COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF
MICHAEL VROOM

Case No. 2026-002
(MPTC ID 9997-5951)

SUSPENSION ORDER

The Respondent Michael Vroom has entered into a Disposition Agreement ("Agreement"), attached hereto and incorporated herein, under which he has agreed to the suspension of his certification as a law enforcement officer in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for a period of 30 days and certain conditions outlined in the Agreement. The Agreement and the suspension become effective on the date of the Agreement's approval by the Massachusetts Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission ("Commission"). See M.G.L. c. 6E, §§ 3(a) and 10; M.G.L. c. 30A, §§ 10 and 13.

Failure of the Respondent to abide by the terms and conditions of the Agreement during his suspension shall result in the Agreement becoming void and may result in the Commission initiating adjudicatory proceedings against the Respondent; and seeking discipline against the Respondent based on any ground supported by the evidence obtained in a preliminary inquiry, whether or not it was covered in the Agreement, up to and including the possible revocation of the Respondent's certification and entry of his information into the National Decertification Index. The Respondent has waived all rights to contest, in this or any other administrative or judicial proceeding to which the Commission is or may be a party, the factual findings, conclusions of law, terms and conditions, and other provisions contained in the Agreement, as well as any Order of the Commission contemplated by the Agreement.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that, for the reasons stated in the Agreement:

(a) The Agreement is approved;
(b) The factual findings and conclusions of law set forth in the Agreement are hereby adopted;
(c) The Respondent's law enforcement certification is hereby suspended for a period of 30 days, beginning on August 20, 2026, subject to the agreed-upon conditions;
(d) During the period of suspension, the Respondent shall not perform police duties or functions or work in a law enforcement capacity;
(e) The Respondent is hereby directed to surrender, and the Respondent's employing law enforcement agency shall collect, without delay, any agency-issued credentials and equipment that promote and support the performance of functions associated with service as a law enforcement officer, including but not limited to, any uniform, badge, firearm, assigned cruiser, and use-of-force instruments, such as tasers, see M.G.L. c. 6E, § 3(a); 501 CMR 15.05(1), (2)(f)-(g); and
(f) The Executive Director shall take the necessary steps to publish this Order and the Agreement on the Commission's website and to publish the Respondent's name and suspension status in any publicly available lists and database published by the Commission.

By vote of the Commission on August 20, 2026.

Margaret R. Hinkle

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

Notice: Paul M. Facklam Jr., Esq., Respondent's Counsel
Amy C. Parker, Esq., Commission Enforcement Counsel
Division of Police Standards
Shaun Martinez, Esq., Deputy Director, Division of Police Standards
Hudson Police Department, Law Enforcement Agency
Collective Bargaining Unit

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING COMMISSION

MICHAEL S. VROOM MPTC ID: 9398-4987	Case No. 2026-002

DISPOSITION AGREEMENT

In the interest of resolving the above-captioned matter and consistent with the public interest and laws and regulations governing the Massachusetts Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission ("Commission"), including M.G.L. c. 6E, §§ 3(a), 8, and 10, and 555 C.M.R. §§ 1.01–1.10, the Respondent, Michael S. Vroom, and the Commission hereby enter into this Disposition Agreement:

Factual Findings

1. The Respondent has been employed as a law enforcement officer by the Hudson Police Department ("HPD") since approximately May 27, 2001.

2. On July 1, 2021, the Respondent was automatically certified as a law enforcement officer in Massachusetts pursuant to St. 2020, c. 253, § 102, an Act Relative to Justice, Equity and Accountability in Law Enforcement in the Commonwealth. On July 1, 2024, the Respondent was recertified by the Commission pursuant to M.G.L. 6E, §§ 3(a)(3) and 4 and 555 C.M.R. §§ 9.01-9.12. The Commission suspended his certification on January 15, 2026, pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 9(a)(4) and 555 CMR 1.06(2).

3. In addition to receiving one suspension and multiple warnings and reprimands between 2001 and 2009, the Respondent has the following sustained internal affairs complaints:

   a. The Respondent received a letter of reprimand and retraining related to using improper means of communication with HPD officers and discourtesy in 2023.

   b. The Respondent was suspended for fifteen days in August 2022, and was sent to a training class, which the Respondent successfully completed, for five separate violations of HPD's rule related to Neglect of Duty occurring on July 21, 2021, when HPD found the Respondent: (1) failed to investigate a potential restraining-order violation or perform a welfare check; (2) failed to ensure that a subordinate officer promptly responded to the same possible restraining-order violation; (3) later observed a subordinate officer use excessive force during booking of an arrested

individual and failed to adequately intervene; (4) then failed to check the same arrested individual's condition, and (5) failed to submit a timely use-of-force report.

4. Finally, the Respondent's most recent instance of sustained misconduct occurred during the overnight shift in the early morning hours of August 17, 2025. The Respondent, a lieutenant at the time, was on duty at HPD as the shift supervisor and officer in charge ("OIC"). At approximately 5:23 a.m., HPD received a report via a 911 call of a man with a knife locked inside an apartment threatening family members. Subordinate HPD officers responded to the scene, evaluated their plan for entry, and they determined to break into the apartment's front door. Over the course of several minutes and as they continued to prepare for entry, the responding officers attempted to contact the Respondent via radio three times to receive authorization before forcible entry. Dispatch, hearing the failed radio attempts, also attempted to call Vroom's office phone twice without success. All the while, the Respondent was asleep in his office with his door closed, his radio volume turned down, and the lights dimmed. A dispatch officer ultimately ran down the hall to the Respondent's office and awoke him. The Respondent then authorized entry by the three (3) officers on scene.

5. Upon further investigation, HPD determined that the Respondent had closed his office door and remained in his office for hours during six (6) overnight shifts over the period May 31, 2025 to July 10, 2025. During the investigation of the August 17, 2025 incident, Respondent admitted that he had difficulty remaining awake during those overnight shifts, but did not disclose his concerns about remaining awake while working those overnight shifts to HPD until after the August 17, 2025, incident.

6. On October 3, 2025, an HPD internal affairs investigation sustained seven HPD rules violations as a result of the August 17, 2025, incident, which include two violations of the rule related to neglect of duty and one violation each of the rules related to incompetence, sleeping on duty conduct unbecoming an officer, attention to duty, and devotion to duty.

7. Effective December 12, 2025, HPD and the Respondent entered a last-chance agreement related to the August 17, 2025, incident, wherein the Respondent was permanently demoted two ranks from lieutenant to patrol officer, he became ineligible to serve as OIC on any shift, he became ineligible to seek or initiate promotional opportunities while employed by HPD, and he agreed that any future incident of misconduct by him will result in discipline up to and including termination, with limited appeal rights.

8. On January 15, 2026, the Commission, pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 8(c)(2) and 555 C.M.R. § 1.02(2) and (4), authorized the Division to conduct a preliminary inquiry into the allegations of misconduct described in paragraphs 3 through 5 above. On the same date, the Commission, pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 9(a)(4) and 555 C.M.R. § 1.06(2), suspended the Respondent's certification when it determined that suspension was in the best interest of the health, safety or welfare of the public.

9. On July 16, 2026, the Commission voted to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the Respondent.

Legal Conclusions

10. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 3(a):

> The [C]ommission shall have all powers necessary or convenient to carry out and effectuate its purposes, including, but not limited to, the power to:
> (1) act as the primary civil enforcement agency for violations of [chapter 6E]; . . .
> (4) deny an application or limit, condition, restrict, revoke or suspend a certification, or fine a person certified for any cause that the [C]ommission deems reasonable; . . .
> (23) restrict, suspend or revoke certifications issued under [chapter 6E]; and
> (24) conduct adjudicatory proceedings in accordance with chapter 30A; . . . .

11. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(b)(iv), "[t]he [C]omission may […] suspend or revoke an officer's certification if the [C]omission finds by clear and convincing evidence that the officer […] was suspended or terminated by their appointing agency for disciplinary reasons, and any appeal of said suspension or termination is completed."

12. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(b)(v), "[t]he [C]omission may […] suspend or revoke an officer's certification if the [C]omission finds by clear and convincing evidence that the officer […] has repeated sustained internal affairs complaints, for the same or different offenses."

13. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(h), the Commission may institute a disciplinary hearing after an officer's appointing agency has issued a final disposition on the alleged misconduct.

14. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 30A, § 10, "[u]nless otherwise provided by any law, agencies may . . . make informal disposition of any adjudicatory proceeding by stipulation, agreed settlement, consent order or default."

15. The allegations described above demonstrate that the Respondent was suspended twice by his appointing agency for disciplinary reasons, which involved several sustained complaints against him for the same or different offenses. *See* § 10(b)(iv) and (v).

Resolution

In view of the foregoing violations of M.G.L. c. 6E, §§ 10(b) (iv) and (v), the Commission has determined that the public interest would best be served by the disposition of this matter without further enforcement proceedings, on the basis of the following terms and conditions which have been agreed to by the Respondent:

16. The Respondent acknowledges that, once this Agreement is executed, the Commission will issue a Suspension Order adopting all of the factual findings and conclusions of law set forth in this Agreement.

17. The Respondent hereby agrees to the suspension of his law enforcement officer certification in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, §§ 3(a), 10(b)(iv), and 10(b)(v) for thirty (30) days, beginning on the date this Agreement is approved by the Commission.

18. During the thirty-day suspension period, the Respondent shall not perform police duties or functions or work in a law enforcement capacity. The Respondent shall surrender, and the Respondent's agency shall collect, without delay, any agency-issued credentials and equipment that promote and support the performance of functions associated with service as a law enforcement officer, including but not limited to, any uniform, badge, firearm, assigned cruiser, and use-of-force instruments, such as tasers.[1]

19. The Respondent agrees that, if he should fail to abide by any of the terms and conditions of this Agreement during his suspension, this Agreement shall become void, and the Division may, without prior notice to the Respondent, take the following steps:

a. initiate adjudicatory proceedings against the Respondent;
b. seek discipline against the Respondent based on any ground supported by the evidence in its preliminary inquiry, including grounds beyond those covered by this Agreement; and
c. seek any level of discipline supported by the evidence, up to and including the revocation of the Respondent's certification and the entry of his information onto the National Decertification Index.

20. The Respondent waives all rights to contest the factual findings, conclusions of law, terms and conditions, or other provisions contained in this Agreement, as well as any Order of the Commission contemplated by this Agreement, in any administrative or judicial forum to which the Commission is or may be a party.

[1] See M.G.L. c. 6E, § 3(a); 501 CMR 15.05(1), (2)(f)-(g).

21. Both this Agreement and the Order of Suspension will be public documents and will be published on the Commission's website pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6E, § 10(g). Furthermore, the status of the Respondent's certification will be publicly available on certain lists and databases published by the Commission.

22. This Agreement shall be effective as of the date it is approved by the Commission.

8/13/26
Date

Michael S. Vroom, Respondent

08/20/2026
Date

Margaret R. Hinkle, Chair