



LEXINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
**PERSONNEL ORDER**  
 Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE  
 October 27, 2025

EFFECTIVE DATE  
 October 27, 2025

NUMBER  
 PO:25-433

TO:  
 SUSPENSION WITHOUT PAY

AMENDS:

INDEX AS:  
 OFFICER  
 ADAM CERVASIO / 58511

RESCINDS:

Effective October 27<sup>th</sup> – November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025, Officer Adam Cervasio will be placed in a five (5) week suspended without pay status for listed violations:

1. Four (4) Week (160 Hours) Suspension Without Pay for G.O. 1973-02L, Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.11 -- Unsatisfactory Performance / 1.36 Insubordination / 1.02 Misconduct
2. One (1) Week (40 Hours) Suspension Without Pay for G.O. 1973-02L, Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct

Officer Cervasio is not authorized to enter any Government work site or other employee only area while suspended. Officer Cervasio must surrender any Police Department and Urban County Government property, including keys and identification.

This was approved through Council on October 9, 2025.

*Lawrence B. Weathers*

Lawrence B. Weathers  
 Chief of Police

LBW/rmh

LEXINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

AGREEMENT OF CONFORMITY WITH KRS 95.450 / 15.520 AND RELEASE

FORM 113 (8/20)

An allegation has been made that: Officer Adam Cervasio 58511

has committed the offense of:  
Unsatisfactory Performance, Insubordination, Misconduct

which constitutes misconduct under the provisions of KRS 95.450 and/or KRS 15.520

(list other applicable law or rule)

General Order 1973-02L, Disciplinary Procedures, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.11 Unsatisfactory Performance / 1.36 Insubordination / 1.02 Misconduct

in that on the June day(s) of 22, 20 25 he/she allegedly:

It has be demonstrably proven that Officer Cervasio ignored a direct order from a supervisor when attempting to make contact with a suspect from an incident earlier in the day. He was then unprofessional in a verbal exchange with the suspect which caused concern about his professional behavior and the expectations policy demands.

Officer Cervasio has also been issued multiple \_\_\_\_\_ for incidents that have not reached the level of professionalism expected by supervisors and LPD policies since February 2025.

---

I have read KRS 95.450, 95.460 and 15.520, and attest that I fully understand all rights guaranteed by these statutes, including the rights to have formal charges preferred and a hearing conducted on those charges.

Further, I, with knowledge of the provisions and my rights under KRS 95.450, 95.460, and 15.520 and in consideration of the recommendation of the Chief of Police of the Lexington Police Department, acknowledge that the appropriate punishment for this conduct is:

Four (4) week suspension (160) hours Without Pay

---

I do hereby voluntarily accept the above disciplinary action, provided that the punishment awarded by the Urban County Council will not exceed the above recommendation of the Chief of Police.

If the Urban County Council rejects the above recommendation, I will be so notified, in which case I may withdraw my acceptance, and will be entitled to all rights, as applicable, under KRS 95.450, 95.460 and 15.520, and this agreement will not be used against me or by me in any hearing in determination of my guilt of punishment.

In further consideration of the acceptance of the above recommendation and penalty by the Urban County Council, I do for myself, my heirs, legal representatives, as assigns hereby expressly release and forever discharge the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government, its officers, agents, employees, and their successors and assigns from all claims, demands, actions, damages or causes of action and from all liability for damages of whatsoever kind, nature of description that I ever had, now have or may have against the aforementioned entities created by or arising out of the action contained herein.

Adam Cervasio  
Employee Signature

TUE. 09-16-2025  
Date

James W. Keith  
Chief of Police Signature

TU 09/16/2025  
Date

**ACTION BY URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL**

10/9/2025

APPROVE ABOVE RECOMMENDATION

DISAPPROVE ABOVE RECOMMENDATION

APL  
Signature of Authorized Representative of  
Urban County Council

**SUSPENSION SERVICE GUIDELINES:**

Suspensions will be served as outlined in General Order series 1973-02 Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers.



Lexington-Fayette Urban County  
Division of Police  
**MEMORANDUM**  
Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE

September 8, 2025

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER  
COP:  
25-0186

TO:

Kenneth Armstrong, Commissioner  
Department of Public Safety

SUBJECT:

Disciplinary Recommendation  
PIU2025F-009 / PIU2025F-011  
Officer Adam Cervasio

FROM:

Lawrence B. Weathers  
Chief of Police

I met with Officer Adam Cervasio on September 4, 2025, and have determined this as Improper Conduct for violation of:

**PIU2025F-009 (#1 Red Folder) –**

- General Order 1973-02L – Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.36 – Insubordination
- General Order 1973-02L – Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 102 - Misconduct
- General Order 1973-02L - Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.11 – Unsatisfactory Performance

For the above charges, I recommend four (4) week suspension (160) hours Without Pay – PIU2025-009

**PIU2025F-011 (#2 Red Folder) –**

- General Order 1973-02L – Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 102 - Misconduct

For the above charge, I recommend one (1) week suspension without pay, to be taken consecutively with the above suspension – PIU2025F-011

Officer Cervasio accepted this discipline on September 6, 2025.

I am requesting this to be presented before Council on Thursday, September 18, 2025.

*Lawrence B. Weathers*

Lawrence B. Weathers  
Chief of Police

LBW/rmh

Attachment



LEXINGTON POLICE  
DEPARTMENT  
**MEMORANDUM**  
Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE  
July 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2025

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER  
PIU 25-058

<p>TO: Lawrence Weathers Chief of Police</p>	<p>SUBJECT: Summary of Formal Complaint on Officer Adam Cervasio PIU 2025F-009</p>
<p>FROM: Lieutenant Joe Anderson Bureau of Investigation Public Integrity Unit</p>	

Sir,

This memorandum will provide a synopsis of the investigation; however, other supporting documents may be viewed in conjunction with this memorandum.

On June 30<sup>th</sup>, Lieutenant Nicholas Whitcomb filed a formal complaint against Officer Adam Cervasio that alleged the following:

*On June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025, Officer Cervasio ignored a direct order from a sergeant and attempted to stop a vehicle. Officer Cervasio also hung up the phone when the sergeant called him to advise him not to initiate further contact with the suspect.*

*If the above allegations are true, then Officer Cervasio has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.36 Insubordination, which states an officer is insubordinate when they fail to follow a lawful order given by a supervisor, or they use disrespectful or abusive language or actions towards a supervisor. Insubordination is deliberate malicious behavior and misconduct which negatively impacts the efficient and effective performance of department operations.*

*On June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025, during the above incident, Officer Cervasio can be observed on BWC striking or running over an object with his vehicle. Officer Cervasio also continued the vehicle pursuit after he lost sight of the vehicle, violating the department's Emergency and Pursuit Driving policy. Officer Cervasio did not mention either occurrence to supervisors. Officer Cervasio also engaged in a verbal exchange with the arrested subject that was unprofessional. All of these decisions served to not reflect most favorably on the department and cast doubt on Officer Cervasio's integrity, honesty, judgement, and character.*

*If the above allegations are true, then Officer Cervasio has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct, which states officers shall conduct themselves at all times, both on and off duty, in such a manner as to reflect most favorably on the department and to not cast doubt on the officer's integrity, honesty, judgment, or character. Misconduct of an officer shall include that which tends to bring the department into disrepute or reflects discredit upon the officer as an*

employee of the department, or that which tends to impair the operation and efficiency of the department or officer.

Officer Cervasio has been issued *since February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2025. He has been consistently late to work, fails to manage his time appropriately, displays poor decision making, and was not physically prepared for work. During the aforementioned pursuit incident on June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025, Officer Cervasio engaged in unnecessary and inaccurate radio transmissions while another officer was in a foot pursuit, preventing that officer from accessing the radio. Officer Cervasio also requested emergency care personnel perform a task that was unnecessary and wasteful. These decisions are a pattern of behavior for Officer Cervasio and he has shown an inability to perform assigned tasks. Officer Cervasio has failed to perform his duties in a manner which will tend to establish and maintain the highest standard of efficiency in carrying out the functions and objectives of the department.*

*If the above allegations are true, then Officer Cervasio has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.11 Unsatisfactory Performance, which states Officers shall familiarize themselves with all rules, regulations, directives, policies and procedures of the department, and maintain sufficient competency to properly perform their duties and to assume the responsibilities of their rank and assignments. Officers shall perform their duties in a manner which will tend to establish and maintain the highest standard of efficiency in carrying out the functions and objectives of the department. Unsatisfactory performance/inefficiency may be demonstrated by:*

- 1. Repetitious or consistent lack of knowledge of the application of laws required to be enforced.*
- 2. An inability to perform assigned tasks.*
- 3. The failure to conform to work standards established for the officer's rank or position. In addition to other indications of unsatisfactory performance/inefficiency, the following will be considered prima facie evidence of unsatisfactory performance/inefficiency: repeated poor performance evaluations, or a written record of repeated infractions of rules, regulations, policies, and procedures.*

## **Investigation**

The BWC footage of Officer Cervasio was reviewed from the June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025 vehicle pursuit. The dispatch audio was also reviewed from that incident. Memorandums from Lieutenant Whitcomb, Sergeant Ada, Sergeant Sullivan, Officer Acree, and Officer Cervasio for the vehicle pursuit BlueTeam report were reviewed. I also reviewed Officer Cervasio's

. Interviews of Lieutenant Whitcomb, Sergeant Ada, Sergeant Sullivan, and Officer Cervasio were conducted.

## **Interview with Lieutenant Whitcomb**

Lieutenant Whitcomb was interviewed on July 3<sup>rd</sup> at 1111 hours in the PIU office. Lieutenant M. Taylor was also present.

Whitcomb has been the lieutenant for \_\_\_\_\_ . He was aware Sergeant Sullivan has been working with Cervasio on his struggles and was told Cervasio was late to work because his family had not adapted to his schedule on day shift and was still living a second shift-type schedule. This resulted in Cervasio staying up late. He was told about officers seeing Cervasio sleeping in his vehicle behind Central roll call. Whitcomb also relayed an example of poor decision making where Cervasio was working off-duty at the Apple Store and responded to a nearby priority call. Cervasio continued with the priority call and stayed there for approximately 3 hours. This only became known when he submitted an overtime slip that no supervisor had knowledge of. Whitcomb stated it appeared to be unnecessary for Cervasio to stay that long on the call and he never asked permission or sought guidance from a supervisor. He also stated he became aware of at least one occasion where Cervasio was on call and had to book in evidence and type an arrest report (maybe multiple reports) and he would begin at 1200 hours but not get completely done until 2000 hours.

Whitcomb recalled an incident on Lima Drive where Cervasio approached a car with 3-4 people in it and never asked for backup. The situation deteriorated and ended with Cervasio deploying his taser. Cervasio also stopped a stolen vehicle that was behind him by turning on his emergency equipment while still in front of the stolen car and conducted the traffic stop that way.

For the June 22<sup>nd</sup> vehicle pursuit, it was determined Sergeant Ada actually hung up the phone on Cervasio, according to Sergeant Ada's memorandum that was reviewed by Whitcomb.

Whitcomb was not working the day of the incident and had not listened to any dispatch audio. He gathered his understanding of the entire incident from reading the memorandums submitted and watching the BWC footage. He was in agreement with Sergeant Ada's decision not to pursue and not attempt to stop the vehicle any further given the lack of resources (RTIC, Air Support) and the lack of violent criminal charges and the driver's increasingly reckless flight.

Regarding the alleged striking of an object or curb by Cervasio, Whitcomb also thinks Cervasio's Tahoe struck something given the BWC footage and the audible "thud" in the video. Whitcomb stated Cervasio advised he was swerving around Officer Acree.

Whitcomb stated once the suspect from the fleeing vehicle was in custody on June 22<sup>nd</sup>, he asked a question, with Cervasio replying "You, motherfucker."

Whitcomb stated he thinks Cervasio has always been receptive to Sergeant Sullivan's supervision and correction, with the exception he seemed surprised at times that certain things were occurring and noticed by others. The interview ended at 1128 hours.

### **Interview with Sergeant Ada**

Sergeant Ada was interviewed in the PIU office on July 2<sup>nd</sup> at 1053 hours. Lieutenant M. Taylor was also present.

Ada stated he was working on June 22<sup>nd</sup> and officers were attempting to locate a stolen vehicle taken from the Sportsman's Motel. He advised Officer Carter first observed the vehicle in the area of Ohio St. when the vehicle fled at a high rate of speed. Ada stated approximately an

hour later, officers again observed the vehicle and attempted to stop it. The vehicle fled at a high rate of speed again, running a red light on Oliver Lewis Way at W. Hight St. This can be heard at 12:05 in the dispatch audio file. Ada advised since the Air Support Unit and RTIC were not available, they were to disregard any further on that stolen vehicle. This can be heard at 12:38 in the dispatch audio file. The dispatcher repeats this directive at 13:03 and at 13:15, repeats the fact no RTIC is available to assist.

About 45 minutes to an hour later, Ada heard Officer Cervasio state he was on his way to the area of Pemberton St. to locate the same stolen vehicle that hit on a FLOCK camera in that area. Ada called Cervasio on the phone and asked him what his intention was in trying to locate the stolen vehicle. Ada advised Cervasio told him he would try to stop it again and hopefully the driver would "bail" and they would then have a foot pursuit. Ada also thinks Cervasio "alluded to pursuing it or the driver would bail". Ada continued to ask Cervasio questions and realized Cervasio was not responding. Cervasio then advised Ada they had a visual on the stolen car so Ada hung up the phone so as not to distract Cervasio and inhibit officer safety.

Ada and Sullivan proceed to the scene as he listened to the radio traffic. Once they figured out the criminal charges and ensured everyone was safe, Ada and Sullivan pulled Cervasio to the side and spoke with him. Ada stated he was explaining the potential risks of what occurred and why he made the decision earlier to not re-engage the suspect vehicle and Cervasio responded with "I get it, you're throwing all these Daniel Whitley questions at me." or a similar statement. Ada recalled the dispatcher repeating his directive on the radio to ensure officers were clear. Ada also stated Cervasio admitted he turned on his emergency lights to initiate contact with the suspect vehicle before they fled.

Ada agreed based on their memorandums, Acree never had any intention of trying to stop the stolen vehicle and continued straight (on a one-way street) as the stolen vehicle turned right. As it happened, the stolen vehicle then turned left, going the wrong way down a one-way, thus travelling in the same direction as both Acree (had already gone straight) and Cervasio, who had already committed to following Acree on Chestnut St. The vehicle continued the wrong way on Pemberton St. before colliding with another vehicle on Breckenridge St., near Pemberton St.

Ada stated he spoke to Acree and Acree advised he had no intention of trying to stop the vehicle and was hoping to find it stopped. Acree's BWC became activated when Cervasio "chirped" his emergency lights and siren. The interview ended at 1103 hours.

### **Interview with Sergeant Sullivan**

Sergeant Sullivan was interviewed in the PIU office on July 7<sup>th</sup> at 1117 hours. Lieutenant M. Taylor was also present.

Sergeant Sullivan has been Officer Cervasio's supervisor since Cervasio came to day shift from second shift on January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2025. Sullivan relayed the same story regarding the pursuit on June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025. He added in reviewing Cervasio's BWC, Cervasio can be heard saying "Where are you at turd?" while searching for the stolen vehicle after it fled for the second time. He also made the comment he did not care if his BWC was on.

After the collision and the suspect was in custody, Sullivan observed Cervasio treating him for his visible minor abrasions and noticed the suspect was "going through the motions like he was hurt." Cervasio asked Sullivan if he wanted him to administer Narcan to him. EC personnel were on scene and asked Cervasio why would he administer Narcan as it would be wasteful. Cervasio replied "I'm aware of that."

Sullivan spoke to Cervasio the next day and asked Cervasio why is disregarded Sergeant Ada. Cervasio advised he did not intend to do so and spoke about his frustrations and anger with our pursuit policy. Cervasio then spoke about his anger and frustration carrying over into his personal life.

Sullivan stated he initially just issued verbal counseling to Cervasio for being late to work as he knew it can be a tough transition. Sullivan advised Cervasio continued to be late, usually three out of the four days he worked. Cervasio advised Sullivan his family still had a second shift schedule and this impacted the time he went to bed, which impacted the time he woke up. Sullivan mentioned going back to second shift but Cervasio was adamant his family wanted him to stay on first shift. Sullivan stated the tardiness continued to be an issue and he began to

Sullivan knew Cervasio had issues with time management and completing tasks on time from his time working with him on second shift. He stated Sergeant E. Thomas created a performance development plan for Cervasio to help him succeed. Sullivan began to see the same issue arise and monitored some calls to see what happened. Sullivan mentioned Cervasio was at roll call after an arrest and stayed marked out on completing the arrest report for five hours and 32 minutes. Another report took him four hours to complete. There were other similar instances and each time, Cervasio essentially said that was how long it took to complete the report. Cervasio stated there were no distractions or any other issue that contributed to the lengthy times.

Sullivan discussed the aforementioned call on Lima Dr. with the occupied vehicle that resulted in a taser deployment. Sullivan was concerned with his overall decision-making (advising he was 10-4 with 3-4 people in a car, stopping his handcuffing to key up his radio to advise dispatch he had the person in custody). Sullivan stated on "numerous calls" they will ask Cervasio a question because something did not make sense and Cervasio was unable to explain his position in a way that was understandable. Sullivan would then give Cervasio advise and while Cervasio would eventually agree, Sullivan wonders if it just done to end the discussion. There were multiple collision reports where Cervasio would put the wrong vehicle as Unit #1 and his reasoning was not logical or correct. An example is Cervasio would assume a vehicle was speeding or ran stop sign or red light prior to being struck while having the right-of-way. Another example is Cervasio ruled a driver was Unit #1 because he stopped for a bicyclist and was then rear-ended. Sullivan also advised other officers would offer advice or try and help Cervasio and he would become defensive or argumentative.

Sullivan stated Cervasio seems receptive to supervision but continues to have the same issues. Cervasio is not at the level expected for an officer with five years of experience. The interview was completed at 1119 hours.

## Interview with Officer Cervasio

Officer Cervasio was interviewed in the PIU office on July 7<sup>th</sup> at 1205 hours. He was represented by Nick Oleson. Lieutenant M. Taylor was also present.

- It was confirmed he did not hang up on Sergeant Ada when he spotted the stolen vehicle. Sergeant Ada hung up as he did not want to distract Cervasio.
- Heard Sergeant Ada's transmission about no further attempts to stop the stolen vehicle, stated it "happened earlier in the morning prior to the encounter".
  - The directive given by Sergeant Ada, and repeated by the dispatcher, occurred at approximately 1200 hours according to CAD.
  - The attempt to stop by Cervasio (third attempt, resulting in the collision) occurred at 1248 hours. There was a 48-minute gap between the directive and Cervasio's re-engagement.
- Knew the reasons given for the order included the risk presented by the reckless nature of the suspect's driving/flight.
- Knew RTIC and Air Support were not available.
- Heard another officer go off-channel and advise the stolen vehicle hit on a FLOCK camera in the area of E. Fifth St. They proceed to that area in an attempt to locate the stolen vehicle.
- He advised primary dispatch of their intention and then receives a phone call from Sergeant Ada. Sergeant Ada asks him what his plans are regarding the stolen vehicle, reminding him "didn't we say wave off earlier?" At this point, Cervasio observes the stolen vehicle and one other officer.
- Cervasio is westbound on E. Sixth St., stopped at the stop sign at Chestnut St. The stolen vehicle is northbound on Chestnut St. stopped at the stop sign on E. Sixth St. There is another marked Tahoe behind stolen vehicle.
- Makes direct eye contact with the suspect in the stolen vehicle, then activates his emergency lights and "chirps" his siren.
  - Admits this was done in an effort to stop the stolen vehicle and initiate contact.
  - Stated his thought process upon seeing the suspect again and after Sergeant Ada had given the directive, was "was the crime's happening in front of me... the crime is occurring right in front of me." "Whatever timeframe was between that (the directive at 1200 hours) ...I felt we'd had enough space between it." "And then somebody else discovered (it) returns to our area and I'm backing somebody and I happen to be the one that gets on the radio."
  - Remembered the quarterly pursuit training and agreed the only crime he had was a property crime, which is one of the scenarios given every three months.
  - After a discussion, he did agree and seemed to understand how and why Sergeant Ada made his decision and the expectation that he is responsible for the same decision in the absence of a supervisor.
- The stolen vehicle squalled its tires and turns right onto E. Sixth St. and then turns the wrong way (left, north) onto Pemberton St., where he continues.
- The other officer continued straight onto Chestnut St., and Cervasio followed him.
- The other officer and Cervasio turn onto Breckenridge St. from Chestnut St. when the other officer advised dispatch the stolen vehicle has been involved in a collision.

- The striking of the curb or other object alleged in the formal complaint occurs at this time when Cervasio is making an evasive maneuver to avoid a collision with the other officer.
- Stated since the suspect fled on foot, "it's not uncommon in these interactions...somebody calls for perimeter and K-9."
- Does not know if his radio transmissions prohibited the other officer (in foot pursuit) from obtaining the radio and apologized if it did.
  - Reviewing the other officer's BWC and Cervasio's BWC in "multit-cam" mode, it does not appear Cervasio "covered" or "stepped-on" the other officer with his radio traffic.
- Asked "I'll Narcan him if you want me to." (9:53 of his BWC). EC told him not to. He replied "I'm aware" to EC personnel regarding it being a waste of Narcan, with EC personnel replying "Well, you just said...Narcan him to Narcan him."
- Admits he replied "You, motherfucker!" when the suspect asked a question (3:46 of his BWC).
  - He did tell Sergeant Sullivan about his exchange at the scene.
  - He agrees this was unprofessional and added this was uncharacteristic of him.
- Agrees he told Sergeant Sullivan he was angry and frustrated about our pursuit policy and it prevents us from doing our job.
- Lives in \_\_\_\_\_ and transferred to 1<sup>st</sup> shift January, 2025. Advised he is often late to work because of a lack of sleep since his family are still on a second shift schedule.
  - Recalled one time where there was snow on his car, which made him late.
  - He tries to go to bed around 2230 or 2300 hours. He advised he had stayed up as late as 0100 and 0200 hours.
  - He agreed on the expectation that we arrive to work on time and must account for variables, such as driving time and weather.
  - He has changed his routine so he only has to shower and get dressed before work.
- The day he was found asleep behind Central Roll Call was the day after a storm hit Madison County. He and his family sheltered in a laundry closet and he went to sleep at 0200 hours.
- Regarding issues with his time management, he knows two incidents where he was getting off-duty around 2000 hours had to do with "bit of fatigue and trying to write out everything."
- Has been seeing \_\_\_\_\_ since 2024 and she is scheduled to ride with him so she can observe for root causes of any issues.

The interview was concluded at 1310 hours.

### **Summary of Formal Charges With Findings**

Each allegation on the formal complaint will be examined in order with a summary afterward.

*On June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025, Officer Cervasio ignored a direct order from a sergeant and attempted to stop a vehicle.* This allegation was found to be true.

*Officer Cervasio also hung up the phone when the sergeant called him to advise him not to initiate further contact with the suspect. This did not occur and this allegation is unfounded.*

*If the above allegations are true, then Officer Cervasio has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.36 Insubordination, which states an officer is insubordinate when they fail to follow a lawful order given by a supervisor, or they use disrespectful or abusive language or actions towards a supervisor. Insubordination is deliberate malicious behavior and misconduct which negatively impacts the efficient and effective performance of department operations.*

It has been demonstrably proven that Officer Cervasio ignored a direct order from a supervisor and violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.36 Insubordination.

*On June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025, during the above incident, Officer Cervasio can be observed on BWC striking or running over an object with his vehicle. Cervasio advised he did not strike anything but was taking an evasive maneuver to avoid colliding with Officer Acree, "cutting right, then left" according to Officer Cervasio. Officer Cervasio's vehicle was taken for inspection and no damage was observed.*

*Officer Cervasio also continued the vehicle pursuit after he lost sight of the vehicle, violating the department's Emergency and Pursuit Driving policy. Officer Cervasio did not mention either occurrence to supervisors. This is unfounded. According to memorandums submitted, combined with the interview of Officer Cervasio, officers state the vehicle already turned the wrong way (north) on Pemberton St. when another officer continued on a straight path (north) on Chestnut St., which is the correct way on that one-way street. Officer Cervasio followed that officer and neither officer had their emergency equipment activated and both were obeying all traffic laws. It is reasonable for Officer Cervasio to follow the other officer for officer-safety reasons and while the initial attempt at stopping the stolen vehicle was clearly the wrong decision, following behind another officer for less than two blocks is understandable. The stolen vehicle was involved in a collision on Breckenridge St. near Pemberton St., and the other officer could see the collision from Chestnut St. at Breckenridge St.*

*Officer Cervasio also engaged in a verbal exchange with the arrested subject that was unprofessional. This allegation is true and supported by BWC footage and Officer Cervasio's interview.*

*All of these decisions served to not reflect most favorably on the department and cast doubt on Officer Cervasio's integrity, honesty, judgement, and character.*

*If the above allegations are true, then Officer Cervasio has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct, which states officers shall conduct themselves at all times, both on and off duty, in such a manner as to reflect most favorably on the department and to not cast doubt on the officer's integrity, honesty, judgment, or character. Misconduct of an officer shall include that which tends to bring the department into disrepute or reflects discredit upon the officer as an*

*employee of the department, or that which tends to impair the operation and efficiency of the department or officer.*

No damage was located on Officer Cervasio's vehicle so it cannot be stated conclusively he struck anything while driving.

Officer Cervasio followed another officer after the stolen vehicle fled an attempted traffic stop. Officer Cervasio did not continue the pursuit after losing sight of the stolen vehicle.

It has been demonstrably proven that Officer Cervasio engaged in a verbal exchange with an arrested subject that was unprofessional. This is the only portion of the Misconduct charge that was founded.

*Officer Cervasio has been* *since February 4<sup>th</sup>,*  
*2025. He has been consistently late to work, fails to manage his time appropriately, displays poor decision making, and was not physically prepared for work.* Officer Cervasio has been consistently late for work and was found to be asleep in his marked vehicle one day while on-duty. There have been at least two occurrences when Officer Cervasio has taken longer than acceptable to complete his normal patrol tasks, such as booking evidence and writing arrest reports. There have been numerous collision reports Sergeant Sullivan had to send back because Officer Cervasio used incorrect or assumed facts to justify who was Unit #1. It is agreed Officer Cervasio has displayed poor decision making.

*During the aforementioned pursuit incident on June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025, Officer Cervasio engaged in unnecessary and inaccurate radio transmissions while another officer was in a foot pursuit, preventing that officer from accessing the radio.* Officer Cervasio's radio traffic was not appropriate in its timing or content. It was confirmed the officer in foot pursuit did not attempt to transmit during Officer Cervasio's radio transmissions, however he would have been unable to give Officer Cervasio's decision to transmit over the radio instead of giving the officer in foot pursuit priority. This allegation is true.

*Officer Cervasio also requested emergency care personnel perform a task that was unnecessary and wasteful.* Officer Cervasio did volunteer to administer Narcan if any personnel wanted him to. Sergeant Sullivan deferred to EC personnel on scene who quickly corrected Officer Cervasio and advised him it was not necessary. This allegation as stated is unfounded but the content continues to show a pattern of poor decision making, especially given Officer Cervasio's response to EC personnel being "I'm aware."

*These decisions are a pattern of behavior for Officer Cervasio and he has shown an inability to perform assigned tasks. Officer Cervasio has failed to perform his duties in a manner which will tend to establish and maintain the highest standard of efficiency in carrying out the functions and objectives of the department.*

It has been demonstrably proven that Officer Cervasio has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.11 Unsatisfactory Performance, which states Officers shall familiarize themselves with all rules, regulations,

directives, policies and procedures of the department, and maintain sufficient competency to properly perform their duties and to assume the responsibilities of their rank and assignments. Officers shall perform their duties in a manner which will tend to establish and maintain the highest standard of efficiency in carrying out the functions and objectives of the department.

### Conclusion

It has been demonstrably proven that Officer Cervasio ignored a direct order from a supervisor and violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.36 Insubordination.

It has been demonstrably proven that Officer Cervasio engaged in a verbal exchange with an arrested subject that was unprofessional and violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct, which states officers shall conduct themselves at all times, both on and off duty, in such a manner as to reflect most favorably on the department and to not cast doubt on the officer's integrity, honesty, judgment, or character. Misconduct of an officer shall include that which tends to bring the department into disrepute or reflects discredit upon the officer as an employee of the department, or that which tends to impair the operation and efficiency of the department or officer.

It has been demonstrably proven that Officer Cervasio has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.11 Unsatisfactory Performance, which states Officers shall familiarize themselves with all rules, regulations, directives, policies and procedures of the department, and maintain sufficient competency to properly perform their duties and to assume the responsibilities of their rank and assignments. Officers shall perform their duties in a manner which will tend to establish and maintain the highest standard of efficiency in carrying out the functions and objectives of the department.

---

Lieutenant Joe Anderson  
Bureau of Investigation  
Public Integrity Unit

Cc: file -- PIU 2025F-009



Lexington Police Department  
**MEMORANDUM**  
 Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE  
 June 30, 2025

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER  
 PIU: 25-045

TO:  
 Assistant Chief Jacqueline Newman  
 Bureau of Patrol

SUBJECT:  
 FORMAL COMPLAINT

FROM:  
 Lieutenant Joe Anderson  
 Bureau of Investigation  
 Public Integrity Unit

**COMPLAINANT:** Lieutenant Nicolas Whitcomb

**ACCUSED OFC.:** Officer Adam Cervasio

**ALLEGATION:** Violating General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule - 1.36 Insubordination, General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 - Misconduct, and General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.11 - Unsatisfactory Performance.

**ALLEGED CIRCUMSTANCES:** On 06/22/2025, Officer Cervasio ignored a direct order from a sergeant and attempted to stop a vehicle. Officer Cervasio also hung up the phone when the sergeant called him to advise him not to initiate further contact with the suspect. On 6/22/2025, during the above incident, Officer Cervasio can be observed on BWC striking or running over an object with his vehicle. Officer Cervasio also continued the vehicle pursuit after he lost sight of the vehicle, violating the department's Emergency and Pursuit Driving policy. Officer Cervasio did not mention either occurrence to his supervisors. Officer Cervasio also engaged in a verbal exchange with the arrested subject that was unprofessional. All of these decisions served to not reflect most favorably on the department and cast doubt on Officer Cervasio's integrity, honesty, judgement, or character. Officer Cervasio has been since 2/4/2025. He has been consistently late to work, fails to manage his time appropriately, displays poor decision making, and was not physically prepared for work. During the aforementioned pursuit incident on 6/22/2025, Officer Cervasio engaged in unnecessary and inaccurate radio transmissions while another officer was in a foot pursuit, preventing that officer from accessing the radio. Officer Cervasio also requested emergency care personnel perform a task that was unnecessary and wasteful. These decisions are a pattern of behavior for Officer Cervasio and he has shown an inability to perform assigned tasks. Officer Cervasio has failed to perform his duties in a manner which will tend to establish and maintain the highest standard of efficiency in carrying out the functions and objectives of the department.

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

- The Bureau Commander and Officer Cervasio should sign the Acknowledgment Sheet and process this complaint.
- The Commanding Officer should provide the attached copy of the Form 111 and the Officer's Rights Packet to Officer Cervasio.
- Officer Cervasio should contact the Public Integrity Unit to arrange for a time to provide a formal statement.

	<u>DATE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
Bureau Commander <u>D. Seft</u>	<u>6-30-25</u>	<u>1409</u>
Supervisor <u>[Signature] 46626</u>	<u>6-30-2025</u>	<u>1224</u>
Officer <u>Adam Cervasio, 58511</u>	<u>MON 06-30-2025</u>	<u>1223 HRS</u>

Accused officer would like the Public Integrity Unit to notify the FOP President or their designee that a formal complaint is filed against them. (Circle One) YES or NO

Returned to the Public Integrity Unit Joe Anderson 07-01-2025 0800

Joe Anderson  
Lieutenant Joe Anderson  
Bureau of Investigation  
Public Integrity Unit

mrv

enclosures

cc: Chief Lawrence Weathers  
file – PIU2025F-009

**LEXINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
FORMAL COMPLAINT FORM**

FORM 111 (2/24)

File #: PIU2025F-009

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Employee Involved: Officer Adam Cervasio			Employee #: 58511	Hire Date: 01/20/2020
Present Assignment: Bureau of Patrol / Central Sector				
Complainant: Lt. Nicholas Whitcomb #46626			Complainant Address: 150 E. Main St., Lexington, Ky 40507	
Complainant Phone #: (859) 258-3600	Alternate Complainant Phone #: N/A		Complainant Email: N/A	
Date of Incident: Various	Time of Incident: Various	Location of Incident: Various	Date and Time Reported: 06/23/2025 / 1500	How Reported: <input type="checkbox"/> Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phone <input type="checkbox"/> Person <input type="checkbox"/> Email

**DESCRIPTION OF ALLEGATIONS:**

On 06/22/2025, Officer Cervasio ignored a direct order from a sergeant and attempted to stop a vehicle. Officer Cervasio also hung up the phone when the sergeant called him to advise him not to initiate further contact with the suspect.

If the above allegations are true, then Officer Cervasio has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.36 Insubordination, which states an officer is insubordinate when they fail to follow a lawful order given by a supervisor, or they use disrespectful or abusive language or actions towards a supervisor. Insubordination is deliberate malicious behavior and misconduct which negatively impacts the efficient and effective performance of department operations.

On 6/22/2025, during the above incident, Officer Cervasio can be observed on BWC striking or running over an object with his vehicle. Officer Cervasio also continued the vehicle pursuit after he lost sight of the vehicle, violating the department's Emergency and Pursuit Driving policy. Officer Cervasio did not mention either occurrence to his supervisors. Officer Cervasio also engaged in a verbal exchange with the arrested subject that was unprofessional. All of these decisions served to not reflect most favorably on the department and cast doubt on Officer Cervasio's integrity, honesty, judgement, or character.

If the above allegations are true, then Officer Cervasio has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct, which states Officers shall conduct themselves at all times, both on and off duty, in such a manner as to reflect most favorably on the department and to not cast doubt on the officer's integrity, honesty, judgment, or character. Misconduct of an officer shall include that which tends to bring the department into disrepute or reflects discredit upon the officer as an employee of the department, or that which tends to impair the operation and efficiency of the department or officer.

Continued on page 2...

I swear/affirm that the facts set out in the allegations herein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Complainant Signature: *ncw* Date: 6-30-25  
 Subscribed and sworn before me this date: 6-30-25 *Melanie R. Votaw KY 2019*  
 (Date) (Notary)  
 My Commission Expires: 2-3-2029

**Witness:**  
 Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

File #: PIU2025F-009

Employee: Officer Adam Cervasio

**CHIEF OF POLICE**

[Finding: PC=Proper Conduct, IC=Improper Conduct, IE=Insufficient Evidence, PF=Policy Failure, UC=Unfounded Complaint]

Finding Policy Violation

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.36 Insurbordination
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.11 Unsatisfactory Performance

Chief of Police Determination:  Case Be Closed  Corrective Training  Recommend Disciplinary Action (see below)

Materials Reviewed: I reviewed PIU Synopsis

Comments:  
For PIU 2025F-009 - I recommend a four (4) week suspension (160 Hours) Without Pay

Signature: Lawrence B. Weathers Date: 9/8/2025

**DISCIPLINARY REVIEW BOARD**

Finding Policy Violation


Disciplinary Review Board Recommendation:  Case Be Closed  Corrective Training  Disciplinary Action (see below)

Comments:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**CHIEF OF POLICE FINAL DETERMINATION**

Case Be Closed  Corrective Training  Recommend Disciplinary Action (see below)

Comments:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**ALLEGATIONS CONTINUED:**

Officer Cervasio has been late to work, fails to manage his time appropriately, displays poor decision making, and was not physically prepared for work. During the aforementioned pursuit incident on 6/22/2025, Officer Cervasio engaged in unnecessary and inaccurate radio transmissions while another officer was in a foot pursuit, preventing that officer from accessing the radio. Officer Cervasio also requested emergency care personnel perform a task that was unnecessary and wasteful. These decisions are a pattern of behavior for Officer Cervasio and he has shown an inability to perform assigned tasks. Officer Cervasio has failed to perform his duties in a manner which will tend to establish and maintain the highest standard of efficiency in carrying out the functions and objectives of the department.

If the above allegations are true, then Officer Cervasio has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.11 Unsatisfactory Performance, which states Officers shall familiarize themselves with all rules, regulations, directives, policies and procedures of the department, and maintain sufficient competency to properly perform their duties and to assume the responsibilities of their rank and assignments. Officers shall perform their duties in a manner which will tend to establish and maintain the highest standard of efficiency in carrying out the functions and objectives of the department. Unsatisfactory performance/inefficiency may be demonstrated by:

1. Repetitious or consistent lack of knowledge of the application of laws required to be enforced.
2. An inability to perform assigned tasks.
3. The failure to conform to work standards established for the officer's rank or position.

In addition to other indications of unsatisfactory performance/inefficiency, the following will be considered prima facie evidence of unsatisfactory performance/inefficiency: repeated poor performance evaluations, or a written record of repeated infractions of rules, regulations, policies, and procedures.