



STATE OF DELAWARE  
DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY AND HOMELAND SECURITY  
**DIVISION OF STATE POLICE**  
P.O. Box 430  
DOVER, DELAWARE 19903

November 7, 2025

Christian Kervick  
Executive Director, Criminal Justice Council  
Carvel State Building  
820 N. French Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801

Dear Mr. Kervick:

The enclosed document is the Delaware Criminal Justice Council 11 Del. C §9210 Authorized Disclosures for the investigation involving Delaware State Police Cpl. Kenneth Haynes.

Sincerely,

Colonel William D. Crotty  
Superintendent

# Delaware Criminal Justice Council

## 11 Del. C. §9210 Authorized Disclosures

### Agency Information

Law Enforcement Agency: Delaware State Police

Date of Incident: Non-specific Dates occurring from 2022 through 2024

### Incident Details

Law Enforcement Officer has discharged a firearm at a person. ☐ Yes | ☒ No

Law Enforcement Officer's use of force that results in serious physical injury. ☐ Yes | ☒ No

An investigation that results in a sustained finding that a Law Enforcement Officer engaged in a sexual assault or sexual harassment. For purposes of this paragraph, "sexual assault" means the commission or attempted initiation of a sexual act by means of force, threat, coercion, extortion, or offer or implication of leniency or official favor, under the color of authority. Propositioning sex or commission of a sexual act while an officer is on duty is deemed a "sexual assault." ☒ Yes | ☐ No

An investigation that results in a sustained finding that a Law Enforcement Officer engaged in dishonest conduct. This includes, but is not limited to sustained findings of perjury, false statements, filing false reports, witness tampering, and destruction, falsification, or concealment of evidence. ☐ Yes | ☒ No

A sustained finding of domestic violence by a Law Enforcement Officer. ☐ Yes | ☒ No

### Detailed Narrative

Please include a detailed narrative of the incident. A "detailed narrative" means a complete description of the facts, steps taken to further an investigation, evidence collected, conclusions reached, the names of officers involved for whom misconduct was substantiated, any discipline assigned in connection with the event, and the employment status of disciplined officers. 11 Del. C. § 9200(b)(1).

The detailed narrative may not reveal the name or any personal identifying information of a victim or witness. In a domestic violence case where revealing the name of the officer would also allow identification of the victim, the officer's name may be redacted.

The Criminal Justice Council shall post the narratives they receive under this paragraph on their website within 30 calendar days of receipt.

I. Complete Description of the Facts:

On or about August 1, 2024, a citizen (Citizen1) came forward alleging she was sexually assaulted by Cpl. Kenneth Haynes (Haynes) of the Delaware State Police (DSP) Troop 4. This notification was made via Citizen1's contact with Troopers with whom she was familiar through prior contact. At about the same time, Citizen1 filed a civil suit against Haynes alleging the same conduct. A criminal investigation was initiated and concluded with no charges being brought. That investigation, however, uncovered facts supporting a possible violation of the Division's *Respectful Workplace and Anti-discrimination Policy* (Policy), specifically the Policy's "Nonverbal sexual harassment" prohibition against distributing graphic material.

It was discovered that Cpl. Haynes had sent, via phone applications, sexually explicit photographs (male genitalia) to female DSP employees while on and off duty.

II. Investigatory Steps:

As noted, a criminal investigation was initially conducted by DSP. During the course of the criminal investigation, numerous interviews were conducted and other evidence reviewed. Through further investigatory steps, witnesses, including family members of Citizen1, were identified and interviewed. Haynes was not interviewed because he exercised his fifth amendment right not to provide a statement during the criminal investigation. The criminal investigation revealed information that Haynes initially shared Snapchat profiles with Citizen1 and the two communicated via that social media program. Citizen1 received pictures and communications from Cpl. Haynes that were sexual in nature. Information uncovered suggested that the incident with Citizen1 may have been consensual in nature and a decision was made, in conjunction with prosecuting authorities, that criminal charges were not appropriate.

During the criminal investigation, a third party (sworn Trooper) notified the criminal investigator that they were aware of a female Trooper who worked on the same shift as Haynes who had received a sexually explicit photograph from Haynes via Snapchat. An interview with the Trooper confirmed that she received the photograph. That in turn led to other interviews where other female employees reported receiving inappropriate photographs from Hanes via phone applications. Following the conclusion of the criminal investigation, the above information was provided to the DSP Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR).

OPR investigated all of the concerning conduct revealed during the criminal investigation. OPR interviewed Haynes, reinterviewed the female employees who were interviewed in the criminal investigation and took other investigatory steps. Based upon all of the evidence collected, OPR substantiated three counts of misconduct, including a violation of the Policy.

III. Evidence Collected:

Due to the late reporting of the initial incident, surveillance footage and DSP body worn camera/in car camera footage was not available. Nothing of note was located during the criminal investigation in regard to DSP camera footage. The above interviews took place and all interviews were recorded.

IV. Conclusions Reached:

- The allegation of Rules & Regulations #1A was determined to be **Not Substantiated** (1 Count)

- The allegation of Rules & Regulations #1 (Respectful Workplace and Antidiscrimination Policy) was determined to be **Substantiated** (1 Count)
- The allegation of Rules & Regulations #4 (Conduct Unbecoming) was determined to be **Substantiated** (1 Count)
- The allegation of Rules & Regulations #5 (Neglect of Duty) was determined to be **Substantiated** (1 Count)

The recommended penalty of termination falls outside the parameters of Summary Discipline; therefore, the options of a Divisional Trial Board or a Superintendent's Hearing were offered to adjudicate the findings. Haynes initially requested a Divisional Trial Board. A board was assigned and the proceeding was scheduled on October 7, 2025 as agreed upon by all parties. Shortly before the hearing, Haynes waived his right to a hearing and resigned. The Division has provided the Police Officer Standards and Training Commission with notice of Haynes' separation from employment with the Division for possible further action relating to Haynes' police officer certification.

V. The names of officers involved for whom misconduct was substantiated:

**Cpl. Kenneth Haynes was substantiated for the following violations of Delaware State Police Policy:**

**Rules and Regulations #1** (Respectful Workplace and Anti-discrimination Policy) – 1 count

**Rules and Regulations #4** (*Conduct Unbecoming*) – 1 count

**Rules and Regulations #5** (*Neglect of Duty*) – 1 count

VI. Any Discipline Assigned in Connection with the Incident:

None due to Haynes' resignation.

VII. The Employment Status of Disciplined Officers:

Resigned, as noted.

