



**CITY OF NEW HAVEN  
DEPARTMENT OF POLICE SERVICE  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS UNIT**

---

**CASE CLOSURE SUMMARIES: April 2024**

**IA Case Number: 23C-022**

**Date Received: April 11, 2023**

**Complainant: Stacey Wezenter**

**Incident District: 8**

**Officer(s): Lt. J. Marshall, Det. L. Soto, Det. S. Romano, Det. J. Folch, Det. M. DeCarvalho, Det. C. Boyle, Det. J. Moore, Det. J. Paxton, Det. J. Stone, Ofc. M. Ofiara**

**Date Closed: March 5, 2024**

**Disposition: Exonerated**

New Haven Police Detectives conducted an online child pornography investigation which led them to a suspect with a corroborated address of 590 East St. apt. #2. 590 East St. is a multifamily dwelling with two mailboxes, indicating two apartments, #1 and #2. Detectives obtained a search warrant for 590 East St. apt. #2 and executed it on the top floor apartment, they believed to be #2. Initially, detectives believed the apartment on the top floor was unit #2 however, it was unit #1, Stacey Wezenter's apartment. Upon gaining entry, Wezenter was detained and handcuffed as they began the search of the apartment. Detectives quickly discovered they had the wrong apartment and immediately stopped the search, uncuffed and apologized to Wezenter and explained the situation to her. Wezenter informed detectives that the suspect lived on the lower level. Wezenter filed a civilian complaint stating she was awoken from her sleep by her "door being busted open" and her home being raided. She stated she was handcuffed with no explanation until they discovered they had the wrong apartment. She added that the officers apologized and had her show them the correct door and identify her neighbor. The investigation determined Detectives did their due diligence to verify the address of their suspect. This determination was made from review of reports, body worn camera footage and interviews that were conducted of all parties involved. The investigation showed Detectives went to the target location in an attempt to further verify, however, they were not able to speak with anyone. 590 East St. is a three-level dwelling, the first level does not have any apartments and only has stairs leading to the second level (first floor with an apartment); from that level there is an additional set of stairs leading to the top level (second floor with an apartment). Due to the confusing layout, unit 2 being on the first floor with an apartment and unit 1 being on the top floor, any reasonable officer would have mistaken the addresses, therefore it was determined that officers did not knowingly or purposefully enter the wrong dwelling. Once Detectives were informed, they had the wrong apartment they quickly uncuffed Wezenter and remained professional and polite with her during the entire interaction. The investigation determined by a preponderance of evidence that the alleged act did occur, but the officers engaged in no misconduct because the act was lawful, justified and proper. Although, they had the incorrect apartment Detectives reasonably believed it was the correct door. The search warrant was written for the apartment door the Detectives executed it on. Therefore, the officers in this complaint were found to be **Exonerated**.

**IA Case Number: 24C-008**  
**Date Received: January 6, 2024**  
**Complainant: Necole Dundy**  
**Incident District: 10**  
**Officer(s): Officer R. Loschiavo**  
**Date Closed: April 1, 2024**  
**Disposition: Exonerated**

New Haven Police Officers responded to 85 Carmel St for a landlord/tenant dispute. The complainants stated that their apartment door code was changed and were unable to gain access to their rooms. The officer was informed that the landlord, Necole Dundy, was angry at the complainants and changed the codes. The officer made several attempts to contact Dundy on scene but was unsuccessful. The officer also sent her a message via text asking Dundy to contact him regarding her side of the story and to see if she had any eviction paperwork. He stated if she did not contact him he would have do a warrant for criminal lockout. The complainants were able to gain access to the apartment by another tenant and did not wish to pursue any criminal lockout charges against Dundy. The following day the officer received a test message from Dundy stating she had not locked the complainant out and that it was "operator error." Dundy also expressed discontent for the officer calling her place of employment. Dundy filled a civilian complaint regarding the incident. The investigation determined by preponderance of evidence that misconduct or malfeasance complained about did occur, but the officers engaged in no misconduct because the act was lawful, justified, and proper. This determination was made from review of reports, body worn camera footage and interviews conducted. The officer was conducting an investigation within the scope of his duties, he attempted to contact Dundy on the numbers provided as part of the investigation. The text message sent to Dundy was stating a possible outcome of the investigation since Criminal Lock out is an arrestable offense. Therefore, the officer in this complaint was found to be **Exonerated**.

**IA Case Number: 24C-020**  
**Date Received: February 27, 2024**  
**Complainant: Christopher Bernardini**  
**Incident District: 9**  
**Officer(s): Officer R. Torres**  
**Date Closed: March 7, 2024**  
**Disposition: Unfounded**

New Haven Police Officers were dispatched to 4 Forbes Ave, on March 15, 2023, for a disorderly conduct complaint. The complainant stated he was threatened by Christopher Bernardini, an employee, and wanted to press charges. Officers responded to Bernardini's home and spoke with him. Bernardini admitted to getting in an argument with the complainant but stated he never threatened him. Bernardini was given a Misdemeanor Summons for Breach of Peace for the incident. Bernardini made a civilian complaint via email stating he was wrongfully arrested. He believed the arrest was related to corruption within the New Haven Police Department and payback for filing an OSHA complaint against his former employer. He believed his former employer and the NHPD were conspiring against him because of his former employer's connection with a police commissioner from another town. He also stated that the officer purposefully turned off his body worn camera during their interaction in order to lie about the arrest. The investigation determined by preponderance of evidence that misconduct or malfeasance complained about did not occur. This determination was made from review of report and body worn camera footage. Upon viewing body worn camera footage Officer Torres initially has his body camera inactive, however, upon realizing this he immediately activates his camera and informs Bernardini. He requests that Bernardini repeat his statement since it

had not been captured. Bernardini states on camera that we went to his former employer and admitted to getting into a breach with him. He does not dispute the summons and laughs with the officer during the interaction. There was no apparent connection with New Haven Officers and Bernardini's former employer. Therefore, this complaint was **Unfounded**.

---

**IA Case Number: 24C-026**  
**Date Received: March 20, 2024**  
**Complainant: Diondrea Silva-Brown**  
**Incident District: 1**  
**Officer(s): Officer T. Arnone**  
**Date Closed: April 2, 2024**  
**Disposition: Exonerated**

New Haven Police Detectives responded to 910 Chapel Street, Chipotle, on a possible domestic dispute. While officers were conducting an investigation to determine what was occurring one of the females involved attempted to leave the premise. Officer Arnone stopped her from leaving by grabbing on to her arm. He explained she needed to wait until the investigation was completed, the female became irate and asked why the officer touched her. Once the investigation was concluded the female was allowed to leave. Officers were not able to identify the female, however, it was determined a crime had not been committed. Diondrea Silva-Brown filed a civilian complaint stating the female was her sister. Silva-Brown explained, the information she had of the incident was not from her observation but from the account her sister gave her. Silva-Brown was informed, by her sister, that as she attempted to leave Chipotle, she was grabbed by an officer who refused to let her go. She stated she spoke with the officer who explained to her they were trying to conduct an investigation and needed her to stay on scene until they could get both sides of the story. Silvia-Brown stated her issue was her sister was never told she needed to stay, and he did not explain to her why he grabbed her. The investigation determined by preponderance of evidence that misconduct or malfeasance complained about did occur, but the officers engaged in no misconduct because the act was lawful, justified, and proper. This determination was made from review of reports and body worn camera footage.

---