

Delaware Criminal Justice Council

11 Del. C. §9210 Authorized Disclosures

Agency Information

Law Enforcement Agency: Newark Police Department

Date of Incident: 08/27/25

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."

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:

Joseph McCreary (McCreary), a certified PA Police Officer, applied for employment with the Newark Police Department (NPD) in 2025. After passing the testing phase, a background check was conducted and McCreary was ultimately hired. He completed the POST certification and was placed on Field Training.

While he was assigned to Field Training, the NPD became aware that McCreary may be on a “Brady List” in Pennsylvania, which would impact his ability to testify and function as a police officer in Delaware.

It was determined that McCreary failed to disclose this information and that he falsified and omitted additional information during the application and background investigation process. The material that was omitted and falsified in his Personal History Questionnaire (PHQ) was of such significance that it would have disqualified McCreary from being hired as a police officer. As a result, McCreary’s falsification and omissions became the subject of an internal investigation.

II. Investigatory Steps:

Upon learning this information, McCreary was formally notified and immediately placed on administrative leave. The Office of Professional Standards initiated an internal investigation.

III. Evidence Collected:

PHQ document, video recording of McCreary’s interview, memos and documents from previous employers, preliminary investigative memo from the Administration and Investigations Bureau Commander.

IV. Conclusions Reached:

McCreary falsified and omitted material information during the application and background investigation process. Because this information was not disclosed, he was hired by the City of Newark. The omissions and falsifications were significant and would have disqualified him from employment as a Newark police officer. During his interview with the Professional Standards Officer, McCreary provided false responses to several questions. The

following day, McCreary resigned. The investigation concluded that McCreary violated departmental policy including Sections 1.1 (Standard of Conduct) and 1.20a (Truthfulness) and this determination would have resulted in McCreary's termination.

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

Joseph McCreary

VI. Any Discipline Assigned in Connection with the Incident:

McCreary resigned on September 23, 2025, and prior to the completion of the investigation. The Professional Standards Officer completed the investigation which would have resulted in termination.

VII. The Employment Status of Disciplined Officers:

McCreary resigned in lieu of termination and voluntarily relinquished his POST certification.