

On May 18, 2026, after due notice of time and place, the Commission held its regular quarterly meeting located at 1128 South Bradford Street, Dover, DE 19901, during which it reviewed the recommendation of the Hearing Board and considered whether to accept or reject the recommendation of a 1-day suspension. The following Commissioners were present at the meeting: Chief Richad McCabe (chair); Chief Mark Farrall; Chief Thomas Johnson, II; Charles “Chip” Simpson; Rep. Frankin Cooke; Commissioner Paul Bauer; Mayor Robin Christiansen; Rev. Dr. Carol Boggerty; Chief Wilfredo Campos; Colonel William Crotty. At the time of the

meeting, Jones appeared with counsel Mark Denney, Esq. and made a statement on his own behalf. Kenneth Feaster, Deputy Attorney General, advised the Commission.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In all situations where the provisions of § 8404(a)(4) or § 8410(b) of Title 11 are to be applied to or invoked against any agency or individual, that agency or individual shall be entitled to a hearing before three members of the Commission. 29 *Del. C.* § 10161(f). The hearing board must make factual findings supported by substantial evidence. “Substantial evidence” means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. The hearing board may accord significant weight to the agency’s employment determination where the police officer has been discharged from employment for a breach of internal discipline following a hearing pursuant to Chapter 92 of Title 11, or if they have knowingly and voluntarily waived their right to such a hearing. However, the relative weight of the agency’s employment determination is a balancing process, a matter of discretion and judgment, and the facts are subject to de novo review by the hearing board. The decision of the hearing board, therefore, must involve consideration of the underlying factual record and independent factfinding by the hearing board.

The recommendation of a hearing board is not final until approved by the full board having jurisdiction. 29 *Del. C.* § 10161(f). Here, the Commission will reject a recommendation of a hearing board only if it decides that the hearing board recommendation (1) is contrary to a specific state or federal law or regulation, (2) is not supported by substantial evidence, or (3) is arbitrary or capricious. If the hearing board’s recommendation is rejected, the Commission must remand the matter to the hearing board for further proceedings in accordance with the Commission’s written reasons for rejection.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

The evidence presented before the Hearing Board included the testimony of Captain Dannaile Rementer, Ryan Jones, and on behalf of Ryan Jones were Agent Anthony Salvemini (Supervisor, Homeland Security in Philadelphia, PA), Joseph Aube (Retired DSP Trooper), and Thomas Brackin (Executive Director of DSP Troopers' Association). DSP submitted copies of the following: Trial Board Decision; Decision of the Superintendent; Secretary Bushweller's Decision on Appeal; Trial Board Transcription; MVR-Jones Front Camera – 12/29/24; Uniform Collision Report – 02-25-451; Notification of Divisional Trial Board; and Photographs – TFC Jones MVR/BWC. Counsel for Jones submitted copies of the following: Delaware State Police (DSP) 11 Del. C. 9204 Waiver; DSP Results of Internal Inquiry Example; 11 Del. C. Sec. 9200(11); 3/13/25 Email exchange following conclusion of investigation; 4/28/25 letter to Board Members; Email to DSTA leadership following first notice of substantiated findings – the day before the Trial Board; Screenshots with time stamps from Jones' body worn camera on 12/29/24; Photo of Jones' unrepaired DSP vehicle after the "collision"; Transcript of March 7, 2025 interview with Nathaniel Blair by Former Lieutenant Dermot Alexander; Character letters for Jones from Chief Ogden, Ret. Major Sawyer, HIS SSA Salvemini and many others; Mobley v. State. Also, the parties jointly submitted a copy of the Transcribed Interview with Christopher Zimmerman by Lieutenant Dermot Alexander. The facts below are contained in the above-referenced documents and were summarized in the testimony before the Hearing Board and read into the record before this Commission.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE HEARING BOARD

On the evening of Sunday, December 29, 2024, Jones and Cpl. Michael Joie (hereinafter "Joie") were each on duty and engaged in a vehicle pursuit of a stolen vehicle. Jones was operating

a fully marked DSP Tahoe and was nearing the end of his day shift. Joie was operating an unmarked gray Tahoe and was near the start of his night shift. The driver of the stolen vehicle forcefully collided with another vehicle, at which point the driver of the stolen vehicle exited the vehicle and fled on foot. Jones pulled his Tahoe to the shoulder of the road, exited, and proceeded to pursue the suspect on foot. Very shortly thereafter, Joie arrived on scene and parked his Tahoe in front of Jones's Tahoe with the front tires on the curb. Joie immediately exited his Tahoe and also pursued the suspect on foot.

Jones had attempted to put his Tahoe in "park" prior to exiting and believed that he had done so. However, due to a generally known issue with the DSP Tahoes, the park did not properly engage. Jones's MVR recording showed that, shortly after Joie exited his Tahoe, Jones's Tahoe slowly drifted forward and made contact with the rear of Joie's Tahoe, with the front bumper of Jones's Tahoe contacting the tailgate of Joie's Tahoe.

A few minutes later, both Jones and Joie returned and recognized that Jones's Tahoe had moved forward and contacted Joie's Tahoe. It was found that there was a passenger in the stolen vehicle and, at this time, Joie escorted that passenger to his Tahoe and placed him into the backseat.

Jones backed up his Tahoe, creating space between the two vehicles, and Jones and Joie examined the vehicles. Though difficult to hear, some audio of their discussion could be heard from the MVR recording, including the phrases "hundred thousand miles," uttered by Joie referring to Joie's Tahoe, and "never happened," and "nope," uttered by Jones, while Jones and Joie engaged in their inspection, including touching both Tahoes.

Regarding a comment about a "scratch," associated with the "hundred thousand miles" comment, Jones indicated that this was not a reference to a dent but, rather, was about a smudge on Joie's Tahoe that turned out to be dirt that came off when rubbed.

Jones explained, through his testimony, that the phrase “never happened” is commonly used as a sarcastic retort of disbelief when coming upon a scene with an apparent outcome but missing evidence, such as finding a shooting victim but finding no spent shells in the area. He explained that, in this case, it was clear that the vehicles had made contact, but they did not notice the damage in the moment and did not have any indication at that time as to how this had occurred because he had not been present to see the Tahoe move and, at that time, was not personally aware of the parking issue with the DSP Tahoes.

Jones indicated that there was a smudge of some sort on Joie’s vehicle, but that it appeared to have been dirt that came off of the vehicle when rubbed. Otherwise, his testimony was that he did not notice any damage to either vehicle in the moment, possibly due to lighting conditions, tunnel vision, or adrenaline from the very recent vehicle and foot pursuits. Jones further testified that there was no discussion between him and Joie, neither on-scene nor any time thereafter, indicating that there was actually damage to either Tahoe, nor as to devising a plan to hide damage or to not make a report. The Hearing Board found Jones’s testimony credible, noting that there were also three sergeants on-scene at this time, none of whom noticed damage on the vehicles at the scene either.

Subsequently, Joie drove from the scene to transport the passenger from the stolen vehicle to the hospital. Jones then went back to Troop 2 to complete paperwork. At this time, Jones also viewed the MVR video and saw the video of his Tahoe drifting forward into Joie’s Tahoe. Jones testified before the Hearing Board that he was aware at that time that his MVR video was subject to audit and would be viewed and, accordingly, did not have any motivation to be dishonest. After then swearing to warrants, Jones went home. Jones acknowledged that he did not report the

collision at this time. He indicated that this was because he had other responsibilities at that time related to his shift, had just finished a 21-hour shift, and planned to report during his next shift.

Jones was scheduled to be off on Monday, December 30, 2024 and Tuesday, December 31, 2024, though he worked an overtime job on Tuesday, December 31, 2024. He returned to his regular day shift on Wednesday, January 1, 2025. After arriving for his shift on January 1, 2025, Jones contacted MCpl. Aube (hereinafter “Aube”), his supervisor that day, and told him about the incident. Jones told Aube that he realized that his Tahoe had drifted into Joie’s Tahoe when he watched the video near the end of his last shift, but did not notice damage to either Tahoe, and asked Aube what he needed to do. Aube testified that he advised Jones at that time that he did not need to make a collision report because there was no damage and no injuries, though Aube testified that he did not watch the MVR video.

Sgt. Lloyd did not testify before the Hearing Board, but her actions during pertinent time periods were recounted by Capt. Rementer and indicated in the documents provided. According to Capt. Rementer’s testimony, on Thursday, January 2, 2025, Sgt. Lloyd reviewed portions of videos, including Jones’s MVR video, related to the pursuit and subsequent time period. This was when she learned of the collision, though she was on-scene the night of Sunday, December 29, 2024, including speaking to Jones on-scene, and did not see the collision nor any damage on-scene at that time.

After viewing the videos, Sgt. Lloyd called Jones while he was conducting a traffic stop and asked if he was aware of the collision. At this time, Jones advised that he became aware of the collision from watching his MVR video at the end of his shift, as noted above, and that he had reported it to Aube.

According to Capt. Rementer's testimony, subsequently, after Sgt. Lloyd noticed the dent on Joie's Tahoe during an unrelated incident, and speaking with Joie, Sgt. Lloyd had Jones meet her at Troop 2 so that she could inspect his Tahoe. Jones met with Sgt. Lloyd at Troop 2 and, at that time, Sgt. Lloyd indicated that she found damage to the front right bumper of Jones's Tahoe and determined that a departmental report was necessary and she prepared that report.

On Sunday, January 5, 2025, Sgt. Lloyd watched the videos in their entirety. This is when she heard the phrases "never happened" and "hundred thousand miles," as noted above. From watching the videos and her discussions with Jones and Joie, Sgt. Lloyd felt that both troopers had not been honest with her, causing her to report up her chain of command.

Jones and Joie were subsequently referred for a trial board hearing, convened on April 30, 2025 (hereinafter, the "Trial Board"). The Trial Board recommended a suspension of eight hours for both Jones and Joie as to Rules and Regulations #1 (Divisional Motor Vehicle Collisions – Division Members involved in a motor vehicle collision, no matter how minor, will immediately notify the appropriate communications center and their immediate supervisor of the incident). The Trial Board also recommended termination of both Jones and Joie as to Rules and Regulations #15 (No member shall knowingly make a false statement, falsify any written or verbal report or knowingly withhold material matter from such report or statement).

DSP Superintendent Col. William D. Crotty reviewed the Trial Board's recommendations and, by written decision dated October 1, 2025, sustained their decision on each count, including the decision for termination. Jones and Joie both appealed the Superintendent's decision to the Secretary of the Department of Safety and Homeland Security, Joshua Bushweller. A hearing on that appeal was held on November 20, 2025. Secretary Bushweller issued a written decision dated December 8, 2025 affirming the Superintendent's decision to terminate Jones and Joie.

A written Notice of Employment Status Change, indicating “Termination,” was signed by Col. Crotty on December 16, 2025. By letter dated December 22, 2025, the Commission notified Jones that he was eligible for decertification due to his discharge from employment with a law enforcement agency for a breach of internal discipline and that he had a right to a hearing on the matter. Jones requested such a hearing, and a hearing was held before the Hearing Board on March 12, 2026.

DECISION

After thorough consideration of the facts and deliberation of this matter, this Commission found that the Hearing Board did conduct independent factfinding and considered possible mitigating evidence in making its recommendation of a 1-day suspension for Jones. This Commission further found that the Hearing Board applied the appropriate balancing process to the facts, including consideration of the underlying factual record and independent factfinding by the Hearing Board. Of particular importance to the Commission’s deliberations were statements by Hearing Board members Horvath and Leonard that, based on the evidence presented to the Hearing Board, they did not believe Jones was dishonest. Upon review of the testimony and exhibits offered into evidence before the Hearing Board, this Commission agrees.

Although the Hearing Board and this Commission did not independently find that all the underlying factual allegations were sustained against Jones, its authority in this matter is constrained by statute. Pursuant to Title 11, Section 8404(a)(4)(e)1, the Commission is required to suspend or revoke certification of an officer who has received a hearing under Chapter 92 and has been discharged from employment with a law-enforcement agency for a breach of internal discipline. Accordingly, because Jones received the requisite hearing and had been terminated, the Hearing Board and this Commission are obligated to impose a sanction regardless of whether they

reached the same factual conclusions as the terminating agency. In recognition of the fact that this Commission did not find Jones dishonest, this Commission accepts the Hearing Board's recommendation of a 1-day suspension as the minimum penalty available by law to satisfy its statutory mandate.

Accordingly, on this 24th day of June 2026, the decision of the Hearing Board to suspend Jones for 1-day is AFFIRMED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Richad McCabe, Chief Richad McCabe (Chair)
/s/ Mark Farrall, Chief Mark Farrall
/s/ Thomas Johnson, Chief Thomas Johnson, II
/s/ Charles Simpson, Charles "Chip" Simpson
/s/ Frankin Cooke, Rep. Frankin Cooke
/s/ Paul Bauer, Commissioner Paul Bauer
/s/ Robin Christiansen, Mayor Robin Christiansen
/s/ Carol Boggerty, Rev. Dr. Carol Boggerty

OPPOSED

/s/ Wilfredo Campos, Chief Wilfredo Campos

ABSTAIN

Colonel William Crotty
Colonel Jamie Leonard