



CITY OF BOSTON
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY
Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

CIVILIAN REVIEW BOARD (CRB) - COMPLAINT #328

CASE TIMELINE:

Date of Incident: February 15, 2024
Time of Incident: 9:28 PM
Location of Incident: [REDACTED] Boston, MA
Date of Filing: April 23, 2024
Date of CRB Decision: July 14, 2026

BOSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT (BPD) EMPLOYEE(S):

BPD Employee Name	District	Employee ID#	Sex	Race/Ethnicity
Police Officer Lawrence Li	A-1	173485	M	UNK
Police Officer Cesar Ortiz Arias	A-1	168490	M	UNK

CASE PROCEDURAL HISTORY:

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS:

- 1) The Complainant alleged that on February 15, 2024, she and several neighbors called 911 to report trespassers inside their residential building. When Boston Police officers responded, the Complainant explained what she had witnessed. According to the Complainant, while one officer gathered information from her, both officers proceeded to the second floor and returned with an individual whom the Complainant stated was trespassing on the property.
- 2) The Complainant alleged that while one officer spoke with the individual, the second officer approached her and requested her Social Security number, which she stated she reluctantly provided. The Complainant alleged that the officer treated her disrespectfully by requesting her Social Security number rather than asking for a state-issued identification card. The Complainant further alleged that the officer shifted his focus toward her instead of the reported trespasser, making her feel as though she had done something wrong.



CITY OF BOSTON
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY
Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

APPLICABLE RULES & LAWS:

1. **BPD Rule 102§9 (Respectful Treatment):** Employees must be civil, respectful, courteous, and considerate toward members of the public.
 - a. **Allegations of Misconduct:** The Complainant alleged that the responding officer treated her disrespectfully by requesting her Social Security number instead of accepting her state-issued identification. The Complainant stated that she felt the officer shifted his attention away from the reported trespasser and toward her, making her feel as though she had done something wrong. She further alleged that she felt compelled to provide her Social Security number despite offering a state-issued identification card and described the interaction as dehumanizing.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

1. On April 30, 2024, former OPAT Investigator attempted to contact the Complainant by telephone to discuss the complaint filed with OPAT. The Complainant did not answer, and a follow-up call was planned.
2. On May 1, 2024, former Investigator spoke with the Complainant regarding the complaint. The Complainant stated that on February 15, 2024, she and several neighbors observed individuals trespassing inside their residential building. According to the Complainant, the individuals were causing a disturbance and making residents feel unsafe, prompting her to call 911. The Complainant stated that responding officers removed the individuals from the building before speaking with her about the incident.
3. The Complainant stated that while providing information to one of the responding officers, the officer requested her Social Security number but did not ask for a state-issued identification card. The Complainant stated that she felt discriminated against because she is disabled and legally blind. She further stated that she complied with the officer's request because she did not want to escalate the situation. According to the Complainant, the officer did not explain why her Social Security number was being requested. The Complainant stated that she wanted to understand why the officer requested her Social Security number instead of her state-issued identification and questioned the officer's purpose for requesting the information.
4. On or about May 6, 2024, OPAT received and reviewed the Boston Police Department Incident Report (Incident No. [REDACTED]) relating to the reported trespassing incident. According to the report and investigative notes, the responding officers escorted the trespassing individual from the building and issued the individual a summons for trespassing. Investigative notes further indicate that Officer Li requested Social Security numbers from all individuals involved in the incident for purposes of completing the



CITY OF BOSTON
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY
Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

incident report, rather than from only the Complainant.

5. As part of the investigation, former Investigator also identified additional investigative steps, including requesting body-worn camera footage and identifying a witness for follow-up.
6. On June 12, 2026, OPAT Investigator was assigned the investigation following its reassignment. On the same date, Investigator contacted the Complainant by email to advise that the case had been reassigned, confirm that the complaint remained active, determine whether the Complainant wished OPAT to continue the investigation, and request any additional information or evidence relevant to the matter.
7. The Complainant responded and confirmed that she wished OPAT to continue its investigation. The Complainant also requested an in-person meeting to further discuss the incident.
8. On June 29, 2026, Investigator conducted an in-person interview with the Complainant. The Complainant reiterated that she was the individual who called 911 to report the trespassing incident because she believed the individual posed a risk to residents. The Complainant stated that after officers made contact with the reported trespasser, she felt the officers' attention shifted toward her. She stated that one officer requested her Social Security number, recorded it on a cellular phone, and did not explain why the information was being requested. The Complainant stated that she offered to provide a state-issued identification card instead but ultimately provided her Social Security number because she did not feel comfortable refusing the officer's request.
9. The Complainant described the interaction as dehumanizing and stated that it caused her emotional distress and feelings of anger toward the responding officers. She further stated that she was seeking accountability for the officer's actions, that an apology alone would not be sufficient, and that she would like to see changes in officer behavior, including additional training regarding interactions with individuals with disabilities. The Complainant also expressed an interest in restitution.
10. As part of the continued investigation, Investigator reviewed a video provided by the Complainant titled "IMG_1149.mov," with a duration of one minute and ten seconds.
11. On July 7, 2026, Investigator sent interview requests via email to both Boston Police Department employees named in the allegations. As of the date of this report, no response has been received from either officer.



CITY OF BOSTON
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY
Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

EVIDENCE REQUESTED/REVIEWED:

The following materials were identified, requested, and reviewed as part of the OPAT investigation.

I. Evidence Available and Reviewed

Evidence ID	Evidence Type	Description / Title	Date Requested	Date Received	Date Reviewed
328-EV0001	Incident Report	BPD Incident Report, Incident No. [REDACTED] (1.1 Report)	05-06-2024	05-06-2024	05-06-2024
328-EV0002	Intake Form	OPAT Complaint Intake Form	04-23-2024	04-23-2024	04-23-2024
328-EV0003	Internal Record	OPAT Intake Coordinator Notes	04-2024	04-2024	05-2024
328-EV0004	Internal Record	Former OPAT Investigator Case Notes	05-2024	05-2024	05-2024
328-EV0005	Interview Notes	Complainant Interview, June 29, 2026	06-29-2026	06-29-2026	06-29-2026
328-EV0006	Video	Complainant Video, "IMG_1149.mov" (1 minute, 10 seconds)	05-2024	05-2024	05-2024
328-EV0007	Correspondence	OPAT Email Correspondence Regarding Case Reassignment, Scheduling, and Interview Coordination	—	—	06-29-2026



CITY OF BOSTON
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY
Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

II. Evidence Requested but Not Yet Received

Evidence Type	Description / Title	Date Requested	Status
Body Worn Camera (BWC)	Body Worn Camera (BWC) from Incident - I#: [REDACTED]	05-06-2024	Pending

III. Summary of Evidence

- a) OPAT reviewed the Boston Police Department Incident Report, the Complainant's intake materials, internal investigative records, the Complainant interview conducted on June 29, 2026, a video provided by the Complainant, and correspondence related to the investigation. These materials formed the basis of OPAT's review and analysis.

CRB FINAL DETERMINATION:

The CRB reached a **unanimous (6-0)**, regarding allegations against **Police Officer Lawrence Li, ID #173485**, in violation of the following BPD Rules:

BPD Employee Name	Applicable BPD Rule	Finding
Police Officer Lawrence Li	102§9 (Respectful Treatment)	Not Sustained

The CRB reached a **unanimous (6-0)**, regarding allegations against **Police Officer Cesar Ortiz-Arias, ID #168490**, in violation of the following BPD Rules:

BPD Employee Name	Applicable BPD Rule	Finding
Police Officer Cesar Ortiz-Arias	102§9 (Respectful Treatment)	Not Sustained

Analysis:

- a) The complainant alleged that Officer Li violated BPD Rule 102§9 (Respectful Treatment) by requesting her Social Security number while she was reporting a trespassing incident without providing an explanation for the request, causing her to believe she was being treated as the subject of the investigation rather than the reporting party. The complainant further expressed concern that the interaction created the appearance that she was being treated differently because of her disability.



CITY OF BOSTON
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY
Evandro C. Carvalho, Executive Director

- b) OPAT reviewed the Boston Police Department Incident Report, the complainant's written statements, the complainant interview conducted on June 29, 2026, the video submitted by the complainant, and other investigative materials. The investigation established that the complainant contacted 911 to report a trespassing incident, cooperated with responding officers, questioned why her Social Security number was being requested, offered to provide a state-issued identification card instead, and was not provided an explanation for the request. The available evidence also indicates that Officer Li requested Social Security numbers from multiple individuals involved in the incident.
- c) In reaching its determination, the Civilian Review Board considered the investigative record, as well as the complainant's testimony given during the Executive Session of the CRB meeting. The Board determined that requesting a Social Security number under these circumstances was consistent with established investigative procedures and did not, by itself, constitute a violation of BPD policy. Although the Board acknowledged the complainant's confusion and frustration resulting from the lack of an explanation for the request, the available evidence did not establish that Officer Li's conduct was discourteous, inconsiderate, or otherwise failed to meet the standard of respectful treatment required by BPD Rule 102§9. The Board also determined that the investigation did not substantiate the complainant's concern that she was treated differently because of her disability, given that all individuals present had been requested of their Social Security numbers.
- d) Accordingly, after considering all of the available evidence and the complainant's testimony, the Civilian Review Board found that the allegation of a violation of BPD Rule 102§9 (Respectful Treatment) was Not Sustained.