous and considerate toward their supervisors, their subordinates, and all other members of the Department and the general public. No employee shall use epithets or terms that tend to denigrate any person(s) due to their race, color, creed, gender identity, or sexual orientation except when necessary in police reports or in testimony.
  - a. Complainant alleged the 911 operator was rude and unprofessional when she said, *"It has only been 8 minutes... You need to understand that we are on a roll call."*

## SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE / INVESTIGATION:

1. On September 7, 2023, Investigator Toney reached out to **Complainant via telephone** to discuss the incident that took place on August 30, 2023. Complainant stated that he required emergency services and called 911 for the police to come to his assistance. Complainant said that the 911 operator was extremely rude and unprofessional. Complainant stated that the 911 operator said, *"It has only been 8 minutes... You need to understand that we are on a roll call."* The Complainant believed that the operator spoke to him in a rude and unprofessional manner, and wanted the operator to be held accountable for her lack of professionalism for the way she dealt with him.
2. On September 20, 2024, Investigator Vergara reviewed the **911 call recorded** at 4:00:10 PM. The caller expressed concern, saying, *"I called to say that there are some kids at the house, and they are here now."* At 4:00:41 PM, the caller mentioned, *"I am going outside now."* The operator replied, *"You don't have to go outside with the bat. I understand, but we don't want to cause any more problems."*



City of Boston, Massachusetts

Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

**Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director**

*Are there any weapons?" The caller responded, "My son is involved; it's happening right now." The operator stated to Complainant, "We will send help right away." At 4:01:13, Complainant stated, "You okay?" to which a male voice in the background responded, "Do I look okay?" At 4:01:22, Complainant stated, "Yeah, they are jumping, where are they?" At 4:03:33 PM- 4:04:31, the caller contacted 911 again. Operator Emely Rijo answered this call. The caller stated, "The police are on their way, but they just jumped my son." Operator Rijo replied, "I will advise the call. How's your son? Does he need an ambulance?" to which Complainant replied, "He has bleach all on his eyes." The operator stated, "I updated the call, we are going to send help over, an ambulance for your son."*

- a. At 4:05:31, an unknown caller contacted 911 and reported that ten to fifteen kids were about to start a fight in Almont Park, Mattapan, MA, and it happened less than 5 minutes ago, caller did not see a weapon. The caller also stated that a kid threw a water bottle at another kid, and the kid aggressively approached the other kid while the other kids were cheering. The caller mentioned that she did not notice the police cruisers that typically park at Almont Park. She requested that the police respond to the situation. Operator Briana Xavier #122348 replied, "I am entering the call as we go. The next available unit will respond."
- b. At 4:07:28, Complainant called again and stated, "I already called. The police are not coming; these kids are out here free. They came to my house, beat my son up, they threw bleach on him, and talking xxxxxxxx. And they are in Almont Street now," Operator Rijo, Emely #155756 stated, "Am I speaking to XXXXX? I see we keep getting updates about the call; we are on the way now. We will send a unit." At 4:08:13, Complainant stated that one of them had a knife but didn't have an idea which kid had it, and someone else saw it, but not him. At 4:08:26, "Complainant stated. "But the issue is, ain't nobody come to my house. I called a while ago. ....they still here?" Operator Rijo replied, "It's only been eight minutes, sir. They are on their way, and they have dispersed from where you originally gave us a call, and are also looking for them at the same time. I'll notify the unit."



City of Boston, Massachusetts  
Office of Police Accountability and Transparency  
**Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director**

- c. At 4:10 PM, Complainant **placed another call to 911** and stated, “ *I already called, I am waiting for the police, and they just got in the bus now, all of them, the 28 bus.*” Operator Alexis Williams (#133948) stated, “ *Okay, will notify transit police now. I’ll update the call.*” Complainant stated that he needed to be called because “ *the kids can’t keep coming back to the house.*” Complainant also noted he filed a police report because they threatened him at his house, and stated, “ *I want these kids arrested and pressed charges on all of them.*” Operator Williams responded, “ *So, do you want to speak to the officers?*” Complainant replied, “ *I am looking at them now, it’s the 28 bus, going up on Norfolk Street station. They are going to be passing the police station.*” Operator Williams stated, “ *I’ll let officers know.*” Complainant replied, “ *Because nobody had come here, someone had a knife.*” Operator Williams stated, “ *Yeah, Officers are doing a roll call now, and there is a shift change. There are a lot of calls that they have to take care of, so we are getting the next available unit. We will notify the transit police that they are on the 28 bus.*” At 4:12:10, Operator Williams stated, “ *I already told you, sir, I put the request for you to speak to the officers, so they’ll still be going to your house to speak to you.*” Complainant responded, “ *Okay, but they are gone.*” Operator Williams responded, “ *Sir, right, we can’t bring them back. What do you want them to do?*” to which Complainant responded, “ *fucking chase them and fucking get to them. They had a knife and threw bleach at my son. That’s what I want.*” Operator Williams said, “ *Like I said, I don’t know if you heard me, but we are notifying transit police that they are on the bus.*” At 4:12:45, Complainant stated, “ *Here are the cops now, here are the cops now, hold on. No, we are fine.*”
3. On September 20, 2024, Investigator Vergara listened to **the Turret tape**. At 4:01:53 PM, the dispatcher broadcast, “An additional two men, B3, for a fight, XX XXXXX” At 4:04:36 PM, the dispatcher announced, “I got a Charlie-based, two-man, jump one male party. XX XXXXX.”



City of Boston, Massachusetts  
Office of Police Accountability and Transparency  
**Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director**

- a. At 4:06:14 PM, Investigator Vergara listened to the broadcast related to Complainant's incident. At 4:11:54 PM, the dispatcher stated, *"Boston to Transit PD. I just want to give you guys a heads-up for xx xxxxx St. I've got a couple of teens who assaulted a male party at that location. They decided to get on the 28 bus going towards Norfolk. I just want to give you guys a heads-up."*
  - b. At 4:12:30 PM, Transit PD acknowledged the call. At 4:13:50 PM, a police officer reported, *"The caller here is saying that a group of 10 males showed up to his house, held a knife at him, and threw bleach at him, and they just got on bus 28."*
  - c. At 4:14:09 PM, an individual stated over the radio, *"Do we have a description of the male who held the knife at him? So we don't have a description of the male?"* The officer responded that the group consisted of ten males wearing red sneakers, but no specific description was available.
  - d. At 4:22:49 PM, officers reported that they were with the teen who had bleach in his eyes and requested EMS to respond.
4. On September 20, 2024, Investigator Vergara reviewed the **BPD 911 Call Taking Protocols Rule 324A**.
- a. A Priority One call indicates that an immediate police response is critical. Conditions that will define a Priority One call for service are:
    - i. *"Any apparent threat to life, any danger of serious physical injury, any major property damage, or any incident that may result in the same;*
    - ii. *Any active felony or violent misdemeanor, or active incident that may result in either serious physical injury or major property damage or loss. Also considered as a Priority One would be any felony or violent misdemeanor that recently occurred (within 15 minutes), and there is a probability that the suspects may be apprehended.*
    - iii. *Any serious injury or illness that may result in substantial personal harm if police assistance is delayed;*



City of Boston, Massachusetts

Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

**Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director**

- iv. *Any incident involving exigent or unique circumstances that demands an immediate police response (i.e., sniper, explosive device, gas leak); or*
  - v. *Any domestic violence incident.”*
- b. A Priority Two call is less critical; however, police presence is still needed. Conditions that will define a Priority Two call for service are:
- i. *“Any recent or active crime or incident that does not represent a significant threat to life and property.*
  - ii. *These types of incidents would include a felony that has just occurred, but without injury to the victim*
  - iii. *and the suspect has fled the scene (longer than 15 minutes);*
  - iv. *Any in-progress incident that could be classified as a possible crime (e.g., suspicious person or vehicle, prowler, et cetera);*
  - v. *Any property damage incident that represents a significant hazard to the free of traffic; or*
  - vi. *Any incident that would require a prompt, but non-emergency response.”*
- c. A Priority Three (or Lower) call indicates that police presence is necessary, but the response can be delayed. Conditions that will define a Priority Three call for service are:
- i. *“Any non-active crime or incident that does not require an immediate investigation (i.e., a B&E that was not recently committed, but which is being reported at this time);*
  - ii. *Any incident that involves non-emergency and/or non-criminal services; or*
  - iii. *Any other incident that is no longer active, yet due to its nature, cannot be responded to by phone.”*
5. On September 20, 2024, Investigator Vergara reviewed the **CAD sheet PXXXXXXXXX - I#XXXXXXXXXX**. Complainant called the 911 operator. At 2:23:06 PM, BPD received a call. At 2:23:18, BPD entered the call. At 2:23:21, BPD dispatched officers. At 2:26:14, “*CD40 flagged down for disturbance.*” At 2:27:02, BPD were on scene. At 2:13:10, the event type was changed from Investigation person to Investigation person (threat). At 2:13:10, the event priority changed from 3 to 2. At 3:41:59, BPD closed the incident.





City of Boston, Massachusetts

Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

**Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director**

6. On September 20, 2024, Investigator Vergara reviewed the **CAD sheet PXXXXXXXXY- I#XXXXXXXXY**. Complainant called the 911 operator. At 4:00:12, a call from the complainant is received. At 4:00:34, the call is entered. At 4:00:47, it is noted, “ *CLR states group of 10 teenagers fighting outside. CLR is saying he is going outside with a bat.* ” At 4:01:00, the caller stated, “ They are jumping his son.” At 4:01:21, requested EMS. At 4:02:52, the event priority changed from 1 to 3. At 4:03:05, the event priority changed from 3 to 4. At 4:05:16, a call from an unknown female was made. At 4:06:45, the officers were dispatched. At 4:22:49, officers were on scene. At 5:27:10, the Event was closed.
7. On September 20, 2024, Investigator Vergara reviewed the **CAD sheet PXXXXXXXXW**. At 6:05:18, an unknown female called to report that she saw “*15 teenagers possibly going to fight. The group was cheering on a male without a shirt. Unknown description and no weapons.*” This event was closed and cross-referenced to CAD sheet P230439673.
8. On September 20, 2024, Investigator Vergara reviewed the **police report I#XXXXXXXXY**. The police report stated that on 08/29/23, officers responded at 4:00 PM to a call for a person with a knife at Complainant's home address. Complainant stated that a group of at least ten males and females just jumped his son in front of the house, and one of the kids had pulled a knife on his son. Complainant stated that they knocked the son to the ground, stomped on his head, and poured bleach on him. Complainant stated that he tried to break up the fight by taking a baseball bat from his home, and when he came outside, the group ran down the street and got on the MBTA bus # 28... He also stated that one of them had a knife on him, but didn't know who he was. He stated that they knocked him to the ground, attempted to stomp on his head, and poured bleach all over him. EMS was requested.
9. On September 20, 2024, Investigator Vergara reviewed the **Priority call list for 8/30/23 from 3:30 PM to 6:00 PM**. There were 38 calls before Complainant's call at 16:00:02. There were also more than 100 calls after Complainant's call.
10. Investigator Vergara attempted to speak to **BPD Operator Emely Selina Rijo ID #155756** on October 28, 2024, December 9, 2024, December 20, 2024, and July 30, 2025, by sending interview request letters via email. However, Operator Rijo did not respond.



City of Boston, Massachusetts

Office of Police Accountability and Transparency

**Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director**

11. Investigator Vergara attempted to speak to BPD **Operator Alexis Williams ID #133948**, on October 28, 2024, December 9, 2024, and December 20, 2024, by sending interview request letters via email. However, Operator Williams did not respond.

#### EVIDENCE REQUESTED/REVIEWED:

Evidence	Description	Availability Status
OPAT Complainant Form/Intake Form	Written statements made by Complainant regarding officer's behavior.	Available
CAD sheet	Summary of 911 call and dispatchers' conversations: PXXXXXXXXX, PXXXXXXXXY, and PXXXXXXXXW.	Available
Police reports I#XXXXXXXXXX and I#XXXXXXXXXY	Summary of events on 8/30/25	Available
Turret Tape	Summary of 911 call and dispatchers' conversations	Available
911 call	Audio communications between the operator and Complainant on 8/30/23	Available
BPD Priority list	List of all calls made on 8/30/23	Available
Interview request Operator Alexis Williams	Emailed request on October 28, 2024, December 9, 2024, & December 20, 2024	Not available
Interview statement Operator Emely Rijo	Attempt to interview on October 28, 2024, December 9, 2024, December 20, 2024, and July 30, 2025.	Not available
911 Call Taking Protocols	Operations Division Standard Operating Protocols	Available
Complainant interview	Complainant's statements on September 7, 2023 via phone	Available

#### CRB DECISION:

The Civilian Review Board reached a **Unanimous decision (6-0)**, regarding allegations against Operator **Alexis Williams** for violation of **Rule 102§4 (Neglect of Duty)**, **Rule 102§9 (Respectful Treatment)**, AND **BPD Rule 324§4 (Telephone Report Taking Procedure)**.





City of Boston, Massachusetts  
Office of Police Accountability and Transparency  
**Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director**

<b>BPD Employee Name</b>	<b>Applicable BPD Rule</b>	<b>Finding/Recommendation</b>
Alexis Williams (911 Operator)	Rule 102§4 (Neglect of Duty)	<b>Unfounded</b>
Alexis Williams (911 Operator)	Rule 102§9 (Respectful Treatment)	<b>Unfounded</b>
Alexis Williams (911 Operator)	Rule 324§4 (Telephone Report Taking Procedure)	<b>Unfounded</b>

After reviewing all the evidence and the circumstances surrounding Complainant's allegations, CRB finds that while the interaction alleged by Complainant did occur, the 911 Operator did not violate above BPD rules during her phone interaction with Complainant. Operator Williams' response was within the scope of her duties, providing timely updates, offering appropriate explanations for the delay in police response, and confirming that officers would still be dispatched to location and follow up at Complainant's residence. There is no evidence to suggest otherwise. Therefore, the CRB finds that the actions taken by Operator Williams were reasonable and professional.