201506359
Ricardo Nunez
Khamraj Singh
Danny Rodriguez

At 9:45 on a weekday morning in Brooklyn, a man was walking from the subway to a clinic where he participates in a rehabilitation program. Four NYPD officers, including Detective Carlos Velez, Detective Ricardo Nunez, Sergeant Khamraj Singh, and Detective Danny Rodriguez, stopped and searched the man. Detective Velez had known the man for some time; he had previously arrested the man and the man has an open civil suit against Detective Velez. The man stated that ever since he sued Detective Velez the detective has targeted him. The officers searched the man's pockets, removing his wallet and a packet of cigarettes. They also examined the man's cane.

The CCRB investigator obtained security camera footage of the incident from a nearby building.

Before seeing the security camera footage, the officers provided varying accounts of the incident that did not corroborate each other and which were contradicted by the video recording. Detective Velez stated that he received a call earlier in the morning that the man had purchased narcotics. Detective Nunez said that Detective Velez had used binoculars to observe the man snorting drugs. Detective Singh stated that another officer had seen the man snort drugs. Detective Rodriguez denied being at the encounter at all.

Detective Nunez, who searched the man's pockets, insisted that he had only conducted a pat-down and had not searched the man's pockets until shown the video demonstrating that he did search the man.

The stop and frisk form relating to the incident was not prepared until six weeks after the incident, after one officer had already been interviewed. Detective Singh stated that he had signed the form, prepared by Detective Nunez, after he returned from a vacation, but he had not left on the vacation for over a month after the incident had taken place.

The CCRB found that the officers had improperly stopped and searched the man, and that they had failed to prepare required paperwork. It further found that Detective Nunez had lied when he said he didn't search the man's pockets, that Detective Singh had lied about the timeline regarding the stop-and-frisk form, and that Detective Rodriguez had lied when he denied being present at all. The NYPD disciplined Detective Nunez by giving him a Command Discipline A, and did not penalized Detective Singh or Detective Rodriguez at all.

On a letter from the Brooklyn DA, the CCRB allegations against PO Singh were listed as "failure to prepare a memo book entry" and false official statement" with a notation that the NYPD did not issue a penalty.

Subsequently, the NYPD substantiated allegations and issued verbal instructions against PO Singh regarding incomplete, inaccurate, or discrepant reporting in separate incidences occurring in January 2018, April 2018, and four instances in February 2019.

Interview Details

On July 30, 2015 at approximately 9:45 a.m., [redacted] got off the F train at [redacted] stop in Brooklyn. He was by himself and was wearing a white T-shirt, blue jeans, and black sneakers. He had a cane with him, but no bags or other objects. He walked west on [redacted], south on [redacted] and west on [redacted] He intended to go to his rehab program, [redacted] which is located nearby. When he walked past the house neighboring [redacted] two Mexican men sitting on the stoop said hello to [redacted] but he did not stop to talk. He did not know the men, and was unsure if they lived there or were just hanging out. He believed the men observed what followed.

When [redacted] was in front of [redacted] an unmarked green minivan pulled up on the sidewalk and stopped near him. Four plainclothes officers (Det. Carlos Velez, PO1, PO2, and PO3) got out. PO1 was possibly the driver, but [redacted] was not certain of this.

PO1 and Det. Velez approached [redacted] while PO2 and PO3 stood back and watched. PO1 said, "Yo, what you got in your pockets?" [redacted] said he did not do anything wrong and asked the reason for the stop. PO1 said, "Show me what you got in your pockets." [redacted] said, "You got no reason to be searching me. I didn't do anything wrong."

PO1 then searched [redacted] pants pockets. [redacted] tried to block PO1's hands, but PO1 yelled at him and said not to move. [redacted] kept saying he had no right to search him, and PO1 told him to "shut up." PO1 removed [redacted] wallet from his back-left pants pocket, a pack of Newport cigarettes form his front-left pants pocket, and a few lighters from his front-right pants pocket. PO1 handed the cigarette pack to Det. Velez, who searched the pack, which only had about four cigarettes in it. PO1 went through [redacted] wallet. [redacted] said he had no right to search his wallet and grabbed it from him. PO1 demanded his ID, and [redacted] provided his benefit card. PO1 or PO2 ran the card with a machine in the van.

During the encounter, Det. Velez insulted [redacted] for no apparent reason, calling him a "crack head" and a "dope fiend." He also said, "I know where you live. You live on [redacted] huh?" and said [redacted] was "nothing but a punk." PO1 also asked [redacted] where he was going, and [redacted] said that was none of his business.

The entire encounter lasted 20-25 minutes. [redacted] went to his program, and a man there said he saw the search. [redacted] did not know that man's name and said the man did not want to get involved in this complaint.

[redacted] stated that he is currently suing Det. Velez for an incident that happened about three years ago. In that incident, [redacted] was riding his bicycle and Det. Velez ran into him with a van then got out, punched him in the face, and laughed at him. The lawsuit is still ongoing. Ever since that incident, Det. Velez has constantly been harassing [redacted] and telling other police to harass him. Det. Velez frequently stops [redacted] for no reason, and also raided [redacted] girlfriend's apartment. [redacted] moved to a new apartment to try to get away from Det. Velez, but Det. Velez still bothers him. He said he would like an IAB referral about this harassment.

[redacted] said there are security cameras on [redacted] and the house next door, identified by Google Maps as [redacted]

Det. Velez: White Hispanic man, 6'4", 220-240 pounds, pot belly, slight facial hair, bald head. [redacted] has heard Det. Velez speak Spanish on other occasions. Det. Velez also told [redacted] that he is 44 years old. Wore a red shirt, blue jeans, and sneakers.
PO1: White man, 6' tall, muscular build, dark hair, about 45 years old. Wore sneakers.
PO2: Black man, 5'8" or 5'9", very muscular build. Wore sneakers.
PO3: Man in sneakers. Could not describe further.

Interview Details

Det. Carlos Velez was interviewed at the CCRB on September 9, 2015.

- *Det. Velez is a Hispanic man who is 6'4" tall, weighs 250 pounds, is bald and has brown eyes. He was 44 years old at the time of this incident.*
- *On July 30, 2015, Det. Velez worked from 5:27 a.m. to 2 p.m. He was assigned to the chase car – a white Dodge Caravan – with Det. Rosario as his partner. They were in plainclothes.*

Memo Book

Det. Velez had no memo book entries about this incident.

CCRB Statement

Det. Velez apparently had two encounters with [redacted] on July 30, 2015, and at the start of the interview he described an encounter different from the basis of this complaint, not mentioned by [redacted] during his interview. The incident first described by Det. Velez occurred at about 6:30 or 6:45 a m. At that time, the officers assigned to Det. Velez's team's prisoner van – Det. Manzurov and PO O'Brien – arrested [redacted] in front of [redacted] (In the interview, Det. Velez said they arrested [redacted] at that time. After the interview, he reviewed his documents and said he meant to say [redacted] when he said [redacted].)

Det. Velez's team frequently works on [redacted] He said that people often get off the train or bus at [redacted] and walk along [redacted] to get to a nearby methadone clinic. Around the time of this incident, there had been numerous reports of chain-snatchings and drug dealing in that area, so they were conducting general enforcement.

Det. Velez and his partner, Det. Rosario, arrived a few minutes after the P-van officers stopped [redacted] They had got a report from an undercover officer on a tactical channel, stating that [redacted] had purchased narcotics. When Det. Velez got out of the van, he saw [redacted] standing about five or ten feet from [redacted] and the P-van officers.

Det. Velez said that he has known [redacted] for about seven years. He has arrested him multiple times for selling narcotics and executed two search warrants at [redacted] residence for sale and possession of heroin. [redacted] also has a pending lawsuit against Det. Velez, alleging that he ran him over with a car.

Det. Velez said, "Hey [redacted] how you doing?" He did this to let [redacted] know that more police were present. [redacted] said, "Go fuck yourself." Det. Velez asked [redacted] if he was with [redacted] [redacted] again said, "Go fuck yourself." Det. Velez asked [redacted] to back up. He complied, and stood against a nearby building and watched the arrest. After the P-van officers handcuffed [redacted] and put him in the van, [redacted] asked Det. Velez where they were taking [redacted] Det. Velez said they were taking him to the precinct. [redacted] said, "Fuck you guys." Det. Velez drove away and had no further interaction with [redacted] at that time. He did not search or have any physical contact with [redacted] during that incident, and no other officer interacted with him.

Det. Velez initially said this was the only interaction he had with [redacted] on July 30, 2015. The security footage from [redacted] was played beginning at about 10:20 in the recording. Det. Velez initially thought it showed the interaction he described, but then realized it showed a different interaction.

At 10:46 a.m., Det. Velez requested that the interview be paused while he consulted with Mr. Alongi of the DEA. The recording was resumed a few seconds later. Det. Velez said that Det. Rosario's daughter was hospitalized that day, so he dropped Det. Rosario off at [redacted] Hospital. Det. Rosario kept their white Dodge Caravan at the hospital, and Det. Velez went with Sgt. Singh and Det. Ricardo Nunez in their black Dodge Caravan. No other officers – either in that car or a different one – were present during the later incident.

Det. Velez denied having any independent recollection of the incident that occurred at approximately 9:45 a.m. He did not know why they stopped [redacted] or whose decision that was. They did not receive any radio reports about [redacted] and were not waiting for him specifically when they were in the van. He said they probably did not observe [redacted] for very long before stopping him, because [redacted] is relatively short, and they would only have seen him when he turned the corner onto [redacted]

Interview Details

Det. Velez said that he was the officer in the video with the dark-colored shirt and white shoes. Det. Nunez was the officer in the green-grey shirt who reached into [redacted] pockets, and Sgt. Singh was the third officer visible. Det. Velez did not know what led up to Det. Nunez's search of [redacted] Det. Velez acknowledged that, as seen in the video, he examined [redacted] cane and another small object. He said that [redacted] has a history of concealing narcotics. On one occasion, [redacted] hid heroin in his sock. Once, he tried to swallow narcotics, and another time he hid them in a hole in his pants. On another occasion, [redacted] had a four-legged walker, and hid narcotics in the rubber cap on the leg of the walker. These incidents occurred at various times over the last six or seven years. Det. Velez was the arresting officer in some of those incidents, and was present for the others. The incident with the walker was Det. Velez's reason for examining [redacted] cane. Det. Velez did not know what the small object he examined in the video was. He said that it was "probably nothing" because he put it on the stairs after looking at it. When informed that [redacted] said it was a pack of cigarettes, Det. Velez said that was "very possible." During discussion about the cigarette pack, Mr. Alongi stated that people often hide drugs in cigarette packs.

Det. Velez denied calling [redacted] a "crack head" or a "dope fiend" on either of his encounters with [redacted] on July 30, 2015. He said that, in the video, he was mostly talking to Det. Nunez, rather than [redacted] He did not recall anything [redacted] said during the second incident.

Interview Details

Det. Ricardo Nunez was interviewed at the CCRB on September 18, 2015.

- *Det. Nunez is a Hispanic man who is 6' tall, weighs 205 pounds, is bald and has brown eyes. He was 41 years old at the time of this incident.*
- *On July 30, 2015, Det. Nunez worked from 5:00 a.m. to 1:33 p.m. He was in plainclothes, assigned to unmarked car [redacted] He was assigned as the arresting officer, and was in the leader car with Sgt. Singh and Det. Rodriguez. Det. Velez was also with them at the time of this incident.*

Memo Book
9:55, male Hispanic stopped in regards to possible drug sale in front of [redacted]

CCRB Statement
On July 30, 2015 at approximately 9:45 a.m., Det. Nunez was in a van parked on [redacted] in Brooklyn. Sgt. Singh, Det. Velez, and Det. Rodriguez were with him. Det. Velez was sitting in the back seat of the van looking through binoculars toward [redacted] There is a methadone clinic in the area and there had been complaints of car break-ins and drug sales, so the officers were conducting general enforcement. The team had made two arrests in the area earlier that day.

Two Hispanic men – one later identified as [redacted] – appeared at the [redacted] end of the block and started walking west on [redacted] One man soon split off and went back to [redacted] but [redacted] continued on [redacted] Det. Velez said he saw [redacted] appear to snort some type of drug. Det. Nunez could not see this himself, because he did not have binoculars.

After Det. Velez told the other officers about the snorting, they unanimously decided to drive down the block, get out of the van, and stop [redacted] Det. Nunez had never interacted with [redacted] before, but he believed other members of his team executed a search warrant at his residence several years ago.

[redacted] became agitated as soon as the officers stopped him, saying, "Fuck you" to Det. Velez. Det. Nunez tried to calm [redacted] down, saying, "If you have nothing you can go." [redacted] had a cane, and Det. Velez took it from him for safety reasons, in case [redacted] started swinging it at them. Det. Velez initially said he did not remove any objects from [redacted] aside from the cane, and that he only "patted him down to see if he had any weapons" and did not go inside his pockets. Det. Nunez also picked something off the ground, thinking [redacted] might have dropped contraband, but the object turned out to be nothing. Det. Nunez did not ask [redacted] what he had on him, where he was going, or any similar questions. He never heard Det. Velez or any other officer call [redacted] a "crack head" or a "dope fiend."

The security video from [redacted] was played for Det. Nunez at beginning approximately eight minutes into the interview. He recognized [redacted] as the man in the white shirt. Det. Nunez was the officer in a light-green shirt, Sgt. Singh was in the red shirt, and Det. Velez was in the dark shirt. After watching the video, Det. Nunez said he was uncertain whether Det. Rodriguez was with them at the time of this incident.

Det. Nunez did not remember what the object he picked off the ground in the video was and was unsure if it fell from [redacted] At 15:23 in the video, the investigator pointed out that Det. Nunez appeared to remove something from [redacted] pocket and hand it to Det. Velez. Det. Nunez was unsure what it was, saying, "It could have been a piece of paper. It was nothing." He did not specifically recall whether he removed it from [redacted] pocket. Det. Nunez said that he felt something hard in [redacted] pocket and might have gone inside to take it out, but he was not sure. He said [redacted] wallet was very thick, and the hard object could have been his wallet. He asked [redacted] for ID, and [redacted] was uncooperative with providing it, so he may have removed it from [redacted] wallet. He did not run a search on the ID. Aside from [redacted] wallet, Det. Nunez did not recall removing anything else from [redacted] pockets.

When asked if [redacted] had a cigarette pack, Det. Nunez recalled that [redacted] had a pack of Newports. He said he looked inside the pack to see if [redacted] had narcotics inside. He believed [redacted] had the cigarette pack in his hand.

No contraband was found on [redacted] and he was free to leave after the interaction. Det. Nunez prepared a stop, question, and frisk report. He did not have the UF250 number at the time of the interview, but said he could fax the report.

Interview Details

Sgt. Khamraj Singh was interviewed at the CCRB on September 23, 2015.

- *Sgt. Singh is an Asian man who is 5'8" tall, weighs 165 pounds, and has black hair and brown eyes. He was 45 years old at the time of this incident.*
- *On July 30, 2015, Sgt. Singh worked from 5 a.m. to 1:35 p.m. He was the supervisor of a narcotics team, working in unmarked car [redacted] with Det. Nunez and Det. Rodriguez. Det. Velez was initially working in a separate car with Det. Rosario, but joined Sgt. Singh's car partway through the tour. They were in plainclothes.*

Memo Book

Sgt. Singh had no memo book entries about this incident.

CCRB Statement

On July 30, 2015 at approximately 9:45 a.m., Sgt. Singh was in the back seat of an unmarked van, conducting narcotics enforcement on [redacted] in Brooklyn. He was in the area because the commander of the 76th Precinct, Captain Colon, had informed the Narcotics captain that they had a condition of burglary, grand larceny, and car break-ins in that area. There is a methadone clinic nearby, and drug users and dealers congregate in the area.

Two detectives were in the front seats. Sgt. Singh began his tour working with Det. Rodriguez and Det. Nunez. Det. Velez joined them later. He was not sure whether all three detectives were present at the time of this incident, or which ones were in the front seats.

One of the detectives in the front said he saw what appeared to be a man – known to the investigation as [redacted] – snorting drugs in the street. Sgt. Singh first said Det. Velez observed this, but later said he was unsure which detective saw it. Sgt. Singh could not see the alleged snorting himself, as he was in the back seat. He did not know whether the detective saw an actual drug in [redacted] hands. Sgt. Singh believed [redacted] was initially with another man, but that they split up. They did not stop the other man.

Sgt. Singh initially said he did not remember whether the detective mentioned [redacted] storing the drugs in a particular place on his person. Later, when the investigator mentioned a cigarette pack, he said that he thought the detectives saw him with a cigarette pack in his hand when they observed him, and that he may have put the drug residue or wrapper in the pack.

Sgt. Singh viewed the handwritten copy of the Stop, Question and Frisk report that Det. Nunez faxed to the CCRB and affirmed that it was consistent with what he remembered of the incident. When asked about the box checked regarding actions indicative of a drug transaction, Sgt. Singh said this referred to [redacted] snorting. He did not remember being informed of any transaction between [redacted] and the other man. Sgt. Singh said that the alleged snorting of drugs was the sole reason they stopped [redacted]

[redacted] continued walking on [redacted] and the officers got out and stopped him when he neared their van. [redacted] was very belligerent, yelling "These fucking cops! Why you bothering me?" Based on [redacted] behavior, it seemed like he knew the detectives. Sgt. Singh did not know [redacted] as he has only worked in that area for a few months. Two detectives both spoke to [redacted] Neither Det. Velez nor any other officer called [redacted] a "crack head" or a "dope fiend." He did not know whether Det. Nunez or any officer asked [redacted] if he had anything on him, and did not remember any questions asked of [redacted]

One detective removed [redacted] cane for safety reasons. Sgt. Singh was not aware of [redacted] having any objects aside from the cane. A detective frisked [redacted] and searched his pockets. Sgt. Singh did not frisk or search [redacted] himself, and did not remember which detective did this. Sgt. Singh said [redacted] belligerent behavior and the crimes going on in that area made him uncertain about whether [redacted] had a weapon. He did not have any more specific reason to think [redacted] had a weapon.

When asked about the cigarette pack, Sgt. Singh said the detectives probably searched it to see whether [redacted] put the drug wrapper or residue inside. The officers did not run [redacted] identification. Nothing was recovered from him.

The security footage from [redacted] was shown to Sgt. Singh beginning at approximately 12:20 in the recording. He said that he was the officer in the red shirt, Det. Nunez was in the green shirt, and Det. Velez was the third officer visible. He did not

Interview Details

know where Det. Rodriguez was during this. When asked about the object that fell out of [redacted] pocket at 9:54:23 a m., Sgt. Singh said he was not sure what it was. He said the officers were looking around on the ground to find a drug wrapper, because people often try to hide or discard the wrapper after they snort drugs in public. He also said this was possibly Det. Nunez's reason for searching [redacted] wallet, but he was not certain of this.

Interview Details

Sgt. Singh reviewed the handwritten UF-250 that was faxed to the CCRB by Det. Nunez and confirmed that this was the UF-250 that he signed. He did not know what date Det. Nunez prepared it or what date he signed it. Sgt. Singh said he went on a vacation to Turks and Caicos and signed it when he returned. Sgt. Singh initially did not know the dates of his vacation. After looking at his cell phone, he said he was on vacation for the first two weeks of September, 2015. He did not recall whether he discussed the UF-250 with Det. Nunez before he signed it. Sgt. Singh was aware that he participated in the stop of [redacted] when he signed the report.

Sgt. Singh did not know whether there was a specific deadline by which an officer must prepare a UF-250 after conducting a stop. He described the record-keeping process for UF-250s as follows: first, the officer who conducted the stop prepares the UF-250. The report is taken to the Narcotics base, where they log it in. The approving sergeant can sign it either before or after it is logged in at the Narcotics command. The sergeant can approve the UF-250 regardless of whether he was present for the stop. After it has been logged in at the Narcotics base and signed by a sergeant, it is sent to the precinct where the stop was conducted, and the precinct also logs the report.

Sgt. Singh viewed the computerized version of the UF-250. He confirmed that Det. Kelly, who entered this report, was from his Narcotics command. Sgt. Singh did not know the reason for the delay between the stop on July 30, 2015 and the report being entered on September 15, 2015.

Interview Details

Det. Danny Rodriguez was interviewed at the CCRB on October 14, 2015.

- *Det. Rodriguez is a Hispanic man who is 5'5" tall, weighs 140 pounds, and has black hair and brown eyes. He was 35 years old at the time of this incident.*
- *On July 30, 2015, Det. Rodriguez worked from 5 a.m. to 1:33 p.m. He was in plainclothes in unmarked vehicles. He was on a narcotics field team. He initially worked in the leader car with Sgt. Singh, Det. Nunez, and Det. Velez. Beginning at 7 a.m., he worked with Det. Rosario in the prisoner van, and continued in that assignment for the rest of the tour.*

Memo Book
Det. Rodriguez had no memo book entries directly related to this incident, but had the following relevant entries: 6:55, one under. 7:00, 98 in vicinity of [redacted] for enforcement. 9:20, two under by leader car. 9:30, 98 to [redacted] for enforcement.

CCRB Statement
Det. Rodriguez denied being present for any part of this incident. He was shown a photo of [redacted] and denied interacting with him at any time. Det. Rodriguez said that, at about 7 a.m., he switched from working in the leader car to working in the prisoner van with Det. Rosario. He said the prisoner van stays away from the enforcement area, because it is recognizable to civilians and could ruin the set. He denied having any knowledge of a stop conducted by the leader car at about 9:45 a m. His DEA representative said that prisoner van would not go to the scene unless there was an arrest, and Det. Rodriguez said this was accurate.

Security footage from [redacted] was shown to Det. Rodriguez beginning at 4:12 in the recording. He confirmed that he recognized Sgt. Singh, Det. Velez, and Det. Nunez. The investigator called his attention to a part of the video where a hand briefly appears on the right side of the screen, next to Sgt. Singh. Det. Rodriguez maintained that he was not present for the stop and said he had no knowledge of a fourth officer being in the leader car.

The investigator mentioned that the other officers interviewed said Det. Rosario had to leave work early on July 30, 2015 due to a sick family member. Det. Rodriguez said he was familiar with that. He did not know what time Det. Rosario left work, but said it was "definitely" after 9:45 a.m., because they were working together at that time.

When asked about the allegations, Det. Rodriguez denied participating in the stop of [redacted] frisking or searching him or his possessions, asking him questions, hearing any officer call him a "crack head" or "dope fiend," or having any interaction with [redacted] on July 30, 2015.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
KINGS COUNTY
350 JAY STREET
BROOKLYN, NY 11201-2908
(718) 250-2000
WWW.BROOKLYNDA.ORG

Eric Gonzalez
District Attorney

[INSERT NAME]
Assistant District Attorney

[INSERT DATE]

[INSERT D/C INFO]

Re: [INSERT CASE NAME]
Kings County Dkt./Ind. No. [#########]

In connection with the above-named case, the People voluntarily provide the following information regarding:

MOS NAME: Singh, Khamraj

MOS TAX: [redacted]

in satisfaction (to the extent applicable) of their constitutional, statutory, and ethical obligations. Further, the People reserve the right to move in limine to preclude reference to this information, or otherwise to object to its use and/or introduction into evidence.

Disclosure # 1:
MOS IS A NAMED DEFENDANT IN THE CIVIL ACTION ANTHONY JONES V.
CITY OF NY, ET AL, 11 CV4107, FILED IN US EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

MOS IS A NAMED DEFENDANT IN THE CIVIL ACTION GIBSON WINTERS V.
CITY OF NY, ET AL. 11 CV2900, FILED IN US EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

Disclosure #2:
NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATION ARISING FROM 11/13/2010:
DEPARTMENTAL RULES AND VIOLATIONS: PARKING PERMIT RESTRICTED USE UNAUTHORIZED USE.
CASE CLOSED 1/26/11.

Disclosure #3:
NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATION ARISING FROM 4/4/2016:
MOS FAILED TO ENSURE THAT A UF250 SUBMITTED WAS PROPERLY PROCESSED.
ACTION TAKEN: LETTER OF INSTRUCTION
CASE CLOSED: 3/17/16.

Disclosure #4:
NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATIONS ARISING FROM 1/30/2018:
1.MOS SUBMITTED AN INVOICE WITH A DISCREPANCY FOR CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE -LAB.
2.MOS SUBMITTED AN INCOMPLETE/INACCURATE REPORT- PROPERTY CLERK INVOICE.
ACTION TAKEN: VERBAL INSTRUCTIONS.
CASE CLOSED 2/14/2018.

Disclosure #5:
NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATIONS ARISING FROM 4/4/2018:
1.MOS SUBMITTED AN INVOICE WITH A DISCREPANCY FOR CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE -LAB.
2.MOS SUBMITTED AN INCOMPLETE/INACCURATE REPORT- PROPERTY CLERK INVOICE.
ACTION TAKEN: VERBAL INSTRUCTIONS.
CASE CLOSED 4/9/2018.

Disclosure #6:
NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATIONS ARISING FROM 2/7/2019:
1.MOS SUBMITTED AN INVOICE WITH A DISCREPANCY FOR CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE -LAB.
2.MOS SUBMITTED AN INCOMPLETE/INACCURATE REPORT- PROPERTY CLERK INVOICE.
ACTION TAKEN: VERBAL INSTRUCTIONS.
CASE CLOSED 2/12/2019.

Disclosure #7:
NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATIONS ARISING FROM 2/26/2019:
1.MOS SUBMITTED AN INVOICE WITH A DISCREPANCY FOR CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE -LAB.
2.MOS SUBMITTED AN INCOMPLETE/INACCURATE REPORT- PROPERTY CLERK INVOICE.
ACTION TAKEN: VERBAL INSTRUCTIONS.
CASE CLOSED 3/13/2019.

Disclosure #8:
NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATIONS ARISING FROM 2/26/2019:
1.MOS SUBMITTED AN INVOICE WITH A DISCREPANCY FOR CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE -LAB.
2.MOS SUBMITTED AN INCOMPLETE/INACCURATE REPORT- PROPERTY CLERK INVOICE.
ACTION TAKEN: VERBAL INSTRUCTIONS.
CASE CLOSED 4/4//2019.

Disclosure #9:
NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATIONs ARISING FROM 2/26/2019:
1.MOS SUBMITTED AN INVOICE WITH A DISCREPANCY FOR CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE -LAB.
2.MOS SUBMITTED AN INCOMPLETE/INACCURATE REPORT- PROPERTY CLERK INVOICE.
ACTION TAKEN: VERBAL INSTRUCTIONS.
CASE CLOSED 4/4//2019.

IN ADDITION, BASED UPON CCRB DOCUMENTS UP TO DATE THROUGH OCTOBER 13, 2020, THE PEOPLE ARE AWARE OF THE FOLLOWING CCRB SUBSTANTIATED AND/OR PENDING ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THIS OFFICER:

Disclosure # 10:
CCRB CASE: 200815762
REPORT DATE: 10/31/2008
INCIDENT DATE: 10/30/2008
CCRB SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATION(S):
1. ABUSE—FRISK
2. ABUSE—VEHICLE SEARCH

NYPD ACTION: INSTRUCTIONS

Disclosure # 11:
CCRB CASE: 201202466
REPORT DATE: 02/23/2012

Disclosure # 12:

CCRB CASE: 201506359
REPORT DATE: 07/31/2015
INCIDENT DATE: 07/310/2015
CCRB SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATION(S):

1. ABUSE—STOP

NYPD ACTION: NO PENALTY
OTHER MISCONDUCT NOTED:

1. OMN—FAILURE TO PREPARE A MEMOBOOK ENTRY—OM
2. OMN—FALSE OFFICIAL STATEMENT—OM

NYPD ACTION: NO PENALTY

Eric Gonzalez
District Attorney
Kings County

New York City Police Department
Stop, Question & Frisk System

Precinct:	Crime Suspected:	UF250 #
76	CRIMINAL POSSESION OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE	2015

Occurence Location: INTERSECTION OF § 87(2)(b) , BROOKLYN Cross Streets: Describe Location: SIDEWALK Location Type: OUTSIDE	Occurence Date: 07/30/2015 Occurence Time: 0955 Period Observed Prior: 2.00 minutes Duration of STOP: 5 minutes	Jurisdic Radio F Sp

Name of Person Stopped: Unknown

Nickname/AKA: Sex: MALE Race: BLACK HISPANIC Age: § 87(2) Date of Birth: Identification: VERBAL Address : Telephone #: - -	Height: 5FT6IN Weight: 150 Eyes: BROWN Hair: BLACK Build: MEDIUM Other Marks:	Arre Offe Arre Summ Offe Summo Fris Searc

Officer in Uniform: NO If NO, How ID: VERBAL SHIELD
Did Officer Explain STOP?: NO If NO, Explain: CONFRONTATIONAL
Weapons Found, If any: NO
Other Contraband Found: NO
Contraband/Weapon Location:

Physical Force Used:
HANDS ON SUSPECT
SUSPECT AGAINST WALL

Circumstances Leading to Stop:
Suspects Actions - ACTIONS INDICATIVE OF ENGAGING IN DRUG TRANSACTION
Suspects Actions - OTHER -SNORTING

Additional Factors:
- AREA HAS HIGH INCIDENCE OF REPORTED OFFENSE
- TIME OF DAY/WEEK CORRESPONDING TO CRIMINAL ACTIVITY
- OTHER -APPEARED TO INGEST / SNORT HEROIN

Frisk Basis:
Reason for Frisk - KNOWLEDGE OF SUSPECTS PRIOR CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

Search Basis:
Reason for Search - HARD OBJECT

Demeanor of Person Stopped: CONFRONTATIONAL

Remarks Made by Person Stopped: GET THE FUCK AWAY FROM ME

Additional Reports Prepared:

Reporter Name: DT3 NUNEZ	Tax #: 914896	Command 740	Agency: NYPD
Reviewer Name: SDS SINGH	Tax #: 915183	Command: 740	Agency: NYPD
Entered by: DT3 KELLY	Tax #: 936855	Command 740	Date 09/15/2015

END OF STOP QUESTION & FRISK REPORT

2015-076-00142

§ 87(2)(i)

9/23/2015