

**GROTON POLICE  
DEPARTMENT**

**INTERNAL AFFAIRS  
INVESTIGATION**

**C25-014**

**February 11, 2026**

**DLG**

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

**COMPLAINT:** On July 16, 2025, Chris Wilson submitted a Civilian Complaint Form to the Town Manager regarding the Groton Police Department’s handling of the investigation into the fatal car accident on October 14, 2024, at approximately 0120 hours, located on Fishtown Road near the Mystic River Magnet School.

**ABSTRACT OF ALLEGATION:** The complaint alleges that the Groton Police Department failed to conduct a timely, thorough, and compassionate investigation into a fatal motor vehicle crash, did not adequately pursue leads related to underage drinking and associated criminal activity, and took no meaningful enforcement action. It further claims unprofessional conduct by supervisory personnel at the scene and requests a comprehensive review, disciplinary consideration, renewed investigative efforts, and a formal response from town and police leadership.

**APPLICABLE RULE(S):** General Order 1.01 – Oath of Office and Code of Ethics  
General Order 5.08 – Traffic Accident Investigation  
General Order 6.06 – Youth Investigations

**DISCOVERY OF ADDITIONAL RULE(S) VIOLATION(S):** None

**SUBJECT OF COMPLAINT:** Groton Police Department Officers, Chief Louis Fusaro

**DATE/TIME OF INCIDENT:** October 14, 2024, at approximately 0120 hours.

**LOCATION OF INCIDENT:** Fishtown Road near the Mystic River Magnet School & Groton Police Department

**DATE COMPLAINT RECEIVED:** On or about July 16, 2025

**ASSIGNED INVESTIGATOR:** Attorney Eric P. Daigle

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

**BACKGROUND**

On October 14, 2024, at approximately 0120 hours, a fatal motor vehicle crash occurred in Groton, Connecticut, near Fishtown Road by Mystic River Magnet School (160 Fishtown Road, Mystic, CT) involving four juveniles. At 0121 hours, Groton Emergency Dispatch received an iPhone Crash Detection Alert from 720-919-0012, followed one minute later by a 911 call from Magnum DeSouza, a civilian witness who reported the collision. Officers Shawn Paradis and Alana Berkman (GTPD) were dispatched immediately and arrived on scene within a minute of the alert. They located a gray 2012 Toyota 4Runner (CT BN30482) that had left the roadway at high speed and struck a tree.

The vehicle was operated by 17-year-old [REDACTED]. Passengers included [REDACTED] (front passenger), Alexander Quilter (right rear passenger), and 14-year-old [REDACTED] (left rear passenger). [REDACTED] sustained fatal injuries, while the other three occupants suffered serious trauma. Upon arrival, Officer Paradis approached the passenger side while Officer Berkman went to the driver's side. Both observed all four occupants to be unconscious. At 0124 hours, Paradis requested medical assistance and reported to dispatch at 0126 hours that entry into the vehicle was not immediately possible. Initial assessment showed the driver, front passenger, and right rear passenger were breathing, while the left rear passenger—later confirmed as [REDACTED] was unresponsive. At 0133 hours, officers successfully opened the rear driver's side door and began extrication of [REDACTED] who was treated as the top medical priority.

Emergency medical personnel quickly arrived. EMT Abigail Maerkel, in a statement on October 16, 2024, noted a strong odor of alcohol from [REDACTED] and that his speech was inconsistent with the situation. Paramedic Christopher Jones, who also provided a statement on the same date, treated [REDACTED]. Civilian witness Magnum DeSouza gave a statement at 0330 hours on the morning of the crash, describing his observations as the first person to arrive at the scene.

In addition to Officers Paradis and Berkman, numerous law enforcement personnel responded, including Officer Mitchell Chapman (GTPD/SCRTU), Sergeant Bolduc (GTPD), Sergeant Bedard (GTPD/SCRTU), Officer Baudro (GTPD), Sergeant Capalbo (SPD/SCRTU), Officer McDermott (SPD/SCRTU), Officer Friend (SPD/SCRTU), Sergeant Andrade (LPD/SCRTU), Chief Louis Fusaro, and Detective Kyle LoPriore (GTPD). Other witnesses present included Esme Pray, a friend of the group who notified others after learning of the crash, and John-Marc Quilter, father of passenger Alexander Quilter, who arrived at the scene and later provided information about his son's condition. Several friends of the juveniles, including Ezra Stebbins, his father Justin Stebbins, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were also identified as having been with the group earlier that evening and were observed near the scene.

All four occupants were transported to hospitals immediately following the collision. [REDACTED] was first taken to Lawrence & Memorial Hospital before being transferred to Yale-New Haven Hospital (YNHH) at 0623 hours. Despite stabilization efforts and transfusions, he succumbed to his injuries and was pronounced deceased at 2214 hours on October 14, 2024. An autopsy the next day confirmed the cause of death as blunt force trauma. [REDACTED] was transferred from Lawrence & Memorial at 0925 hours on October 14 to YNHH, where he remained until November 5, 2024, when

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

he was discharged and later transferred to Gaylord Rehabilitation Facility on November 8, 2024. Alexander Quilter was transferred from Lawrence & Memorial at 0752 hours on October 14 to YNHH and discharged on October 23, 2024, at 1658 hours. [REDACTED] the driver, was admitted to YNHH with significant injuries and remained hospitalized until October 24, 2024, at 1653 hours.

The investigation quickly expanded to reconstruct the events leading up to the crash. Officers Mitchell Chapman and Detective Kyle LoPriore led the inquiry. On October 17, 2024, James Blomberg reported that his friend, [REDACTED] had been with the boys earlier in the evening and that their vehicle had been traveling at speeds over 100 mph. He also relayed information that alcohol had been supplied at a residence. On October 20, 2024, investigators interviewed Christopher Wilson, [REDACTED] father, who provided a detailed timeline, photos, and details of phone calls with his son, including an 11:28 p.m. call in which [REDACTED] reported being stopped by Stonington Police.

Further interviews were conducted in the following weeks. On October 23, 2024, at 1500 hours, investigators interviewed [REDACTED] who confirmed being with the group at multiple parties in Mystic, Uncasville, and East Lyme, where alcohol was present. Later that day, at 1530 hours, [REDACTED] and his father clarified that [REDACTED] had not been with the group that evening because he had been at a Patriots game. On October 25, 2024, investigators interviewed [REDACTED] who confirmed being with the group at multiple parties in Mystic, Uncasville, and East Lyme, and provided a timeline similar to that disclosed by [REDACTED]. On November 11, 2024, attempts to interview Ezra Stebbins (1400 hours) and [REDACTED] (1406 hours) were unsuccessful—Stebbins declined, and [REDACTED] mother refused access. Detective LoPriore also attempted contact with Nick Bannen and Ethan Shiman on multiple occasions between October 30 and December 13, 2024, but both declined. All individuals involved in the crash also declined to speak with the Groton Police Department during the investigation.

Investigators broadened the scope to determine how alcohol was obtained. On November 26, 2024, at 0955 hours, Chris Wilson signed a consent form for the extraction and analysis of [REDACTED] iPhone, which was reviewed by Detective Richard Savino on December 13, 2024. On December 16, 2024, at 1500 hours, Officer Chapman and Detective LoPriore interviewed Christian and Erin Stanley, whose daughter, [REDACTED] admitted to hosting a party in East Lyme that night without their parents' knowledge. [REDACTED] confirmed alcohol was present, but stated the juveniles involved in the crash had not stayed. Follow-up inquiries included interviews at residences in Uncasville (November 21, 2024) and Groton Long Point's "Dollhouse" (November 22, 2024), where the group had gathered earlier. Detective LoPriore also conducted inquiries at local liquor stores regarding possible alcohol purchases.

In addition to witness statements, Officer Chapman reviewed medical records, autopsy findings, surveillance video showing the vehicle minutes before the crash, scaled crash diagrams, and crash data downloads. Toxicology confirmed [REDACTED] blood alcohol concentration at 0.12%, and crash data showed the vehicle was traveling at a very high speed prior to impact.

On January 9, 2025, [REDACTED] was arrested under both juvenile and adult warrants. He was charged with manslaughter in the second degree (motor vehicle), first-degree assault, misconduct with a motor

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

vehicle, reckless driving, DUI under 21, and multiple motor vehicle violations. The case continued into 2025 with additional witness interviews, phone record analysis, and civilian complaints. On July 16, 2025, [REDACTED] father, Chris Wilson, filed a formal civilian complaint seeking additional records and clarification of the case handling. Mr. Wilson made an additional complaint to Chief Fusaro via email on September 9, 2025.

**COMPLAINANT STATEMENT(S)**

On July 16, 2025, Chris Wilson submitted a Civilian Complaint Form to the Town Manager regarding the Groton Police Department's handling of the investigation into the fatal car accident on October 14, 2024, at approximately 0120 hours, located on Fishtown Road near the Mystic River Magnet School. **(Exhibit A)**

The complaint listed the following areas of concern:

- Alleges the Groton Police Department failed to conduct a timely, thorough, and accountable investigation into a fatal motor vehicle crash that resulted in his son's death.
- Claims police did not adequately pursue known leads related to underage drinking, including alcohol provided by local businesses, house parties involving minors, and adult involvement, despite being made aware of these issues.
- Asserts that no meaningful enforcement actions or charges were taken against individuals allegedly responsible for contributing to the illegal activity preceding the crash.
- Reports viewing body-worn camera footage in which a supervising officer is allegedly heard laughing and the Chief of Police is described as making a sarcastic remark at the crash scene, characterizing this conduct as unprofessional and dehumanizing. He submitted the brief clip. **(Exhibit B)**
- Expresses that the department's conduct compounded the family's trauma and demonstrated a lack of compassion and respect following the death.
- Formally requests a full and transparent review of the handling of the investigation, disciplinary review of involved personnel, renewed attention to unresolved criminal activity, and a written response from police and town leadership.
- Mr. Wilson also provided a package of photographs and information alongside his complaint. **(Exhibit C)**

Additionally, Mr. Wilson filed another complaint with Chief Fusaro via email on September 9, 2025, reiterating the information listed above in his original complaint. **(Exhibit D)**

**Christopher Wilson**

On Monday, September 22, 2025, Attorney Eric P. Daigle and Investigator Tim Webster interviewed Christopher Wilson regarding his allegations and complaint against the Groton Police Department. The interview was held at Mr. Wilson's home located at 20 Tra Mart in Montville, CT. The interview was recorded and transcribed. The relevant portions of the interview are summarized below. (Ex. E, Chris Wilson Interview Audio; Ex. F, Chris Wilson Interview Transcript)

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

Mr. Wilson is the father of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] passengers of the fatal motor vehicle crash on October 14, 2024. [REDACTED] sustained fatal injuries, and [REDACTED] sustained serious trauma from the accident. Mr. Wilson initiated the complaint against the Groton Police Department's conduct around the investigation on July 16, 2025, and sent a second complaint on September 9, 2025.

Mr. Wilson goes over the timeline of events leading to the crash, the night itself, and its outcome. Mr. Wilson advised that Ezra Stebbins and [REDACTED] have provided him with a rough timeline of events from that night. During his review of the timeline, Mr. Wilson references photos he received from his son's, [REDACTED], phone, which show them drinking at multiple locations throughout the night of October 13, 2024.

Mr. Wilson states, *"So this is another photo at the Dollhouse. This is timestamped the day. This is my oldest, [REDACTED] looks like with a Twisted Tea in his hand. And then you can see here there's two 12 packs of alcohol."* (Ex. F, pg. 5) When asked if he knew where they got that alcohol from, Mr. Wilson indicates that, through his personal investigation and his attorney, they assume it is Nick Bannon, stating *"Nick Bannon did admit that he bought the alcohol that day. To his Lawyer. And my lawyer talked to his lawyer"* (Ex. F, pg. 6).

Mr. Wilson explains that the Groton Police Department is not aware of this because his attorney plans to use it in the civil case against individuals, stating, *"No, no. And my lawyer's thinking was, I'm not going to tell the cops because this is our insight. Pretty much, he believes Nick is going to rat other people out because there's more people with fake IDs."* (Ex. F, pg. 6)

Mr. Wilson goes on to show multiple photos indicating different underage individuals having or purchasing alcohol in the months and days leading up to the accident, explaining that he believes multiple kids still have Fake IDs and are still using them to purchase alcohol. Mr. Wilson expresses his frustration with the handling of this information from the Groton Police Department stating, *"So it's like this was on the day October 13th. It's like you have beer at this house, why aren't you guys going to the house and talking to them? Why isn't nothing being done?"* (Ex. F, pg. 8)

Mr. Wilson explains he is aware of some of the limitations of the Groton Police Department in not being able to talk to specific individuals, stating, *"I was going to say that. So there's probably like six or seven kids that the cops wanted to interview. The first one was Ezra. Ezra has a lawyer. Okay, we can't talk to him. But my question is what's stopping the cops from contacting the lawyer and getting those people in? I know damn well these kids don't have lawyers because I know them all. I know them all. They don't have lawyers. So soon as Ezra mentioned that I have a lawyer, he told so-and-so, just say this, just say this. And then it's just like a ripple effect. None of these kids have lawyers. I know that for sure."* (Ex. F, pg. 8).

Mr. Wilson expands upon his frustration with the Groton Police Department regarding [REDACTED] prior interactions with Groton Police Officers, including being known to them multiple times prior to the accident. Mr. Wilson states *"Now are you guys aware, so [REDACTED] got arrested in*

GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014

January. We didn't know this until our first court case. The judge was pretty hard on him. Turns out, [REDACTED] had interactions with Groton PD five times, four out of five times, alcohol's involved. He has four infractions. So who's not at fault? Who dropped the ball? How does a 17-year-old get four infractions from a cop and DMV's not involved" (Ex. F, pg. 9)

When asked to further clarify his complaint, Mr. Wilson states the following:

*Chris Wilson: I just feel like with all this evidence that they do have, I just don't think they really put much effort into it. That's how I feel.*

*Eric Daigle: So to clarify, the evidence would be that these kids have had access to-*

*Chris Wilson: Alcohol.*

*Eric Daigle: ... or did have access to alcohol.*

*Chris Wilson: And they're still buying. I have proof of Ezra still buying alcohol. I have Ethan still buying alcohol.*

*Eric Daigle: Okay. And what are the cops supposed to do about that?*

*Chris Wilson: Go to the liquor store, talk to their parents. I mean what if someone else is has died?*

*Eric Daigle: No, no, I fully get it. I just want to make sure what your perception is of that. Okay.*

*Chris Wilson: I mean at least look into it.*

*Eric Daigle: Do you know whether or not they went to the package store? The police.*

*Chris Wilson: Physically, I don't, but I don't ... He wanted me to meet him. Because after I told him that, he wanted me to meet him, and I didn't want to deal with him.*

*Eric Daigle: Okay. All right, so-*

*Chris Wilson: And if he did, they would've been caught. The liquor store would've been caught, I feel like.*

*Eric Daigle: Okay. So your four bullet points here were underage drinking that occurred prior to the crash-... that's what you're talking*

*about here.*

*Chris Wilson: Yeah.*

*Eric Daigle: Okay. Alcohol illegally obtained by minors at local businesses.*

*Chris Wilson: The package store.*

*Eric Daigle: Same thing here.*

*Chris Wilson: Yeah.*

*Eric Daigle: All right. And then the fourth bullet point is adults and other individuals who contributed to these events but have faced no consequences. Is there anybody ... I know you're being general there. Is there a specific, is there a list of people you think should have been involved in that?*

*Chris Wilson: So I know firsthand, [REDACTED] parents allow him to drink at home, just because of all the photos I have. That night, I wouldn't put so much blame on the Groton Long Point house because they have a cottage. Clearly, they're drinking there, but-*

(Ex. F, pg. 11-13)

Mr. Wilson was asked about his review of the investigation, in which he states that he has not read the full investigation conducted by the Groton Police Department and is not aware of all the steps that the police department took during the investigation. Mr. Wilson also confirms that the Groton Police Department has all the information disclosed today, except for the private investigator's report and the attorney's information regarding Nick Brannon.

Mr. Wilson was asked about the clip of Chief Louis Fusaro making an allegedly sarcastic remark from the night of the incident, which was included within his original complaint to the Town. Mr. Wilson plays the clip from Sergeant Boldoc's body-worn camera from the scene. Due to the background noise of the clip, it is hard to understand what he says but Mr. Wilson explains that Chief is saying "Oh, it's a stationary object doesn't go anywhere. And you can hear a lieutenant giggle in the background." (Ex. F, pg. 18) Mr. Wilson states, "I just felt like ... And they knew [REDACTED] was dead at the time when he said that. It was in the video, but I don't know, I just felt like my gut just dropped when I heard that. Especially as a chief, as a police department, you just don't, I feel like you don't say something like that." (Ex. F, pg. 19)

Mr. Wilson also explains that he made a formal complaint to the Stonington Police Department regarding their interaction with the kids within Downtown Mystic a few hours prior to the accident, stating, "So like I said, the cops came, kid ran. The cop told him to wait right there, kid

GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014

ran. Cop asked the driver multiple times if he was high or drinking. Of course, he lied each time. Passenger of that car was [REDACTED] You can hear in his voice he was intoxicated. There's a car next to him with two kids in the car. The kid went to go take a sip of something and [REDACTED] goes, hey, is that vodka in your bottle? The cop just smirks. Pretty much, cop just let them go. Just let them go. So that's just a whole different- So I filed a complaint about three months ago and the deputy chief is reviewing all the video and all this stuff." (Ex. F, pg. 21).

Mr. Wilson expresses his disappointment with the fact that Groton Police Department never followed up with [REDACTED] after he was released from the Hospital and Rehabilitation Facility. Despite Mr. Wilson relaying information to the Groton Police Department, there was never a formal outreach to speak to [REDACTED] When asked if [REDACTED] remembers anything from that night, Mr. Wilson states "I don't force it on him, but here and there, I'll kind of talk to him about it. He doesn't remember anything from that night and weeks prior. But slowly I'll ask him, all right, do you remember going to this liquor store or who you went with? And he'll tell me, yeah, Ethan or this liquor store, which I gave to the cops." (Ex. F, pg. 23)

When asked if the private investigator that his Attorney hired without his knowledge had any conclusions as to any of his concerns, Mr. Wilson explains, "No, not really. I mean I think he's just going off of what I said. Seriously, when I say 90% of it is everything that I did. And then what really irks me is I met him. He seemed like a good dude, but we talked every day. Every freaking day, we talked, and then he goes on vacation. And he just ghosted me for two months. So after that, I haven't even talked to him." (Ex. F, pg. 25)

Mr. Wilson expresses a question about the law regarding posting minors' information online. The Groton Police Department's social media team posted about the entire accident on their Facebook page. The post did not include a video, but Mr. Wilson explains, "But minors' names were mentioned. I didn't talk ... They didn't call me. The accident happened. I didn't hear from them for five days. And I only heard from them because I went in to get a police report. So five days went by and then that's when they called me. I'm like." (Ex. F, pg. 26). When asked if they were formally notified of the accident, Mr. Wilson explains that notification of the accident was made to his wife, who was at the hospital, explaining, "To her because the cops were there. And plus we knew all the cops that were at the hospital. But my question is, so this was up for months and it's no longer there, so they deleted the post." (Ex. F, pg. 27).

Mr. Wilson was asked prior to ending the interview if there was anything else that hadn't been discussed today, and he stated, "I just feel like whoever has evidence or the boys that aren't talking. I feel like all of this will come out in the civil suit, so you can only rep for so long. But I feel like all of them will get subpoenaed to come to court. But other than that, I don't think there's anybody else." (Ex. F, pg. 29)

**SUBJECT STATEMENT(S)**

**Officer Shawn Paradis**

On Tuesday, September 23, 2025, Attorney Eric P. Daigle and Investigator Tim Webster interviewed Officer Shawn Paradis in the conference room at the Groton Police Department regarding allegations made by Chris Wilson regarding the investigation and actions related to the fatal car accident on October 14, 2024. The interview was recorded and transcribed. The relevant portions of the interview are summarized below. (Ex. G, Officer Shawn Paradis Interview Audio; Ex. H, Officer Shawn Paradis Interview Transcript)

Officer Paradis had been employed with the Groton Police Department for six and a half (6.5) years at the time of the accident. He held the position of patrol officer, primarily working the midnight shift. Officer Paradis is no longer employed at the Groton Police Department and has been employed at the State of Connecticut, Department of Motor Vehicles for about five (5) months as a truck inspector through the CVSA.

Officer Paradis was assigned to work a patrol assignment during the night shift on October 14, 2024, and was right down the street when the call about an accident came out on the radio around 0120 hours. Officer Paradis immediately responded to the scene, where he saw an SUV in the woods after wrapping around a large tree. Officer Paradis explains that *“There was already neighbors outside yelling for help. And I exited my cruiser and went to the car. It was hard to see into the car because it was facing into the woods because it had struck the tree head-on, and all airbags were deployed, all the side curtain airbags. I moved the airbags out of the way, one of the side curtain airbags to see four, at that time, motionless, unconscious, teenage males within the vehicle.”* (Ex. H, pg. 3)

Officer Paradis stated that he immediately called dispatch to report the scene, as no doors could be opened due to the force of the car's impact, which had bowed all door frames. Officer Paradis states, *“After that, I was on the passenger side, I ran around to the driver's side and I tried to open all the doors first. All were locked, or at least they were unable to be opened. I utilized my department-issue baton and began smashing out the driver's side window where the driver was with his face buried into the steering wheel. I was able to break the window, clean it out, and then from there I tried to unlock the doors. But again, because they were pinned shut, that did not work. At that time, I had another officer with me, she was trying on the other side, and I can't recall who started to move first, but I believe it was the front passenger.”* (Ex. H, pg. 3)

Officer Paradis explains that he helped triage medical and assisted in getting the victims out of the car. Once all occupants were out, Officer Paradis stated that he helped get them all loaded into ambulances and then began supporting crowd control. Officer Paradis states, *“And this incident was a little different from the average one, just because so many other teenagers started just arriving on scene because of the crash detection and other things, somehow other people knew. So just doing crowd control, keeping them away, as well as assisting with pulling them out onto the backboards.”* (Ex. H, pg. 4)

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

Officer Paradis stated that he started to gather names and information from those on the scene, including one of the fathers of one of the occupants, who misidentified his son for another victim who looked similar. After speaking with the individuals at the scene, Officer Paradis stated that he was able to identify who was in the car. Officer Paradis explains that *“because it was my area, it was my call initially. I had to go with the driver of the vehicle to the hospital. He was technically in my custody and I needed to witness the blood draw.”* (Ex. H, pg. 4)

Officer Paradis explains, *“The empty can, alcoholic beverages, the canisters, cans in the back, as well as the driver smelled, an alcoholic beverage was emanating from his breath as he was being put on a backboard and being transported into the ambulance,”* led him to the conclusion that the driver had been drinking. (Ex. H, pg. 4) Officer Paradis states that the driver was communicating to everyone by just swearing and other things.

Officer Paradis states that once at the hospital, he witnessed the blood being drawn. He explains that *“From there, I record the time that it was drawn. The nurse, the phlebotomist, whoever that did the blood draw. I gathered that information. At that time, that was, again, the driver, the driver's family was there. And then it was just trying to figure out what else was happening. But at that point I'd already witnessed it. I had what I had or what I needed to have. So I left him after that.”* (Ex. H, pg. 5)

Officer Paradis explains that as the evening progressed and the investigation into what had happened progressed, his responsibility was to back up his fellow officer in dealing with crowd control of family members and friends who had shown up at the hospital. Officer Paradis states *“So I had to do that. And then I met with the mother of the deceased in another room because both her sons were there at the time. And that was it. Anything like this, any serious incident, detectives are going to show up. They showed up at some time. I met with them and that was the end of me being in this incident.”* (Ex. H, pg. 5)

Officer Paradis states that in the following days, he did not take any investigative steps, and his only responsibility was to complete his report on the incident. Officer Paradis indicates, for the record, that everything discussed today was from his memory, as he did not have access to review any files prior to the interview, as he is no longer employed by the Groton Police Department.

Officer Paradis was briefed on the complaint from Chris Wilson and asked if he had ever received any information from anybody specifically related to where kids had been drinking and where they got their alcohol from. Officer Paradis stated, *“No”*. (Ex. H, pg. 6)

### **Detective Kyle LoPriore**

On Tuesday, September 23, 2025, Attorney Eric P. Daigle and Investigator Tim Webster interviewed Detective LoPriore in the conference room at the Groton Police Department regarding allegations made by Chris Wilson regarding the investigation and actions specific to the fatal car accident on October 14, 2024. Detective LoPriore was represented by Laurie Socha, Union Representative. The interview was recorded and transcribed. The relevant portions of the interview

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

are summarized below. (Ex. I , Detective Kyle LoPriore Interview Audio; Ex. J, Detective Kyle LoPriore Interview Transcript)

Detective LoPriore has been employed with the Groton Police Department for the last eighteen (18) years. He has held the position of Detective for the past three (3) years, has served as a Task Force Officer for four (4) years, and is currently in the middle of the Arson Investigation School.

Detective LoPriore was on call the night of October 14, 2024, and was called in for the fatal accident that occurred around 0120 hours. Detective LoPriore explains that *“My role that evening or that night was, or actually, I guess, morning, was to assist with the processing it all. There was not much. We didn't do a whole a lot when I first got there because they were still forming the Accident Recon Team.”* Detective LoPriore states that *“So I actually went and I interviewed a witness with another patrol officer, and then I think that's all I did that night. Then I waited until the next morning and we came back here and did supplemental interviews and all that.”* (Ex. J, pg. 2)

Detective LoPriore states that he interviewed the witness who was first on the scene and heard the accident to *“establish the approximate time of the crash, the location of the crash, when they heard it past their house, and what he saw at the scene at the time”*. Detective LoPriore indicates that he was not involved in processing or securing any of the evidence from the scene that night and that he *“left the rest up to the Accident Recon Team”*, stating that during a fatal accident evidence collection is the Recon Team's responsibility. (Ex. J, pg. 4)

Detective LoPriore states that the following days, the team conducted a lot of supplemental reports. He explains that *“So usually what we would do is we'd each get assigned a different task, like different follow-ups, either trying to figure out the past 24 hours with, I think, Chapman did that. We would also do any kind of additional witness statements. We would try to find people who were at the scene. I know there's a group of people at the scene. We secured the vehicle here. I think I may have had a part of that. I think Heather and I did that, secured the vehicle in the lot, in the impound lot.”* (Ex. J, pg. 4-5)

Detective LoPriore explains that once they got the download from [REDACTED] Phone, they followed up the information they got from the phone. Detective LoPriore was asked during the investigation if there were any other phones seized. Detective LoPriore states, *“So there were two phones that were seized out of the rear of the vehicle. One on the passenger side, one on the driver's side.”* (Ex. J, pg. 5) Detective LoPriore explains that one phone was *“Quilter's and I'm Not sure who the other one was.”* Detective LoPriore goes on to state that he is not sure if those phones were dumped since there is a phone guy within their investigation teams who handles that. (Ex. J, pg. 5)

Detective LoPriore states that during the investigation, he was involved in the follow-ups mostly. He explains *“So we tried to locate the addresses and talk to the families or the kids who threw the parties or something like that, trying to determine if they were there or if they weren't or where the alcohol came from, who had it. So that was initially what we did. We went to East Lyme, Uncasville, and I think we went in town over here on Allyn Street.”* (Ex. J, pg. 6)

GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014

Detective LoPriore explains that the most useful information was found within [REDACTED] Phone and his Life360 account, which “corroborated the information” provided by Chris Wilson. Detective LoPriore states they did not receive any information from [REDACTED] phone and used information found within [REDACTED] phone, which included “a group message” involving individuals from that night. Detective LoPriore states that he “*doesn't recall*” if [REDACTED] phone was ever seized or processed based on his knowledge during the investigation. (Ex. J, pg. 6-7)

Detective LoPriore is shown a timeline that was provided by Chris Wilson that he received from Ezra Stebbins. Detective LoPriore explains that he went to the locations identified on this timeline, stating “*Yeah, we went to 23 Desjardins, Uncasville, Webster Street in East Lyme, Webster Road, and then Pequot. Yep.*” (Ex. J, pg. 8) When asked if his actions were in direct response to tracking down these locations that were provided, Detective LoPriore states “*Yes*” and that supplemental reports were completed by either him or Officer Chapman. (Ex. J, pg. 8)

Detective LoPriore goes on to explain that they first went to the Dollhouse which is in the back of Alex Quilter’s Grandparents house. Detective LoPriore states that they talked to “*the grandparents there, the owners of the actual residence.*” Detective LoPriore states that the grandma indicated that the kids were there and “*Yeah, that's where Alex Quilter was staying. He would stay in the Dollhouse as his own little apartment and he would have friends over. They didn't mention anything about drinking. They said they didn't see any kind of drinking or anything there. But that's what they said. And I don't remember what time they said they left. I'm reading it now, but I couldn't recall exactly what time they said they left there.*” (Ex. J, pg. 8-9) When asked if they obtain any information at the Dollhouse location related to the allegation by Mr. Wilson around where they obtained alcohol or if they drank there, Detective LoPriore states “*No*” (Ex. J, pg. 9).

Detective LoPriore states that after visiting the Dollhouse, they went to Uncasville next, explaining “*So that was a party that they allegedly had gone to, but we talked to the parents eventually. I don't think we had any contact that day we actually went out there. But I think we talked to the parents eventually and they said that they had a few girls that were having a party there and the girls allegedly had some other friends come over from a different town or whatever. But they said that the girls were the only ones at the house. They didn't remember seeing the kids or we knew that they often drove, obviously the vehicle that the crash was in, and they had a blue, what was it, Yukon or something, that they also drove and the parents didn't remember seeing any of those vehicles or those kids.*” (Ex. J, pg. 10) Detective LoPriore explains that during the interview they asked about information regarding whether they had drunk there or whether they had received any alcohol at the residence, in which “*the parents said they didn't have any alcohol there.*” (Ex. J, pg. 10).

Detective LoPriore explains that after visiting Uncasville, “*I think we went to East Lyme. Yeah, because Mystic we went down last and we didn't have any contact there at all. We went to East Lyme. They called me back later also, they weren't at the actual residence either. East Lyme was a bigger party. Sorry, the ones in Uncasville, the parents were still at the house. The ones in East Lyme, the parents had gone to one of the casinos and the girl was supposed to have a couple*

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

*friends over, and they ended up having everybody over. And they knew that there was drinking there. The parents left the casino, came back, East Lyme PD was there. They broke it up, pretty much, told everyone to get out of there.”* (Ex. J, pg. 10) Detective LoPriore explains that *“I don't recall if they actually saw the boys there that were involved in the crash. I know that they said that people scattered, ran into the woods, so they found beer bottles, and everything are in the wood line and all that kind of stuff.”* (Ex. J, pg. 10)

Detective LoPriore states the last place they went the place in Mystic where they were alleged that a girl threw a party at a house that she was renting but did not have contact with them. When asked if going to these residence and talking to the people, provided any information around where they were drinking or whether they were drinking at those residents and who provided the alcohol, Detective LoPriore states *“No, we really couldn't get anything after that.”* (Ex. J, pg. 10)

Detective LoPriore explains they attempted to talk to the occupants of the vehicle stating *“They all had lawyers, so we didn't actually end up... Well, I didn't personally interview the occupants.”* (Ex. J, pg. 10) He states that Officer Chapman ran lead on that. When asked in a normal situation, if an individual said they didn't want to talk to you and they had a lawyer, would you reach out to the lawyer to try to set a conversation up, Detective LoPriore responded *“Usually, yes”* and that his not aware if that happened here. (Ex. J, pg. 11)

Detective LoPriore states that another task he assisted in was trying to *“determine who provided alcohol, where they got the alcohol from, we did get information that they frequently went to a couple places in town.”* (Ex. J, pg. 11) Detective LoPriore explains that *“Spencer and Lynn. Yep. And then another one was Oak Tree. So we saw in the group chat that Ezra, the brother of one of them, was some kind of talk about, “Oh, getting this, getting that from the liquor store.” So we thought that if Ezra, he may have been the one that provided the alcohol to him. So I got a picture of him and I actually went out to liquor stores and was like, “Hey, listen, do you recognize this person? Has he been in here recently? Has he bought any kind of alcohol recently?” And then I checked with their video surveillance to see if they actually had any surveillance of the prior, whatever it was, month or so since the crash, and none of the places said that they recognized him or remembered selling alcohol to him. And of course their video surveillance cameras didn't work, so this always happens.”* (Ex. J, pg. 11) Detective LoPriore explains that at both locations, he was unable to identify the individual who purchased alcohol.

Detective LoPriore explains that other steps he took in the investigation included reviewing the Chat Log with Detective Savino from [REDACTED] phone, writing a couple more supplemental reports, and attempting to interview [REDACTED] who was with the group of kids earlier in the night, but the mom said he was not going to talk to them. Detective LoPriore also indicates that Ezra wouldn't speak to them, either, stating that he had a lawyer, but the lawyer's name was not provided for follow-up. (Ex. J, pg. 13-14).

Detective LoPriore concluded his interview by stating, *“I think based on what we had to work with at the time, we did everything we could to try to determine where the alcohol came from. Even going out and going to those liquor stores. I mean, I think we did everything we could based on*

*what we had.*” (Ex. J, pg. 14)

**Officer Mitchell Chapman**

On Tuesday, September 23, 2025, Attorney Eric P. Daigle and Investigator Tim Webster interviewed Officer Mitchell Chapman in the conference room at Groton Police Department relative to allegations made by Chris Wilson about the investigation and actions specific to the fatal car accident on October 14, 2024. Officer Chapman was represented by Laurie Socha, Union Representative. The interview was recorded and transcribed. The relevant portions of the interview are summarized below. (Ex. K, Officer Mitchell Chapman Interview Audio; Ex. L, Office Mitchell Chapman Interview Transcript)

Officer Chapman was hired by the Groton Police Department in December 2018 and attended the academy, graduating from POST-C Session 364. He started patrol in June of 2019, completing a few months of field training, and then worked mostly evening shift patrol for approximately three (3) to four (4) years. Since then, he has been alternating between the day and midnight shifts. Officer Chapman holds certifications as a field training officer and as a certified POST-C Instructor. He has also completed three (3) base classes totaling six (6) weeks of training for crash reconstruction through SRR Training Corporation and IPTM. He is assigned as an accident reconstructionist for the Groton Investigative Team. His duties entail supporting any serious injury or fatal motor vehicle accident that occurs here in town, as well as through their mutual aid partners, as they have a regional team that combines multiple agencies, including Groton, Ledyard, Stonington, and Groton City.

Officer Chapman was off duty on October 14, 2024 and was called in for the fatal accident that occurred around 0120 hours. Officer Chapman explains, *“So, essentially I got called in, I'm assuming, I don't know exact timeline, shortly after the accident came in and once they determined that there was serious injuries, possible fatality. So, I responded from home, and then once I came to the police department here, loaded up a car with our equipment and stuff like that and then headed to the scene. Once at the scene, I spoke with other members of the team as well as the supervisors and what not to try to figure out what happened. From there, we started documenting the scene using department prism pools, the laser units and stuff like that to take measurements of the scene and additionally taking photographs and whatnot as well.”* (Ex. L, pg. 4)

Officer Chapman explains that when he arrived on the scene, there were no victims, no victim families, no witnesses, and they spent a couple of hours conducting the scene investigation and documentation. Officer Chapman states that he was assigned as the case officer because at the time, he was the only officer who was assigned as a crash reconstructionist. (Ex. L, pg. 4) Officer Chapman goes on to state that the overall investigation was under his name, and he supported aspects of the field work during the investigation in addition to his reconstruction role. (Ex. L, pg. 5)

Officer Chapman states that after processing the scene, he took the following steps *“So the vehicle was secured as evidence. It was towed back to the department here and put in impound. From that*

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

*point, there was a critical stress debrief at that point. We did the JDCR-18 and stuff like that for the vehicle. Unfortunately, it was bad timing for me because I went on vacation that day and I was gone for a few days after that point. Then when I got back is really when the investigation ramped up.”* (Ex. L, pg.5) Officer Chapman explains that his primary duty once back from vacation was to obtain information regarding the vehicle and complete the necessary search warrants for medical records, blood, etc. (Ex. L, pg.6)

Officer Chapman was asked if during his investigation if they ever interview [REDACTED] the operator of the vehicle, Officer Chapman stated *“I did not interview him. I had been speaking with his father and they had retained an attorney”* (Ex. L, pg. 7) Officer Chapman goes on to explain that he did speak with Chris Wilson multiple times, at least once in person and through email conversations. Officer Chapman states that he maintained pretty good contact with Mr. Wilson, who provided them with information about who the kids were and where the accident occurred. He also assisted Mr. Wilson *“coordinate the funeral services and making sure that police officers were present for the service.”* As the investigation progressed, Officer Chapman states that Mr. Wilson *“would also give us some information that was honestly completely irrelevant to the case, actually, to the point of taking screenshots of a news cover photo and just sending it to us of the car being towed”* (Ex. L, pg. 8)

Officer Chapman states in addition to Mr. Wilson, he spoke to Alexander Quilter’s parents a couple of times, *“Both his mom and his dad as well as his grandparents who he stays with down in Groton Long Point.”* (Ex. L, pg. 7) Officer Chapman states that he did not get to speak to Alexander directly despite multiple attempts, explaining that *“they were pretty uncooperative. There was a lot of phone tag back and forth. At one point, they stopped answering, I believe. Essentially, at one point, they told me he had no memory of the thing and it wouldn't be beneficial. We had tried to speak with him directly. However, he lives in Massachusetts and ultimately we weren't able to get them to bring him down here and for us to go up there just because he lives so far away. At this time also, I was assigned to patrol. I'm not assigned on a special assignment or anything like that. There was a few days and stuff like that that I was assigned, but my primary duty is patrol.”* (Ex. L, pg.8)

Officer Chapman took multiple steps to develop the arrest warrant for [REDACTED] the driver of the fatal accident. Officer Chapman explains that they obtained information that the driver had been drinking through beer cans being inside the vehicle and an odor coming from [REDACTED] that was reported by one of the EMT’s on the scene. Therefore, Officer Chapman obtained a search warrant for both the blood and medical records of [REDACTED] which showed he had an elevated blood alcohol content. Officer Chapman could not remember if there was an indication of drugs in his system. (Ex. L, pg. 8-9)

Officer Chapman explains that he did a search warrant for medical records for all occupants of the vehicle. When asked his recollection as to what was found for the remaining occupants, Officer Chapman states, *“I can't remember about Alex Quilter, but I believe [REDACTED] had elevated BAC as well. I don't recall exactly what it was. I want to say [REDACTED] who was the deceased, did not have an elevated BAC, but I'm not 100%.”* (Ex. L, pg. 9) Officer Chapman goes on to explain that he

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

can't really remember all the information recovered from each occupant's medical records as multiple records were pulled from each because they were all transferred from L&M Hospital to Yale New Haven Hospital within a couple of hours. Officer Chapman explains that he only quickly reviewed the investigation file on the morning of September 23, 2025, around 9:00 am, since he had been off for the past few days. (Ex. L, pg.10 )

Officer Chapman states that at some point, the arrest warrant for [REDACTED] was signed, explaining that *"throughout the investigation, we coordinated with the assistant state's attorney regarding this matter as well as the assistant state's attorney over at juvenile court because the offender was 17 at the time. So, there was a bit to work through as far as juvenile charges versus adult because you had the motor vehicle stuff as well as the criminal statutes as well. So, we coordinated with them as far as what charges were going to be applied and then submitted two separate arrest warrants, one to juvenile court and then one to adult court."* (Ex. L, pg. 10)

Officer Chapman was then asked about the steps he took throughout the course of the investigation related to the identification of where the four had been, where they had been drinking, and where they got their alcohol from. Officer Chapman explains that while he was handling the search warrants, most of the detectives were assigned to interviews with people identified as being with the individuals. He states, *"I did a couple myself as well, but ultimately, we did interviews of people who they were supposed to be with that night to try to figure out where they had been or who they had talked to, if they got alcohol from anyone, stuff to that effect. Then ultimately, we also had cell phone data from [REDACTED] cell phone data that Chris ultimately provided us with. I think that information came up with geog location and stuff like that. So, ultimately we followed up with the residences or locations where he had been through."* (Ex. L, pg. 10)

Officer Chapman explains who they spoke with regarding the locations on the timeline provided by Mr. Wilson. Officer Chapman explains that they spoke with the Grandparents of Alexander Quilter, who own the property where the Dollhouse is located. He explains that the grandparents "didn't know anything about what was occurring". Officer Chapman states that while talking to the grandparents, they never went into the actual Dollhouse and were not aware if there was alcohol in there or anything left over from that night. (Ex. L, pg. 10-11) Officer Chapman goes on to state that they talked to the parents of 25 Desjardins Drive in Uncasville, who indicated that the kids *"were only there for a very short period of time, only a few minutes"* (Ex. L, pg. 12). Officer Chapman explains that after going to Uncasville, they went to 5 Webster Road in East Lyme and he states the Detective LoPriore made contact with and is not aware what they said to him. (Ex. L, pg. 13). Officer Chapman states that they reached out to the Stonington Police Department for the records of the interactions they had with the kids in Downtown Mystic that night, explaining *"forget exactly what it says now, but essentially, there wasn't any concerns in that. They were contacting parents, I believe, or something to that effect."* (Ex. L, pg. 13) The last address on the timeline was 71 Pequot Avenue, which Officer Chapman explains they attempted to make contact with them, but were not able to reach them. (Ex. L, pg. 13)

Officer Chapman explains that Detective LoPriore was assigned to canvass some of the liquor stores, and to my knowledge, that ended up in no investigative leads. (Ex. L, pg. 13) Officer

GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014

Chapman states that how the department worked through the investigations, stating *“Ultimately, it's a communication effort that has to be made between everyone. We have to share information and compile all the data and follow up with any leads that come our way. I can say that any lead that came my way, I assured that was fully vetted and followed up on to the best extent.”* (Ex. L, pg. 13). He goes on to state that any information provided by Mr. Wilson was followed up on and reports were created in relation to what was done. (Ex. L, pg. 14)

Officer Chapman goes on to explain additional steps that were taken to identify where the alcohol was obtained or who provided it. He states, *“So, ultimately after the conclusion of the case, we did combine a full case binder and sent it over to the court over New London GA 10 for their review and records as well, just as the case proceeded. Ultimately, through other cases that I've worked on, if they require any additional follow-up or any additional criminal action, they would notify us as they see fit. So, that's one step that was taken. We did do a deep dive into... [REDACTED] cell phone. So we did a deep dive into his cell phone, obviously with the consent of Chris. That didn't reveal any information that could help us establish who was providing these kids alcohol. I can honestly say if there was any information that I came across that I could use to further this investigation or to figure out exactly where this alcohol was coming from, I 100% would have followed up on it. I did follow up on any lead that came to me, and I would love nothing more than to be able to figure out where this alcohol was coming from and to be able to provide the best closure for Chris and his family. But unfortunately, just with the case facts, we just couldn't establish it. We have to have that burden of proof and we just weren't there.”* (Ex. L, pg.14-15)

Officer Chapman states that despite there being a picture of alcohol within [REDACTED] phone, there wasn't anything directly related to providing or obtaining alcohol around the time of the accident. He goes on to state, *“Well, ultimately, I believe when Detective LoPriore did the canvas of the liquor stores and stuff like that, I don't know if he showed photos or something like that, but all of the liquor was name brand. It appeared to be like name brand or Miller Lite or Twisted Tea or whatnot. It wasn't like a specific type of alcohol. I shouldn't say specific, but it's a generic brand and whatnot. So, ultimately, I should say there was one photograph that appeared to have been taken that night where there was a beer can in a couple of their hands down at the Dollhouse. I do remember that, but again, it was like a generic brand.”* (Ex. L, pg. 15). Officer Chapman also explains that, post-arrest of the driver, no additional information was given as to where the alcohol was obtained or who provided it, despite numerous press releases and posts on their Facebook page requesting additional information. (Ex. L, pg. 15-16)

Officer Chapman confirms that he did not speak to any occupants of the vehicle, reinforcing that [REDACTED] attorneys did not allow him to speak to them. Alexander was not interviewed because he was not available, and Officer Chapman did not speak to [REDACTED] during the investigation. (Ex. L, pg. 15-16). Officer Chapman states that along the way, they did identify other people that they were associated with earlier in the evening and attempted to interview everyone identified. He explains that *“A lot of those kids, upon speaking with their parents, immediately lawyered up and wouldn't speak with us. There was a couple interviews that were conducted. I personally didn't interview them. Again, those were assigned to detectives at the time because I had my hands full with all the search warrants and whatnot. So, those were divvied out to the detectives.”* (Ex. L,

pg. 16) Officer Chapman further states that he made multiple attempts at talking to Ezra Stebbins, who provided the timeline to Mr. Wilson, explaining that he was uncooperative despite different attempts to reach him. (Ex. L, pg. 11-12) Officer Chapman explains that if the name of an attorney were provided, it would be documented in his report, and he would follow up with the attorney to try to continue a conversation. (Ex. L, pg. 16)

Officer Chapman was then asked if a search warrant for the driver's phone was ever conducted or if he obtained the driver's phone during the investigation, Officer Chapman stated "No" (Ex. L, pg. 11) When asked if the phone would provide important information regarding the moments leading up to the accident such as speed, location, texting, or distracted driving, Officer Chapman explains that speed was recovered off of the EDR and "Again, that wasn't a call on my part. He was gone by the time I got there. There was, I think, at least one cell phone that was visible inside of the car. I don't know if we thought that was the driver's at that point or exactly what transpired of that." (Ex. L, pg. 18). Officer Chapman explains that the only two phones they believed they had were [REDACTED] and Alexander's phones, in which he states that "We touched base with the assistant state attorneys on that, and ultimately, the family wasn't willing to provide consent, I believe. The state attorney, upon speaking with them, we decided that there wasn't enough for a search warrant on that phone." (Ex. L, pg. 18)

Officer Chapman concludes the interview by stating, "No, I mean, I think we dotted all the I's and crossed all T's on this case. I think we did everything that we could. I think we ran a fully competent and a very full investigation as far as what happened and how we could try to figure out how all this happened and how everything led to what it did. We conducted so many different interviews on this case. There was a lot of technical stuff being the EDRs and the cell phone and all that data and stuff like that. I don't think there's anything that we didn't necessarily touch on." (Ex. L, pg. 18)

### **Sergeant Heather Beauchamp**

On Wednesday, November 19, 2025, Attorney Eric P. Daigle and Investigator Tim Webster interviewed Sergeant Heather Beauchamp in the conference room at the Groton Police Department regarding allegations made by Chris Wilson regarding the investigation and actions specific to the fatal car accident on October 14, 2024. The relevant portions of the interview are summarized below. (Ex. M, Sergeant Heather Beauchamp Interview Audio; Ex. N, Sergeant Heather Beauchamp Interview Transcript)

Sergeant Beauchamp has been employed by the Groton Police Department for approximately twenty-five (25) years. She began her career in patrol in 2001, was promoted to detective in 2007, and to Sergeant in 2018. Since that time, she has been assigned to the Detective Division.

Sergeant Beauchamp was off duty on October 14, 2024, when she was called in for a fatal motor vehicle accident that occurred at approximately 0120 hours. She responded to the scene and explained that, upon her arrival, "the patients had been transported. The vehicle was obviously in the position it was in when it crashed. We had called utilities due to the safety of trees falling onto

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

*the vehicle. That was taken care of. And then I called for a wrecker to tow the car to the police department and just controlled the scene from there. I called in more detectives to respond to the hospital to deal with what had to be dealt with at the hospital and the patients and getting- evidence collection, positive identifications, trying to figure out where everybody was seated. And then I had other detectives at the scene with me, one of which went down and spoke to a witness. And then after that, we all came back here and continued with the investigation.” (Ex. N, pg. 4)*

Sergeant Beauchamp stated that, as the supervisor on scene and as a Sergeant assigned to the Detective Unit, she was responsible for the investigation. She indicated that part of her responsibilities included signing off on the majority of the incident reports generated on the night of the accident. She explained that this process was consistent with normal procedures, stating, “*Yes. So we have the accident reconstruction unit. So they'll finish... The patrol guys will do their first response reports as you see in here, which was Officer Paradis and Officer Berkman. They'll finish that. They'll usually finish the PR one, which is the first accident report, and then the investigation will be turned over to the detective division and whoever gets assigned from accident reconstruction.” (Ex. N, pg. 4)*

Sergeant Beauchamp explained that Officer Mitchell Chapman, from the Accident Reconstruction Division, was assigned as the lead investigator and worked under her supervision. She described her role in managing major investigations and explained her standard practice for organizing investigative tasks. Specifically, she stated: “*So what I do, this is my practice. When we have a major case such as this one, I will get a board and I write everything out that has to be done. Search warrant for car, search warrant for blood, search warrant for this, search warrant for that. Interview, interview, this is who I have to interview. And I'll go through and I'll just put badge numbers near it, which at that point was Mitchell, Chapman and the detectives. So I go through and I assign it, and then after they complete it, I check it off.” (Ex. N, pg. 5)*

Sergeant Beauchamp further summarized the steps taken by herself, her detectives, and Officer Chapman during the investigation, describing the process as “*very extensive.*” She explained that interviews and search warrants were conducted simultaneously, including multiple search warrants for medical records, the vehicle’s event data recorder (EDR), and the vehicle itself, along with continued interviews and the receipt of medical records. She indicated that these investigative steps ultimately led to the application for an arrest warrant for [REDACTED] (Ex. N, pg. 6)

Attorney Daigle then reviewed the initial investigative steps with Sergeant Beauchamp. During that discussion, Sergeant Beauchamp confirmed that no one from the Groton Police Department attended the autopsy, but that the autopsy results and medical records were obtained. She also confirmed that her detective team had completed additional investigative tasks, including obtaining a weather report, receiving photographs from Robert Strohl, and conducting a search of traffic camera footage at the relevant intersection for the vehicle. These steps were completed during the early stages of the investigation.

Sergeant Beauchamp was then asked, based on her experience and oversight of the investigation, for her interpretation of whether the investigation was complete and thorough, given Mr. Wilson's

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

allegations that the Groton Police Department's investigation was not. Sergeant Beauchamp stated, *"I feel this investigation, as far as what we need as investigators for the criminal charges in this case, is completely thorough."* (Ex. N, pg. 7)

Sergeant Beauchamp was then asked what investigative steps were taken to determine where alcohol was obtained and where it was consumed prior to the accident, a major focus within Mr. Wilson's complaint. She explained that one juvenile was interviewed, and they *"gave the timeline of the night and who was with them. We tried to reach out to each, to the juveniles. There were, I think one spoke to us and then everybody else and their parents retained attorneys and did not really want to speak about it. So based on the information that we received from that individual, we were pretty much able to corroborate that with the [REDACTED] phone."* (Ex. N, pg. 8)

Attorney Daigle then showed Sergeant Beauchamp an image provided by Mr. Wilson that identified addresses he believed reflected locations visited on the night leading up to the accident. Sergeant Beauchamp stated that she did not recognize the image itself but indicated that the addresses appeared familiar and were consistent with locations identified through Life360 data obtained from [REDACTED] phone. She explained that after *"Mr. Wilson turned [REDACTED] phone over with consent to have the phone digitally, forensically analyzed, you can follow on here, I don't know if you want me to go through the whole thing, but it shows their timeline based on Life360 as an app, a location app that shows everywhere the phone goes and the speed of the phone and the times and everything like that. I have it on my phone too. So it basically logged their events on his phone. So it does start... We started at about 8:05 and it ends basically at the time of the accident."* (Ex. N, pg. 9)

Sergeant Beauchamp further explained that Life360 provided speed data related to the vehicle; however, investigators also confirmed speed information through a search warrant for the vehicle's event data recorder (EDR). She stated that the EDR data showed that *"it goes from 4.8 seconds prior to the impact to zero seconds prior to the impact. And it goes from 75.8 miles an hour to a final 63.4 miles per hour upon impact"* (Ex. N, pg. 10).

Sergeant Beauchamp stated that members of her investigative team went to each location identified in the Life360 report and attempted to conduct interviews. She indicated that, on November 21, 2024, Detective LoPriore and Officer Chapman spoke with Sean McDugan regarding the address of 23 Desjardins. During that interview, *"He basically said that he and his wife, Angela, lived there with his daughter and she had three or four friends over that night. He did learn that this group of kids involved in the accident were there for a couple minutes, but left. He said there was no party at his house and there was no alcohol at his house."* (Ex. N, pg. 10)

Sergeant Beauchamp further stated that, regarding the address of five Webster Road in East Lyme, Detective LoPriore spoke with Christian and Erin Stanley on December 16, 2024. During that interview, *"She explained that she and her husband, Christian, went to spend the night at Mohegan Sun to celebrate her birthday. The daughter said she was staying at a friend's house with a small group of girls. They went to the casino. He received a call that there was a party at his house. He and his wife immediately left the casino and returned home. East Lyme Police Department was*

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

*there dispersing kids. And they both said they did not observe anybody drinking alcohol, but did find alcohol bottles in the woods behind their house. They spoke to their daughter who admitted to planning the party, but that a number of kids arrived who were not invited. They said they were adamant they did not know about the party and did not condone any underage drinking.” (Ex. N, pg. 11)*

After leaving East Lyme, location data indicated that the individuals traveled to locations within Mystic, where they had contact with the Stonington Police Department. While reviewing the Mystic locations, Sergeant Beauchamp highlighted speed data obtained through the Life360 application, noting that it was highly relevant to the investigation.

Sergeant Beauchamp explained that the Life360 data reflected a timeline beginning at approximately 8:05 p.m. She stated that, prior to reaching Mystic from Groton Long Point, the data showed a top speed of 97 miles per hour, noting that this route would have involved back roads rather than highways. (Ex. N, pg. 11–12)

She further explained that, after time spent at Mystic Park, the data showed that “*at 9:46 PM, they completed a 19-mile drive, which is going to Uncasville, and it's actually reading dangerous speed, 112 miles an hour and 113 miles an hour. And then when they leave Uncasville, it looks like about 10:25, 10:22, 10:23, 10:24. They're also showing a dangerous speed of 116, 115, then they're in East Lyme. Upon leaving there, it shows another dangerous speed, 111, 109, 114, 113. Then they arrive in Mystic.*” She indicated that, during this portion of the trip, she assumed the vehicle was being operated on highways. (Ex. N, pg. 12)

Sergeant Beauchamp concluded that the Life360 data showed the vehicle traveling through “*downtown Mystic on the Stonington side. And then they do show the 71 Pequot Avenue then back in Groton Long Point. And then prior to the accident on what I would assume right before the accident, the last speed that Life360 is getting is 79 miles an hour. And that then you have the EDR dump.*” (Ex. N, pg. 13)

Following her review of the Life360 vehicle speed data from throughout the night, Sergeant Beauchamp continued to describe the interviews conducted and investigative actions taken by her and her team to determine where alcohol may have been obtained and where it may have been consumed during that evening. Sergeant Beauchamp confirms that they made “*contact with the Quilter family at the Groton Long Point address. There was an interview conducted with the grandmother, I believe. We did try to make contact at the 71 Prospect Street and never had contact there. And then the only... We do have the interview with a juvenile who was with them and told us about the night. And he did mention in his interview that there was some drinking at the East Lyme party, he thought twisted tea and that did not match the alcohol that we found in the car when we did the search warrant. And he also said that he did not see [REDACTED] drinking at the party.*” (Ex. N, pg. 14)

Sergeant Beauchamp further explained that her team investigated potential alcohol purchases at

GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014

package stores. She explains that “so we were told that [REDACTED] older brother possibly was getting alcohol for them. We attempted to interview him. He had retained an attorney. We went to some package stores and the package store said they did not recognize him and nobody could tell us that he had... The package stores we went to could not tell us that he purchased alcohol there. I believe we went to Spencer and Lynn on West Main Street in Mystic, showed them a photograph of Ethan Shiman. They said that both managers and cashier did not recognize him, said he never attempted to purchase alcohol from their establishment. Went to OakTree Liquors and again did the same thing. And they both said they did not recognize him and he has never attempted to purchase alcohol there. We did inquire about their recording systems and how long the drive retains, but we were told that it doesn't work and need to be replaced.” (Ex. N, pg. 14)

Sergeant Beauchamp was asked what steps she and her team typically take when an individual states that they do not wish to speak and have retained an attorney. She explained that, in those situations, investigators attempt to follow up by identifying the attorney and inquiring whether the individual may be willing to speak after consulting with counsel. She confirmed that this follow-up process was undertaken in this case. (Ex. N, pg. 15)

Sergeant Beauchamp stated that she could not recall whether this occurred with every individual who declined to speak, but recalled one specific instance involving a parent. She explained that a significant amount was occurring simultaneously during the investigation, including juveniles becoming upset and parents reacting emotionally. She noted that investigators encountered a wide range of responses and emphasized that the situation was clearly tragic, particularly given that the individuals involved were juveniles and that some parents were adamant that investigators not speak with their children. (Ex. N, pg. 16)

Sergeant Beauchamp further explained that the State’s Attorney’s Office was heavily involved in the investigation due to the number of search warrants required, which she stated totaled approximately eleven to twelve, as well as the high-profile nature of the case within the community. She confirmed that the State’s Attorney’s Office did not make any specific requests for additional alcohol-related investigative steps to be completed.

Sergeant Beauchamp stated that, if the State’s Attorney’s Office had concerns or required additional information, they would have contacted her directly. She explained, “We have a great relationship with the State’s Attorney’s Office, and if they feel like there’s more we can do, of course, we’re going to do it,” noting that they would “certainly reach out” if further action were needed. (Ex. N, pg. 16–17)

Sergeant Beauchamp was then asked how she believed the case progressed and what factors may have caused delays that could have been interpreted by Mr. Wilson as a lack of urgency within his complaint. She stated that she did not believe there was a lack of urgency in the investigation and recalled speaking with Mr. Wilson and the Chief regarding his concerns about why [REDACTED] had not yet been arrested. She explained that investigators attempted to explain the investigative process to Mr. Wilson.

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

Sergeant Beauchamp explained that delays occurred due to necessary investigative and legal processes. She stated that the juveniles involved remained hospitalized for a significant period of time, requiring investigators to wait for comprehensive medical records to assess injuries and determine appropriate charges. She further explained that investigators were required to wait for blood alcohol content results, which involved obtaining search warrants for hospital blood samples, submitting the samples to a laboratory, and completing the necessary conversions. She emphasized that these processes, including obtaining multiple search warrants and complying with legal requirements, take time but are necessary to conduct the investigation properly and achieve a sound outcome. (Ex. N, pg. 17)

Sergeant Beauchamp further explained that Mr. Wilson understood this at a high-level, stating “*to a point, but it’s not his job to understand that either. That’s our job, to do our job*” (Ex. N, pg. 18). She explains that, overall, the investigation progressed in a systematic manner, with search warrants being signed as early as October 23, 2024, which was nine days after the accident. She further stated that the arrest warrant was signed on January 8 and served on January 9, approximately three months after the incident. When asked whether that timeline was normal based on a case of this size and her twenty-five years of experience, Sergeant Beauchamp responded, “*Yes. And you can see by the search warrants and everything else being done, and I feel it was pretty quick.*” (Ex. N, pg. 19)

When asked whether she believed her team and the Groton Police Department did everything they could in response to Mr. Wilson’s allegations regarding the investigation into underage drinking, the legal acquisition of alcohol, and house parties, Sergeant Beauchamp responded affirmatively. She explained that, “*It’s also when you take in... I tried to explain this to Chris too. It’s the same as if you have a narcotics case. Prosecution-wise, not talking civil. Prosecution-wise, if we were to arrest anybody for providing the alcohol to the driver, we would have to prove a pretty good... Probable cause is our level. So we would have to prove that that alcohol is the alcohol that intoxicated him to the point where he caused that accident. So you would have to really prove he got that alcohol from wherever is the alcohol that caused that level of intoxication.*” (Ex. N, pg. 20)

Sergeant Beauchamp further explained that meeting this standard is very difficult, particularly when individuals are present at multiple locations throughout the night. She stated that investigators cannot determine whether the alcohol consumed came from one location, another location, or was obtained at a different time altogether, explaining that it could have been alcohol obtained days or weeks earlier or from any number of sources. (Ex. N, pg. 20) She concluded by stating that, in her experience, she has never been able to meet that evidentiary standard to directly connect the source of alcohol to the cause of an accident in prior cases.

In response to questions raised by Investigator Webster regarding whether the department had to be pushed to investigate the source of alcohol, Sergeant Beauchamp clarified that fatal motor vehicle accidents involving juveniles are uncommon. She explained that, while intoxicated driving cases are frequent, it is not typical in non-fatal cases to investigate where alcohol was obtained. However, in fatal cases involving juveniles, she confirmed that investigators routinely examine

the individual's recent movements and background. (Ex. N, pg. 21)

Sergeant Beauchamp also clarified that investigators encountered limited cooperation, particularly once individuals retained legal counsel, and emphasized that when juveniles are involved, additional legal and practical limitations apply. She noted that once individuals are represented by counsel, investigators' options are constrained, and further attempts to recontact individuals may not yield additional cooperation, particularly given the heightened sensitivity and legal boundaries involved when dealing with juveniles. (Ex. N, pg. 22)

Sergeant Beauchamp concluded her interview by stating that the department maintained regular contact with Mr. Wilson throughout the investigation, with multiple officers communicating with him by phone and email. She further explained that the department accommodated Mr. Wilson's requests for in-person visits to provide updates and information, maintaining an open line of communication throughout the course of the investigation. (Ex. N, pg. 22)

### **Chief Louis Fusaro**

On Wednesday, November 19, 2025, Attorney Eric P. Daigle and Investigator Tim Webster interviewed Chief Louis Fusaro in the conference room at Groton Police Department relative to allegations made by Chris Wilson about the investigation and actions specific to the fatal car accident on October 14, 2024. The relevant portions of the interview are summarized below. (Ex. O, Chief Louis Fusaro Interview Audio; Ex. P, Chief Louis Fusaro Interview Transcript)

Chief Fusaro has served as the Chief of Police for the Groton Police Department for over ten (10) years. Prior to being Chief, he retired as a Connecticut State Trooper.

Chief Fusaro begins the interview by explaining his interactions with Chris Wilson during the investigation. Chief Fusaro explained that Mr. Wilson was invited, along with his attorney, to meet with the department to discuss the case and provide any information he believed would be helpful. Although Mr. Wilson's attorney did not attend, Mr. Wilson met with department leadership and shared information, which the department welcomed. Chief Fusaro stated that members of the Detective Division and the Deputy Chief were present for that discussion and that Mr. Wilson was referred to the Detective Division to ensure that any relevant information could be addressed and that assistance could be provided. Chief Fusaro also stated that he attended a memorial service in Noank related to the incident and was present when Mr. Wilson's wife required medical attention and was transported by ambulance. (Ex. P, pg. 2)

Chief Fusaro explains that he responded to the scene on October 14, 2024, when he was notified of a fatal motor vehicle accident that occurred at approximately 0120 hours. He explained that he responded to the scene in the early morning hours due to the catastrophic nature of the incident, which initially involved reports of multiple juveniles in a single-vehicle crash with a tree and the possibility that some or all occupants were deceased. He stated that, "*it was a catastrophic incident. Clearly something like that that happens in the community I serve in is something that I should be involved in and certainly should have firsthand knowledge of. So I responded to the scene.*" (Ex.

P, pg. 3)

Chief Fusaro goes on to explain that his purpose in responding was both to assist personnel already on scene and to ensure appropriate command presence. He states *“These are traumatic events for them as well to make sure that we're getting the support out there that they need to make sure that there's a command emphasis on having our detectives, who also responded, our crash reconstruction team who responded, but also to make sure that we provide some post-incident assistance to our folks because as much as this is impactful to the people that were directly involved, it has some second and third-order effects for our officers and people that respond as well. So I believe we had chaplains at the scene too, if I recall correctly, and there was also fire and EMS personnel from a variety of agencies. So I sometimes like to lift the burden off the first-line supervisors from having to worry about other fire chiefs and officials that may come to this type of thing. I want them to be able to do their job as a first-line supervisor and deflect some of that, some stuff from them.”* (Ex. P, pg. 3)

Chief Fusaro describes how this incident was treated as an “all-hands-on-deck situation”. He adds that *“Again, we didn't know how many victims we had. I believe that was, we were told four, but I don't know the state of, when I responded, didn't know the state of those individuals, if any or all were still alive or, unfortunately, if any had passed at that point in time.”* (Ex. P, pg. 3)

Chief Fusaro also confirms that upon arrival, he believed that all victims had already been transported from the scene. He stated that he spoke with a fire chief who was present and received a briefing from Groton Police Department personnel, including the on-scene supervisor, to understand the situation and the ongoing response. (Ex. P, pg. 4).

Chief Fusaro was asked whether he was aware that some officers were wearing body-worn cameras that evening, as required, and he confirmed that he was. Attorney Daigle then showed Chief Fusaro a video clip capturing his arrival on scene, recorded by Axon device number X60A82636 at approximately 3:08:26 a.m. on October 14, 2024. Chief Fusaro indicated that he believed the footage was recorded from Sergeant Bolduc's body-worn camera. He further confirmed that he had not reviewed this video clip prior to the interview and could not specifically recall whether he had reviewed Mr. Wilson's complete filed complaint, though he was aware of it.

Chief Fusaro was then asked to respond to the general allegations outlined in Mr. Wilson's complaint, which outlined a lack of urgency, thoroughness, and accountability by the Groton Police Department in its investigation of the fatal motor vehicle accident and the associated inquiries into underage drinking, illegal alcohol acquisition, house parties, and contributing individuals. Chief Fusaro strongly disputed these allegations, stating that he was aware of the final outcome of the investigation, including the arrests, and emphasized that from the outset there was *“strong command influence from me and our command staff to make sure that all necessary investigative steps were taken and go above and beyond”* (Ex. P, pg.5)

Chief Fusaro went on to describe the work performed by detectives and crash reconstruction personnel as an *“exceptional amount of work.”* While he stated that he “take[s] exception” to

allegations suggesting investigative failures, he also expressed empathy for Mr. Wilson, acknowledging the “tragic loss of his child” and recognizing the broader impacts of the incident on his family. (Ex. P, pg. 5-6)

Chief Fusaro goes on to explain that he personally emphasized to his subordinates that “*whatever stops we needed to pull out*” should be used to ensure every investigative effort was made, and stated that, to the best of his knowledge and based on his review, those efforts were carried out. When asked whether he had any information indicating that the investigation lacked urgency, thoroughness, or accountability, Chief Fusaro responded, “*Not at all,*” characterizing the department’s response as a “*full-court press.*” He stated that there was a clear emphasis on investigating the presence and source of alcohol, and that detectives were directed to pursue all lawful avenues to identify individuals who might provide relevant information. Chief Fusaro concluded that the investigation met departmental standards, stating that an arrest was made for the operator of the vehicle for driving under the influence and that, while the incident was a tragedy, he believed officers “*did what they were obligated to do and then some.*” (Ex. P, pg. 6)

Chief Fusaro was next asked to respond to allegations in Mr. Wilson’s complaint regarding body-worn camera footage around specific claims that officers acted unprofessionally at the crash scene and that a comment made by the Chief was made in a sarcastic or demeaning manner. The Chief was given the opportunity to review the video; however, the comment was difficult to interpret because it was not audible in the available footage. It was explained that, to the best understanding, the comment was made by the Chief while reviewing the crash scene and observing the vehicle and the tree, and was something to the effect of, “*Stationary object doesn’t go anywhere.*”

Chief Fusaro responded to this allegation by explaining that after reviewing the body-worn camera footage, he did not hear any laughter and could not identify the specific reference to someone laughing. He acknowledged that a comment was made but explained that, given the passage of time, he did not recall the precise wording or the question that prompted it. He stated that the comment “*wasn’t intended to be dehumanizing, sarcastic, dismissive, or insensitive in any way, shape, or form*”. He goes on to explain that rather it was a “*statement of fact*” made while reviewing a catastrophic crash scene involving a vehicle that struck a large, immovable tree. He explained that the context of the comment related to the severity of the impact and the remarkable efforts by officers, EMTs, and others who physically removed trapped occupants from the vehicle without specialized tools. (Ex. P, pg. 7)

Chief Fusaro further explained that the crash scene was deeply disturbing to him, particularly because juveniles were involved, and emphasized that his focus at the time was concern for whether the occupants would survive their injuries. He stated that he understood Mr. Wilson’s reaction given the loss of his child and reiterated that there was no intent to make light of the incident. He stated that the remark, to the extent it was captured, was a factual observation made in response to the circumstances and was not meant to convey sarcasm or minimize the severity of the situation. (Ex. P, pg. 7)

Chief Fusaro was then asked if the complaints about inappropriate behavior were received from

the multiple other agencies present at the scene. He states “*No. Not that I'm aware of. And there were fire department members. As I saw from the video, I recognized one of the chiefs from Old Mystic. I didn't hear anything of the sort.*” (Ex. P, pg. 8)

Chief Fusaro concluded the interview by stating there is nothing else he would like to add to the record, stating “*I don't believe so. I mean, I know you're doing a comprehensive investigation, and certainly every resource of this department and any information that we have will be provided to you and your team to make sure that you have what you need to do your inquiry with.*” (Ex. P, pg. 8)

### **GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT GENERAL ORDERS**

Groton Police Department General Order 5.08, Section A – Reporting and Investigation of Traffic Accidents, in part:

#### **1. Death or Injury**

- a. An Accident Reconstructionist(s), shall be summoned to the scene of collisions when the Shift Sergeant determines that technical expertise will be necessary for the complete investigation of traffic accidents that result in:
  - 1) Death
  - 2) Life-threatening and disabling injuries
  - 3) Collisions involving police vehicles in which an injury is sustained
  - 4) Other crashes as determined by the Patrol Supervisor or above
- b. In response to fatal collisions, as well as those involving life threatening injuries, the following procedures will apply:
  - 1) When it is evident that a fatality or life-threatening injuries are involved, officers will notify their immediate supervisor, and will request notification of all other personnel who have a responsibility at the scene, including notification of any Command personnel, a Public Information Officer (PIO), State's Attorney, and Medical Examiner.
    - a) The Shift Commander shall respond to the scene of all fatal accidents unless unusual or pressing circumstances dictate otherwise.
    - b) Notifying the Chief of Police, Deputy Chief of Police & Captain shall be the responsibility of the Shift Commander.
    - c) It will be the responsibility of the Shift Commander to notify the accident reconstruction team. The accident reconstructionist(s) are only there to assist in the reconstruction of the accident. They are not to be considered the investigating officer(s) unless assigned.

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

- d) The Commander of the Criminal Investigation Division shall be immediately called to coordinate that part of the investigation that requires the tracing of the previous whereabouts of the victim(s).
- 2) Officers will note the exact location and condition of the person(s) so details may be included in the investigative report and diagram.
- 3) Officers will attempt to identify the person(s).
- 4) If identification involves handling personal property or valuables, it should be done in the presence of witnesses, and documented in the written report.
- 5) Officers will properly receipt any property or valuable released to another person or agency.
- 6) The identity of the person( s) will not be released until proper notification of next of kin.
- 7) In the case of an on-scene fatality, investigative duties directly related to the body (bodies) shall be conducted with priority to facilitate the prompt removal of the body (bodies) to the custody of the Medical Examiner.
- 8) An investigative hold will be placed on any vehicle involved in the fatal crash, which will be properly impounded to permit a later, more thorough examination of the vehicle(s).
- 9) Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §14-227c, and in accordance with Public Act 20-1 , *"(b) A blood or breath sample shall be obtained from any surviving operator whose motor vehicle is involved in an accident resulting in the serious physical injury, as defined in section 53a-3. or death of another person, if (1) a police officer has probable cause to believe that such operator operated such motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquor or any drug, or both, or (2) such operator has been charged with a motor vehicle violation in connection with such accident and a police officer has a reasonable and articulable suspicion that such operator operated such motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquor or any drug, or both. (emphasis added)"* Because §14-227c requires an officer to take a blood or breath sample from said operator, the officer must avoid the ambiguous request which may be perceived as consent, as

consent is no longer a valid reason for a search of a person. The officer should tell the operator that they will be taking a sample pursuant to the Connecticut General Statutes.

- c. Accident Reconstruction members will assume responsibility for the following in a serious or fatal accident:
- 1) Completion of a final scale diagram
  - 2) Requesting the driving records of all operators involved from the Department of Motor Vehicles
  - 3) Complete accident reconstruction
  - 4) Ensuring that all pertinent information, evidence, photographs, etc are obtained from the involved vehicles prior to their removal from the scene
  - 5) Requesting supplements from any involved officers to be included with the accident investigation
  - 6) Request the assistance of any outside agencies, if needed (CSP Truck Squad, Town Engineering, etc.)
  - 7) If necessary, applying for a search warrant for any of the following:
    - Any involved vehicles if mechanical defects are believed to be a factor in the accident, or for any necessary measurements required to reconstruct the accident or to obtain any photos or other evidence deemed necessary to assist in reconstructing the accident.
    - To obtain data from vehicle control modules and/or event data recorders.
- (Ex. S, pg. 1-3)

Groton Police Department General Order 1.01, Appendix C – Groton Police Standards of Conduct, in part:

**1.3 – Courtesy: Conduct Toward the Public**

- Officers shall interact with the public in a civil and professional manner that conveys a service orientation to foster public trust and cooperation and adheres to the concepts associated with procedural justice.
- Officers shall treat individuals with courtesy, respect, and dignity.

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

- Officers shall not employ an officious or overbearing attitude or use language that might belittle, ridicule, or intimidate individuals.
- Officers shall perform their duties equitably in both the enforcement of laws and the delivery of law enforcement services within the community and shall strive to maintain public trust by conducting all law enforcement business in an unbiased, fair, and impartial manner.  
(Ex. U, pg.8)

**2.8 – Unbecoming Conduct**

Officers shall not conduct themselves in a manner that, on or off duty, that

- Casts doubt on their integrity, honesty, moral judgement, or character
- Brings discredit to this department; or
- Impairs the agency’s efficient and effective operations.  
(Ex. U, pg. 10 -11)

**DISPUTED FACTS**

1. Did the members of the Groton Police Department fail to properly investigate the circumstances leading up to the October 14, 2024, fatal accident?
2. Did the members of the Groton Police Department neglect their responsibility to file criminal charges based on the circumstances leading up to the October 14, 2024, fatal accident?
3. Did members of the Groton Police Department act unprofessionally and disrespectfully during the investigation of the fatal accident that occurred on October 14, 2024?

**EVIDENCE**

- Ex. A 7-16-25 Signed Complaint Form
- Ex. B Complaint Video Submission of Chief
- Ex. C Complaint Photo Submission
- Ex. D Complaint Email to Chief on 9-3-2025
- Ex. E Chris Wilson Interview Audio
- Ex. F Chris Wilson Interview Transcript
- Ex. G Shawn Paradis Interview Audio
- Ex. H Shawn Paradis Interview Transcript
- Ex. I Detective Kyle LoPriore Interview Audio
- Ex. J Detective Kyle LoPriore Interview Transcript
- Ex. K Officer Mitchell Chapman Interview Audio
- Ex. L Officer Mitchell Chapman Interview Transcript
- Ex. M Sergeant Heather Beauchamp Interview Audio
- Ex. N Sergeant Heather Beauchamp Interview Transcript
- Ex. O Chief Louis Fusaro Interview Audio

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

- Ex. P Chief Louis Fusaro Interview Transcript
- Ex. Q Chief Clip
- Ex. R Chief Clip Transcript
- Ex. S General Order # 5.08 – Traffic Accident Investigations
- Ex. T General Order # 6.06 – Youth Investigations
- Ex. U General Order # 1.01 – Law Enforcement Function

**ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION**

Further discussion is warranted regarding statements attributed to Chief Fusaro at the scene, which became a point of contention during the review process. An approximately eight-minute segment of body-worn camera footage was examined, capturing the Chief’s arrival on scene through several minutes after the alleged statement was believed to have occurred. This footage includes the moment of the alleged remark and provides relevant contextual information regarding the Chief’s conduct, demeanor, and statements immediately before and after the disputed comment. This video segment is labeled Exhibit Q.

Due to conflicting witness accounts and difficulty discerning audio—particularly as a result of significant background noise from a nearby fire truck—the body-worn camera footage was submitted to an independent transcription service for analysis. The purpose of this review was to determine, to the extent possible, what was audibly captured during the recorded segment and whether any statements could reasonably be interpreted as dehumanizing, dismissive, or otherwise inappropriate. The resulting transcript is labeled Exhibit R.

The transcription review produced the following relevant excerpt:

*Sergeant Bolduc: We have the person that called it in, didn't see it but heard it. Either one of you want to take a statement or I can have Mace take a statement. He knows who to talk to. because they came out.*

*Sergeant Beauch...: I'll do that. [inaudible 00:04:52] hospital.*

*Detective LoPro...: Probably do that now.*

*Sergeant Beauch...: [inaudible 00:04:52]*

*Chief Louis Fus...: Yes, stationary object [00:05:00] doesn't go anywhere?*

*Detective LoPro...: No.*

*Chief Louis Fus...: [inaudible 00:05:07] you guys cut all three of them out, or were there three in the car?*

(Ex. R, pg. 4)

As reflected in the transcript, portions of the audio were rendered inaudible due to overlapping speech, environmental noise, and emergency vehicle operations. Further analysis related to the actions of Chief Fusaro and the other members of the Groton Police Department is addressed in Finding #3.

## **RECOMMENDED FINDINGS**

### **FINDING #1**

#### ***General Order # 5.08 – Traffic Accident Investigations***

***Unfounded***

Based on a review of the Groton Police Department’s investigative file and the actions taken by Groton Police Department members, there is no indication that members of the Department failed to properly investigate the circumstances leading up to October 14, 2024, fatal accident in violation of *Groton Police Department General Orders 5.08*.

Chris Wilson claims that the Groton Police Department failed to properly investigate the circumstances leading up to the fatal accident. Mr. Wilson’s complaint form states, “*What has made it even more unbearable is the conduct of the Groton Police Department in the aftermath. From the very beginning, there has been a disturbing lack of urgency, thoroughness, and accountability in investigating the circumstances surrounding my son's death, including:*

- *Underage drinking that occurred prior to the crash*
- *Alcohol illegally obtained by minors at local businesses*
- *House parties where minors were known to be drinking*
- *Adults and other individuals who contributed to these events but have faced no consequences” (Ex. A, pg. 3)*

However, the materials provided for review reflect a comprehensive and methodical investigative effort consistent with accepted law enforcement practices and the required steps outlined within the Groton Police Department’s Policies. Across interviews conducted, Groton Police Department personnel consistently described an investigative approach that emphasized evidence collection, legal compliance, corroboration of information, and follow-up on all identifiable leads.

The investigative file, led by Officer Mitchell Chapman from GPD’s Accident Reconstruction team, includes 123 case/incident reports and 48 additional body-worn camera recordings documenting interviews, scene processing, and follow-up investigative actions. Officers conducted interviews with two (2) eyewitnesses from the scene and two (2) EMTs who assisted with the extraction of the vehicle occupants and their transport to the hospital. In addition, investigators interviewed two (2) individuals who were with the juveniles earlier in the evening and/or who had knowledge of their locations prior to the crash.

GPD members also made documented attempts to interview seven (7) additional individuals, including [REDACTED] and Alexander Quilter, who were directly involved in the events

surrounding the fatal accident. GPD members repeatedly emphasized that limited cooperation from involved juveniles and their families, particularly after legal counsel was retained. Detective LoPriore explained that “*They all had lawyers*” and declined to speak. (Ex. J, pg. 10) Officer Chapman confirmed that [REDACTED] was not interviewed because his family “*had retained an attorney*” (Ex. L, pg. 7), and that repeated efforts to interview Alexander Quilter were unsuccessful due to non-cooperation, geographic distance, and logistical limitations (Ex. L, pg. 8). The exercise of constitutional rights by these individuals limited access to firsthand information but does not reflect a failure by GPD members to pursue those leads.

While Mr. Wilson expressed disappointment that [REDACTED] was not formally interviewed after his release from medical care, testimony explained that [REDACTED] had no memory of the events and that information relayed indirectly by Mr. Wilson was reviewed and incorporated where possible (Ex. F, pg. 23).

Despite these constraints, GPD members pursued corroborative evidence through digital records, search warrants, and third-party interviews. Detective LoPriore explained that the most useful information came from [REDACTED] cellphone and Life360 data, which “*corroborated the information*” provided by Mr. Wilson. (Ex. J, pg. 6–7) Officer Chapman similarly described reliance on geolocation data and timelines derived from [REDACTED] phone, which investigators used to identify residences and locations visited earlier in the evening and then followed up through interviews and outreach. (Ex. L, pg. 10)

Using this location data and the timeline provided by Mr. Wilson, officers identified four locations associated with the individuals’ movements prior to the crash. GPD members successfully contacted and interviewed representatives from three of the four identified locations. They attempted to follow up with the remaining location, 71 Pequot, on November 21, 2024, but did not receive a response despite documented outreach.

Interview testimony consistently reflects that GPD members prioritized determining whether alcohol was obtained unlawfully and identifying its source. Detectives canvassed liquor stores, reviewed photographs depicting alcohol, interviewed individuals believed to be with the juveniles, and coordinated with prosecutors regarding evidentiary thresholds. Detective LoPriore concluded that “*based on what we had to work with at the time, we did everything we could to try to determine where the alcohol came from.*” (Ex. J, pg. 14) Officer Chapman echoed this assessment, stating that every lead was followed and that he would have pursued any information capable of furthering the investigation, but ultimately, we “*just couldn’t establish it*” due to the burden of proof required. (Ex. L, pg. 14–15)

Supervisory oversight and prosecutorial involvement were repeatedly emphasized in interview testimony. Sergeant Beauchamp described the investigation as “*very extensive,*” noting that interviews, search warrants, medical records, EDR data, and laboratory testing were pursued simultaneously. (Ex. N, pg. 6) She also confirmed that the State’s Attorney’s Office was closely involved throughout the investigation and did not request additional alcohol-related investigative steps, explaining that if further action had been required, “*of course, we’re going to do it.*” (Ex. N,

pg. 16–17)

Interview testimony also addressed allegations of delay or lack of urgency. Sergeant Beauchamp explained that perceived delays were attributable to necessary legal and medical processes, including prolonged hospitalization of juveniles, blood alcohol testing, and the execution of approximately eleven to twelve search warrants. She stated that the timeline, from early warrant activity to arrest, was normal and “*pretty quick*” given the complexity of the case. (Ex. N, pg. 19) Chief Fusaro similarly rejected assertions of investigative inaction, characterizing the department’s response as a “*full-court press*” and stating that officers “*did what they were obligated to do and then some.*” (Ex. P, pg. 6)

In addition to these investigative steps, the Groton Police Department maintained an open and ongoing line of communication with Mr. Wilson throughout the investigation. Documentation reflects that GPD members met with Mr. Wilson on at least five (5) occasions to receive additional information, discuss investigative developments, and obtain authorizations, including consent to search [REDACTED] cellphone. GPD members also provided updates and exchanged information with Mr. Wilson through documented email communications during the course of the investigation. These interactions demonstrate continued engagement, transparency, and responsiveness as new information became available. Officer Chapman acknowledged frequent contact, including in-person meetings and email exchanges, and noted that all information provided by Mr. Wilson was followed up on and documented, even when some information proved irrelevant. (Ex. L, pg. 8, 14) Sergeant Beauchamp confirmed that investigators accommodated Mr. Wilson’s requests for updates and maintained open lines of communication despite his understandable frustration with the pace and outcome of the investigation. (Ex. N, pg. 22)

Taken together, the investigative record demonstrates that Groton Police Department personnel pursued available leads, conducted timely interviews, attempted to obtain corroborating information from identified locations and businesses, and documented both successful and unsuccessful investigative efforts. The absence of certain information appears attributable to witness non-cooperation and lack of external records, rather than any failure by GPD members to take appropriate or reasonable investigative steps.

## **FINDING #2**

***General Order # 6.06 – Youth Investigations***

***Unfounded***

Based on a review of the Groton Police Department’s investigative file and the actions taken by Groton Police Department members, there is no indication that members of the Department failed their responsibility to file criminal charges based on the circumstances leading up to the October 14, 2024, fatal accident in violation of Groton Police Department General Order 6.06.

The allegation that members of the Groton Police Department failed to take appropriate enforcement action prior to the October 14, 2024, fatal motor vehicle accident centers on allegations made by Mr. Wilson within his interview that the driver, [REDACTED] had multiple

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

prior police interactions involving alcohol and that those interactions should have resulted in criminal charges or intervention.

Mr. Wilson alleged that [REDACTED] had interacted with Groton Police Department officers on five occasions prior to the accident, four of which allegedly involved alcohol, and questioned “*So who's not at fault? Who dropped the ball? How does a 17-year-old get four infractions from a cop and DMV's not involved.*” (Ex. F, pg. 9) In response to these assertions, we asked Groton Police Department to pull records for review. That review identified three documented pre-accident interactions between Groton Police Department and [REDACTED], consisting of two written warnings and one infraction. Based on the associated citations and incident reports, none of those interactions documented alcohol involvement.

Further evidence reflects that the only documented police contact involving the group of juveniles on the night of the incident occurred in the Town of Stonington, not Groton. During his interview, Mr. Wilson described an interaction between the juveniles and Stonington Police Department officers in downtown Mystic several hours before the crash and indicated that he later filed a formal complaint with Stonington Police regarding that encounter (Ex. F, pg. 21). That interaction was outside Groton Police Department’s jurisdiction and authority.

Additionally, within his written complaint Mr. Wilson goes on to claim that charges have not been brought. He states that “*The Groton Police Department has been made fully aware of these facts. Despite this, no meaningful steps have been taken. Leads have not been pursued. Charges have not been brought. Opportunities for justice have been ignored.*” (Ex. A, pg. 3)

However, following the fatal accident, Groton Police Department conducted a comprehensive investigation that resulted in the successful arrest of [REDACTED] in accordance to the procedures outlined in Groton Police Department General Orders 6.06 – Youth Investigations (Exhibit T). During our interview with Officer Chapman, he explained that GPD members coordinated extensively with the Assistant State’s Attorney and juvenile court prosecutors due to [REDACTED] age at the time of the offense and the overlap between motor vehicle violations and criminal statutes. Two arrest warrants were submitted, one to juvenile court and one to adult court, after charges were determined in consultation with prosecutors. (Ex. L, pg. 10) On January 9, 2025, [REDACTED] was arrested under both juvenile and adult warrants. He was charged with manslaughter in the second degree (motor vehicle), first-degree assault, misconduct with a motor vehicle, reckless driving, DUI under 21, and multiple motor vehicle violations.

Another significant component of the failure to file charges allegation and a focus within the investigation was on determining whether criminal charges could be brought against any individual who may have provided alcohol to the juveniles prior to the accident. Despite extensive efforts, GPD members were unable to identify a legally sufficient source of the alcohol.

During our interview with Sergeant Beauchamp, she explained that to pursue criminal charges for providing alcohol, investigators would have needed probable cause establishing that the specific alcohol provided by a particular individual caused the level of intoxication that led to the crash.

She noted that this evidentiary standard is extremely difficult to meet, particularly when juveniles visit multiple locations over the course of an evening and alcohol could have been obtained from numerous sources at different times. (Ex. N, pg. 20) Sergeant Beauchamp further stated that, in her professional experience, she has never been able to meet this standard in similar cases. (Ex. N, pg. 20)

During the interview with Detective LoPriore, he corroborated these efforts, describing investigative steps taken to identify potential alcohol providers, including reviewing group chat messages, identifying possible suspects, canvassing liquor stores, showing photographs to store employees, and reviewing available surveillance footage. These efforts did not result in identifying any individual who sold or provided alcohol to the juveniles. (Ex. J, pg. 11)

During our interview with Officer Chapman, he further confirmed that although photographs of alcohol were found on [REDACTED] phone, the images depicted generic, name-brand alcoholic beverages and did not establish where, when, or by whom the alcohol was obtained. He further stated that no additional information identifying an alcohol source was developed despite public requests for information, social media outreach, and post-arrest investigative follow-up. (Ex. L, pg. 14–16)

Officer Chapman also explained that the complete case file was submitted to the New London GA-10 court for review and that Groton Police Department remained available for additional follow-up if prosecutors identified any further investigative needs. (Ex. L, pg. 14–15)

Based on the totality of the evidence, the investigation does not support the finding that members of the Groton Police Department neglected their responsibility to file criminal charges. The department pursued all viable investigative leads, coordinated charging decisions with prosecutorial authorities, and filed charges where legally supported. The inability to file additional charges related to the provision of alcohol resulted from evidentiary limitations and prosecutorial standards, not investigative inaction or neglect.

### **FINDING #3**

#### ***General Order # 1.01 – Law Enforcement Function***

***Unfounded***

The evidence did not disclose sufficient evidence to determine that Chief Louis Fusaro and the other members of the Groton Police Department acted unprofessionally and disrespectfully during the investigation of the fatal accident that occurred on October 14, 2024, in violation of Groton Police Department General Orders 1.01.

Chris Wilson claims that Groton Police Department members acted unprofessionally and disrespectfully during the investigation of the fatal accident. Mr. Wilson’s complaint form states “*To make matters worse, I have viewed body cam footage from the crash site in which a sergeant is heard laughing, and the Chief of Police makes a sarcastic remark about the accident. This behavior is not only unprofessional-it is disgraceful and dehumanizing. My son's life was lost, and*

**GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014**

*while we were in anguish, those entrusted to serve and protect this community were making light of our pain.”* (Ex. A, pg.3)

During our investigation, all twenty (20) video clips provided from the scene and hospital on October 14, 2025 were reviewed, including body-worn camera footage, dash camera recordings, and internal vehicle video, totaling 24 hours, 12 minutes, and 39 seconds of footage.

A review of the body-worn camera footage (Exhibit Q), along with analysis of the corresponding transcript (Exhibit R), indicates that portions of the recorded audio were obscured by background noise, overlapping dialogue, and active scene operations. These conditions limit the ability to definitively isolate certain words or phrases. However, the transcript reflects the following statement attributed to the Chief: *“Yes, stationary object [00:05:00] doesn’t go anywhere?”* (Ex. R, pg. 4)

Context is critical when evaluating the statement at issue. Chief Fusaro arrived on scene after officers, emergency medical personnel, and other responders had already engaged in extensive lifesaving efforts, including the physical extraction of vehicle occupants without the use of hydraulic rescue tools. Any statements made during this period occurred within a high-stress, rapidly evolving operational environment following a catastrophic motor vehicle collision.

During his interview, Chief Fusaro stated that the comment was not intended to be dehumanizing, sarcastic, dismissive, or insensitive in any manner. He described the remark as a factual observation made while assessing a severe collision involving a vehicle that struck a large, immovable tree. He further explained that the comment reflected both the force of the impact and the extraordinary efforts undertaken by responding personnel to rescue trapped occupants without specialized equipment. (Ex. P, pg. 7)

Chief Fusaro also confirms *“Well, having just watched it, I don't know the reference to someone laughing. I did not hear that, first of all.”* (Ex. P, pg. 7) It should be noted that the transcript of this clip, also did not record laughter occurring after the statement was made. (Ex. R, pg. 4)

Chief Fusaro goes on to explain that the scene was deeply disturbing, particularly due to the involvement of juveniles, and emphasized that his primary concern at the time was the survivability of the occupants. He acknowledged Mr. Wilson’s reaction given the loss of his child and reiterated: *“There was nothing meant at all to be flippant... I think it was merely a statement of fact based on the situation that was pretty evident to me at that point in time.”* (Ex. P, pg. 7)

Additionally, Chief Fusaro confirmed that no complaints regarding inappropriate conduct were received from personnel of the multiple agencies present at the scene. He stated, *“No. Not that I’m aware of... I didn’t hear anything of the sort.”* (Ex. P, pg. 8)

Based on the available body-worn camera footage, transcript analysis, interview statements, and the surrounding operational context, the review did not substantiate the allegation that Chief Fusaro made a dehumanizing or inappropriate statement during the recorded period. While audio

GROTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION C25-014

limitations prevent absolute certainty regarding every word spoken, the evidence does not support a finding that the Chief's conduct or remarks were inconsistent with professional standards or supervisory responsibilities at the scene.

Prepared By:



Eric P. Daigle, Esq.  
Daigle Law Group