

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, SS

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION  
One Ashburton Place, Room 503  
Boston, MA 02108  
(617) 979-1900

VLADIMIR DAMAS,  
*Appellant*

G1-17-232  
G1-19-010  
G1-20-006

v.

BOSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT,  
*Respondent*

Appearance for Appellant:

Guy F. Caruso, Esq.  
1212 Hancock Street, Suite 310  
Quincy, MA 02169

Appearance for Respondent:

Katherine Sarmini Hoffman, Esq.  
Nathaniel Bowdoin, Esq.  
Anthony Rizzo, Esq.  
Boston Police Department  
Office of the Legal Advisor  
One Schroeder Plaza  
Boston, MA 02120

Commissioner:

Cynthia A. Ittleman, Esq.

DECISION

Vladimir Damas (Mr. Damas or Appellant) filed the instant appeals at the Civil Service Commission (Commission) as follows: appeal docketed G1-17-232 on October 31, 2017; appeal docketed G1-19-010 on January 23, 2019; and appeal docketed G1-20-006 on January 13, 2020 under G.L. c. 31, § 2(b) challenging the decisions of the Boston Police Department (Respondent or BPD) to bypass him for appointment to the position of full-time Police Officer. Pre-hearing conferences were held as follows: G1-17-232 on November 21, 2017; G1-19-010 on February 19,

2019; and G1-20-006 on February 11, 2020 at the offices of the Commission. A hearing<sup>1</sup> was held on the appeal docketed G1-17-232 on January 19, 2018 at the Commission. The hearing was digitally recorded and the parties received a CD of the proceeding.<sup>2</sup> The parties filed post-hearing briefs. When the Appellant subsequently appealed the BPD's decision to bypass him in 2018 and 2019 for the same reasons it applied in its 2017 decision to bypass the Appellant, the parties agreed to consolidate the Appellant's three (3) appeals. Pursuant to 801 CMR 1.01(7)(j). For the reasons stated herein, the appeal is denied.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Fifteen (15) exhibits were entered into evidence at the hearing and one (1) was ordered produced at the hearing and was filed post-hearing, together sixteen (16) exhibits. This included three (3) exhibits for the Appellant (A.Ex./s.) and thirteen (13) exhibits for the Respondent (R.Ex./s.), including the Respondent's one (1) post-hearing exhibit. Further, post-hearing I asked the parties to produce the Education section of the Appellant's applications to the BPD in 2018 and 2019, in connection with the appeals docketed G1-19-010 and G1-20-006, which appeals were consolidated with the appeal docketed G1-17-232. The Respondent produced the Education section of the Appellant's 2020 bypass appeal but the Respondent was unable to produce the Education section of the Appellant's 2018 bypass appeal. Thus, the total number of exhibits in the record is seventeen (17). Based on these exhibits, the testimony of the following witnesses:

---

<sup>1</sup> The Standard Adjudicatory rules of Practice and Procedures, 810 CMR §§ 1.00, *et seq.*, apply to adjudications before the Commission, with G.L. c. 31, or any Commission rules, taking precedence.

<sup>2</sup> If there is a judicial appeal of this decision, the plaintiff in the judicial appeal would be obligated to supply the court with a transcript of this hearing to the extent that he/she wishes to challenge the decision as unsupported by the substantial evidence, arbitrary and capricious, or an abuse of discretion. If such an appeal is filed, this CD should be used to transcribe the hearing.

*Called by BPD:*

- Detective Rafael Antunez, Recruit Investigation Unit (RIU), Boston Police Department (BPD)
- Nancy Driscoll, Director of Human Resources (HR), BPD

*Called by Appellant:*

- Michael Agostini
- Vladimir Damas, Appellant;

and taking administrative notice of all matters filed in the case; pertinent statutes, regulations, policies, stipulations and reasonable inferences from the credible evidence; a preponderance of the evidence establishes the following:

*Stipulations*

*Appeal Docketed G1-17-232*

1. On April 25, 2015, the Appellant took and passed the civil service examination for police officer and received a score of 97.
2. On October 25, 2015, the state's Human Resources Division (HRD) established an eligible list of candidates for Boston police officer.
3. On February 22 and March 2, 2017, HRD, at the request of the BPD, sent Certification No. 04401 to the BPD, from which 130 candidates were selected for appointment.
4. The Appellant was ranked 72<sup>nd</sup> among those candidates.
5. Of the 130 candidates selected for appointment by the BPD, 48 were ranked below the Appellant.
6. On August 31, 2017, the BPD notified the Appellant that it was bypassing him for appointment.

*Appeal Docketed G1-19-010*<sup>3</sup>

7. On March 25, 2017, the Appellant took and passed the civil service examination for police officer and received a score of 94.
8. On September 1, 2017, HRD established an eligible list of candidates for Boston police officer.
9. On March 15, 2018, HRD, at the request of the BPD, sent Certification 05198 to the BPD, from which 10 candidates were selected for appointment
10. The Appellant was ranked 11<sup>th</sup> among those candidates.
11. Of the 10 candidates selected for appointment by the BPD, all were ranked below the Appellant.
12. By letter dated November 7, 2018, the BPD notified the Appellant that it was bypassing him for appointment for the same reasons he was bypassed in 2017.

*Appeal Docketed G1-20-006*

13. On March 25, 2017, the same exam at issue in appeal docketed G1-19-010, the Appellant took and passed the civil service examination for police officer and received a score of 94.
14. On September 1, 2017, HRD established an eligible list of candidates for Boston police officer.
15. On March 29, 2019, HRD, at the request of the BPD, sent Certification 06203 to the BPD, from which 121 candidates were selected for appointment.
16. The Appellant was ranked 40<sup>th</sup> among those candidates.

---

<sup>3</sup> There is no formal stipulation in the record in G1-19-010. However, the parties were given copies of the information provided by HRD to the Commission with this information, pursuant to Commission practice, and there is no indication in the record that the parties disputed HRD's information.

17. Of the 121 candidates selected for appointment by the BPD, 109 were ranked below the Appellant.
18. By letter dated November 15, 2019, the BPD notified the Appellant that it was bypassing him for appointment for the same reasons he was bypassed in 2017 and 2019.

*Background of Appellant*

19. At the time of the hearing in the appeal docketed G1-17-232, the Appellant was thirty-three (33) years old. He is a Black male who speaks Haitian-Creole fluently and lives in Dorchester. (Testimony of Appellant; R.Ex. 1)
20. The Appellant graduated from a Boston high school in 2003. He attended college for one semester but left to work when his father became ill. (Testimony of Appellant)
21. The Appellant worked for Harvard University for approximately eight (8) years after high school. He held positions as assistant cook and then storekeeper for dining services. (Testimony of Appellant)
22. In 2011, the Appellant became employed as a Correction Officer at the Massachusetts Department of Correction (DOC), a position he has held at least until the time of the full hearing in the appeal docketed G1-17-232. The Appellant was stationed at MCI Cedar Junction at that time. (Testimony of Appellant)<sup>4</sup>
23. The Appellant's DOC supervisor submitted two (2) Supervisor Form responses to BPD as part of its background investigation of the Appellant. In his March 6, 2017 Supervisor Form, a DOC Captain noted that he has known the Appellant for five (5) years and had been his supervisor for three (3) years. The Captain noted that the Appellant "has been a very

---

<sup>4</sup> In a post-hearing email message to both parties shortly before this decision was rendered, I asked if Appellant's counsel if the Appellant was still employed as a Correction Officer at the state Department of Correction and his counsel replied in the affirmative.

dependable employee. He reports to duty on time and ready to perform his duties.” The Captain added that the Appellant has a “positive relationship with his supervisors ... [and] with his co-workers.” (A.Ex. 3)

24. In his March 24, 2018, Supervisor Form submitted to BPD as part of their investigation of the Appellant, the Captain noted that “Officer Damas has received positive performance evaluations. He takes pride in his duties and is a good role model.” “Mr. Damas is noted to have a good relationship with his supervisors and is “well respected by his fellow co-workers.” “Officer Damas treats everyone with respect. His ability to treat the very diverse inmate population fairly, would make him an excellent police officer.” (A.Ex. 2)
25. The Appellant had never been disciplined as a Correction Officer. (Testimony of Antunez)
26. The Appellant has been through DOC training to handle stressful and dangerous situations he may encounter, including de-escalation tactics. (Testimony of Appellant)
27. Boston police training and DOC training share several common components. (Testimony of Antunez)
28. On August 20, 2012, the Appellant was issued a Class A License to Carry Firearms without restrictions by the Boston Police Commissioner. (A.Ex. 1; Testimony of Appellant)

*Appellant’s 2017 Application to the BPD*

29. On or around March 18, 2017, the Appellant signed his application and submitted it to the BPD for consideration. Det. Antunez was assigned to review the Appellant’s application and conduct a background investigation. (R.Ex. 1; Testimony of Antunez and Driscoll)

*Appellant’s High School Record*

30. During a review of the BPD police incident reports involving the Appellant, Detective Antunez discovered a 2001 incident report involving the Appellant, at which time the

Appellant was approximately 16 years old. In the BPD incident report regarding the charges, a police officer noted that the Appellant had been recently expelled from his high school in 2000. (R.Exs. 2 and 3; Testimony of Antunez)

31. The Appellant did not disclose that he attended or was expelled from the high school in his application in the section regarding education on the BPD application completed in 2017. In response to the application question asking if he had ever been suspended or received any disciplinary action at any of the schools you have attended beyond the eighth grade, the Appellant answered “No.” (R.Ex. 1; Testimony of Antunez and Driscoll)
32. Det. Antunez called and spoke with the Appellant about the expulsion. The Appellant said that he had been expelled from the Catholic high school but that he did not include it in his application because it occurred a long time ago and had slipped his mind. The Appellant explained to Det. Antunez that he was expelled for carrying a knife to school in response to someone who tried to rob him 2 years before he was expelled. When asked by Det. Antunez, “ ‘[D]oes this mean you were carrying that [knife] for two (2) years before you were expelled from school?’ and he [the Appellant] said yes.” (R.Ex. 11; Testimony of Antunez)
33. At the conclusion of Det. Antunez and the Appellant’s phone conversation, Det. Antunez asked the Appellant to provide a written statement describing his 2001 school expulsion and explaining why he did not include this information in his application. The Appellant produced the written statement as requested. Det. Antunez found that the Appellant wrote that the attempted robbery occurred one day before his expulsion instead of 2 years prior to his expulsion. In addition, the Appellant’s written statement said,

I did not intentionally withhold this information (sic) it simply slipped my mind since I was only in that school for a very short period time and it was over 16 years ago. Since then a lot has transpired in my life. I also noticed that inadequate space was left on the application in order for me to add additional

schooling and the directions clearly state to list all of the schools after 8<sup>th</sup> grade beginning with the most recent which I did as much as spacing allowed me to and also on page 16 the question asked if I ever had disciplinary from these institutions which was true I never had any disciplinary actions from the schools I listed on the application, so not to be used as an excuse, but maybe also to be taken into account. This application process is also very complexed (sic). (R.Exs. 4 and 11; Testimony of Antunez)

34. In the spring of 2008, when he was approximately 23 years old, the Appellant was involved

in a melee outside of the Caprice nightclub in Boston. According to the police incident report, Boston police officers were dispatched to the nightclub because there was a large crowd of people yelling and screaming at one another outside of the nightclub. The report states that: Ms. A, in the crowd, threatened some other women there; the officers repeatedly commanded Ms. A to desist; when officers attempted to arrest Ms. A for disturbing the peace, the Appellant's friend, Mr. B, intervened, saying "I'll take her." (R.Ex. 7)

35. The police report also states that Officers told Mr. B that Ms. A was being arrested; Mr. B yelled at the officers, including an obscenity; officers attempted to arrest Mr. B for disturbing the peace; and Mr. B violently resisted arrest and had to be taken to the ground, where he was finally taken into custody. (Id.)

36. In regard to the Appellant, the police reports states that : the Appellant approached Mr. B as the police arrested Mr. B; the Appellant yelled to Mr. B as he (Mr. B) was being arrested, telling him not to worry; a police officer ordered the Appellant to stop and leave the area because he was further inciting the crowd; when the Appellant failed to leave, the officers attempted to arrest him; the Appellant violently resisted arrest and disregarded verbal commands to comply. The report also states that the Appellant (like others arrested at the melee) were maced and officers were finally able to place the Appellant in handcuffs. The



Appellant was charged with disorderly conduct and resisting arrest, but the charges against him were dismissed the same day. ((R.Exs. 2, 7 and 9; Testimony of Antunez)

37. The Appellant acknowledges that, as part of the above-referenced interaction with police, he may have referred to police officers as “f—king pigs”. (Testimony of Appellant)

*BPD Bypassed the Appellant*

38. On or around July 12, 2017, Detective Antunez prepared a Privileged and Confidential Memorandum (hereinafter “PCM”) which contained a summary of his investigation of the Appellant’s background. (R.Ex. 11)

39. On or around July 12, 2017, the roundtable reviewed Detective Antunez’s PCM and the Appellant’s application, discussed the Appellant’s background, and decided to bypass the Appellant. (Testimony of Driscoll)

40. By a letter dated August 31, 2017, the BPD informed the Appellant that it decided to bypass the Appellant based, in part, on his untruthful representations and inconsistent statements during the background investigation. Specifically, the BPD letter asserted that the Appellant made inconsistent statements regarding his expulsion from school in 2000 and regarding his involvement in the 2008 resisting arrest incident outside of the nightclub. (R.Ex. 12; Testimony of Driscoll)

41. The BPD also bypassed the Appellant in 2018 (appeal docketed G1-19-010) and 2019 (appeal docketed G1-20-006) for the same reasons the BPD found in 2017 (appeal docketed G1-17-232). (Administrative Notice) However, the Appellant noted in his application related to his G1-20-006 appeal that he attended a Boston high school briefly, that he had been disciplined in school and that he had been suspended or expelled from a school. (Respondent’s exhibit provided in response to my recent request of both parties for the

Education section of the Appellant's applications related to docket numbers G1-19-010 and G1-20-006 to BPD) The Respondent was unable to produce the Education section of the Appellant's application related to his appeal docketed G1-19-010. (Administrative Notice)

42. The Appellant timely filed the instant three (3) appeals with the Commission in 2017, 2019 and 2020. (Administrative Notice)

43. The parties agreed to consolidate the three (3) appeals. (Administrative Notice; 801 CMR 1.01(7)(j))

#### *Applicable Law*

The fundamental purpose of the civil service system is to guard against political considerations, favoritism, and bias in governmental hiring and promotion. The commission is charged with ensuring that the system operates on "[b]asic merit principles." Massachusetts Assn. of Minority Law Enforcement Officers v. Abban, 434 Mass. 256, 259, citing Cambridge v. Civil Serv. Comm'n., 43 Mass.App.Ct. 300, 304 (1997). "Basic merit principles" means, among other things, "assuring fair treatment of all applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration" and protecting employees from "arbitrary and capricious actions." G.L. c. 31, section 1. Personnel decisions that are marked by political influences or objectives unrelated to merit standards or neutrally applied public policy represent appropriate occasions for the Civil Service Commission to act. Cambridge at 304.

The issue for the Commission is "not whether it would have acted as the appointing authority had acted, but whether, on the facts found by the commission, there was reasonable justification for the action taken by the appointing authority in the circumstances found by the commission to have existed when the Appointing Authority made its decision." Watertown v. Arria, 16

Mass.App.Ct. 331, 332 (1983). See Commissioners of Civil Service v. Municipal Ct. of Boston, 369 Mass. 84, 86 (1975); and Leominster v. Stratton, 58 Mass.App.Ct. 726, 727-728 (2003).

The Commission's role, while important, is relatively narrow in scope: reviewing the legitimacy and reasonableness of the appointing authority's actions. City of Beverly v. Civil Service Comm'n, 78 Mass.App.Ct. 182, 189, 190-191 (2010) citing Falmouth v. Civil Serv. Comm'n, 447 Mass. 824-826 (2006) and ensuring that the appointing authority conducted an "impartial and reasonably thorough review" of the applicant. The Commission owes "substantial deference" to the appointing authority's exercise of judgment in determining whether there was "reasonable justification" shown. Beverly citing Cambridge at 305, and cases cited. "It is not for the Commission to assume the role of super appointing agency, and to revise those employment determinations with which the Commission may disagree." Town of Burlington and another v. McCarthy, 60 Mass. App. Ct. 914, 915 (2004).

Disputed facts regarding alleged prior misconduct of an applicant must be considered under the "preponderance of the evidence" standard of review as set forth in the SJC's recent decision in Boston Police Dep't v. Civil Service Comm'n, 483 Mass. 461 (2019), which upheld the Commission's decision to overturn the bypass of a police candidate, expressly rejecting the lower standard espoused by the police department. Id., 483 Mass. at 333-36.

### *Analysis*

For at least the past decade, it appears that Mr. Damas has been a model citizen. After eight (8) years of employment at Harvard, he was appointed as a Correction Officer at the Department of Correction, a paramilitary organization that conducts thorough background investigations on all applicants. He has now worked at DOC for many years and receives high praise for his demeanor and work ethic from his supervisors. He is actively involved with his child's life and

was deemed suitable to be issued a license to carry a firearm by the Boston Police Commissioner. He has successfully passed multiple civil service examinations for police officer and scored high enough to be among those eligible for consideration. Mr. Damas has been rejected six times by the BPD.<sup>5</sup>

In two hiring cycles that preceded these bypasses, Mr. Damas was among a group of tied candidates who was not selected for appointment. Although there was no appealable bypass in those prior hiring cycles, Mr. Damas filed a non-bypass equity appeal. Specifically, Mr. Damas, at the time, questioned whether the method used by the BPD to select which candidates from his tie group would be offered employment violated basic merit principles because it appeared to have been influenced by nepotism. In particular, Mr. Damas referred to an article published by the *Bay State Banner* on July 28, 2016, in which it was reported that a BPD official had said that “three of the 15 recruits hired from among those who were tied at the bottom of the applicant list were related to BPD command staff.” In its reply brief in that case, the BPD stated in part:

“ ... the Department considered recommendations from sworn and civilian members of the Department and the [then] Police Commissioner’s personal knowledge of a recruit’s qualifications because the Department already possessed information about the applicant’s background and qualifications and believed those credentials would contribute to the Department.”

Although the Commission concluded that it lacked jurisdiction to hear the Appellant’s appeal at the time, Commissioner Paul Stein wrote in part that:

“ ... the Commission will continue to monitor the concerns that Mr. Damas has raised about the BPD’s tie-breaking process to ensure they do not persist in the future. In particular, it is hard to understand how the fact that picking a candidate who happens to be personally acquainted with the [then] BPD Police Commissioner and/or knows other members of the BPD staff, over another otherwise equally qualified candidate who does not have those relationships, fits the standards of a merit-based hiring process. Similarly, if the BPD does, in fact, discourage applicants to use BPD members as “references” but considers ‘recommendations’ from BPD staff for use as a tie-breaker, that problematic

---

<sup>5</sup> The Appellant recently filed a new bypass appeal with the Commission, contesting a subsequent decision by the BPD to bypass him for appointment.

practice should be carefully reviewed.” (Damas v. Boston Police Dep’t, 29 MCSR 550 (2016))

In these three instant appeals, the BPD has bypassed the Appellant three times, appointing, cumulatively, more than 160 candidates who were ranked below the Appellant on the various Certifications involved here.<sup>6</sup> It is in this context that I carefully considered whether, after a fair, thorough and impartial review process, the BPD has shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, that there was reasonable justification to bypass Mr. Damas for appointment as a police officer.

The BPD’s reasons for bypass, as stated in the bypass letters, can be grouped into two (2) categories: 1) alleged prior misconduct, some of which dates back well over a decade; and 2) alleged untruthfulness. Since this case can be decided solely on the issue of alleged untruthfulness, my findings and analysis are limited to that reason for bypass.

The BPD alleges that Mr. Damas:

1. Omitted material information on his 2017 application for employment by failing to state that he had attended and been expelled from a high school in Boston.
2. Provided conflicting information regarding the underlying misconduct that resulted in that suspension, first telling the background investigator that he had carried a knife to high school for 2 years and then providing a written statement to the investigator stating that he had only brought a knife to high school on one occasion.
3. Provided misleading information regarding whether he engaged in disorderly conduct and/or resisted arrest during the incident that occurred outside the Caprice nightclub in Boston.

---

<sup>6</sup> The six non-selections include: 2 in which the Appellant was not bypassed; the 3 instant appeals; and 1 new appeal recently filed by the Appellant.

I listened carefully to the Appellant's testimony regarding why he failed to disclose to BPD investigators that he attended and was expelled from a high school in Boston. Mr. Damas struggled to provide a plausible explanation for the omission, echoing much of what he wrote to the investigator (i.e. – time had elapsed; he didn't view it as important; there wasn't sufficient space to include the information). Had Mr. Damas, in his 2017 application, simply disclosed that he had been expelled from high school many years ago, it is unlikely that the expulsion, standing alone, would have provided BPD with reasonable justification to bypass him for appointment. Mr. Damas, however, appears to have omitted this negative information to the BPD to avoid painting himself in an unfavorable light. This is exactly the type of "fudging the truth" that the Commission, and years of precedent-setting judicial decisions, has determined to be a valid reason for bypassing an otherwise acceptable candidate for appointment as a police officer.

The second instance of alleged untruthfulness is related to the above-referenced expulsion. The background investigator has a specific memory, as noted in his testimony and his written summary completed at the time, that the Appellant acknowledged carrying a knife to high school for two years. Thus, the background investigator was surprised to read the Appellant's written statement stating that he had only brought a knife to school on one occasion. I credit the background investigator's testimony in this regard. He appeared to have a firmer recollection of the conversation and was genuinely surprised, at the time, when he read the Appellant's written statement in this regard.

That leads to the final allegation of untruthfulness: whether or not the Appellant was untruthful by denying that he engaged in disorderly conduct and/or resisted arrest during the incident outside the Caprice nightclub many years ago. I carefully listened to the Appellant's testimony and gave the appropriate weight to the police report, the fact that the criminal charges

against him were dismissed the same day; and that it was a chaotic scene on the night in question. Although the Appellant acknowledged that he made incendiary statements that night, I credit his testimony that he did not act in a disorderly manner and/or resist arrest. I did not give weight to the background investigator's double hearsay testimony that a prior investigator spoke with the arresting police officer, who was purportedly able to recall specific statements and actions of the Appellant from a chaotic incident many years ago. In short, the BPD has not shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the Appellant engaged in disorderly behavior and/or resisted arrest. Thus, the Appellant's denials in this regard do not constitute untruthfulness.

As noted above, however, the Appellant did, either through omission or conflicting statements, make untruthful statements that provided the BPD with reasonable justification to bypass him for appointment. While the Appellant apparently sought to correct the omission regarding his expulsion from high school in at least one subsequent hiring cycle (2019), the BPD was justified in relying on the prior omission in its decision to bypass Mr. Damas for appointment.

Left unaddressed here is whether the Appellant should be permanently disqualified for appointment as a Boston Police Officer, a position apparently held by the BPD. To ensure clarity, I don't believe that the BPD can simply recycle these same reasons without conducting a reasonably thorough review on a going-forward basis. The Appellant has over a decade of being a good citizen; he has been a model employee at DOC; and he was deemed suitable by the Boston Police Commissioner to be issued a license to carry a firearm. It would seem prudent for the BPD, going forward, to grant the Appellant a discretionary interview, so that members of the BPD command staff can decide whether the Appellant poses too high of a risk to appoint as a

police officer. To me, such a review would be consistent with the need to provide all applicants, including those with past transgressions, with a fair and impartial review.

For all of the above reasons, the Appellant's three consolidated appeals are *denied*.

Civil Service Commission

/s/ Cynthia A. Ittleman

Cynthia A. Ittleman

Commissioner

By a vote of the Civil Service Commission (Bowman, Chairman; Camuso, Ittleman, Stein and Tivnan, Commissioners) on February 11, 2021.

Either party may file a motion for reconsideration within ten days of the receipt of this Commission order or decision. Under the pertinent provisions of the Code of Mass. Regulations, 801 CMR 1.01(7)(l), the motion must identify a clerical or mechanical error in this order or decision or a significant factor the Agency or the Presiding Officer may have overlooked in deciding the case. A motion for reconsideration does not toll the statutorily prescribed thirty-day time limit for seeking judicial review of this Commission order or decision.

Under the provisions of G.L. c. 31, § 44, any party aggrieved by this Commission order or decision may initiate proceedings for judicial review under G.L. c. 30A, § 14 in the superior court within thirty (30) days after receipt of this order or decision. Commencement of such proceeding shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of this Commission order or decision. After initiating proceedings for judicial review in Superior Court, the plaintiff, or his / her attorney, is required to serve a copy of the summons and complaint upon the Boston office of the Attorney General of the Commonwealth, with a copy to the Civil Service Commission, in the time and in the manner prescribed by Mass. R. Civ. P. 4(d)

Notice to:

Guy F. Caruso, Esq. (for Appellant)

Anthony Rizzo, Esq. (for Respondent)