

201508062

John McCrossen  
Michael Greaney

On September 15, 2015, at 7:05 a.m., Detective John McCrossen and Detective Michael Greaney, both of the Warrants Sector, knocked on the door of an apartment in Mount Vernon, NY. A woman inside asked who was there and the detectives said they were NYPD. The woman opened the door but kept the latch and chain attached and spoke to the officers through the partially opened door. The woman called her husband, who asked Detective John McCrossen for his name and badge number. Detective McCrossen responded "I'm NYPD, that's all you need to know." The man told his wife not to let the officers in unless they showed a warrant; she passed the phone to the officers and they spoke with her husband. She then closed the door and the officers forced their way in. They did not find the person they were looking for and left.

The woman testified to the CCRB that she had called her husband on the phone, then passed the phone to the officers. She stated that after the phone call, the officers pushed open the door, breaking the latch searched the apartment, and left. She stated at that point she called her husband again. Her husband's testimony matched hers, and he stated that he heard her shout at the end of the first call.

The officers stated that after the first call, the woman left the door slightly open and the chain on, and said "do what you have to do," which they took as consent to search the apartment. The officers testified that they unscrewed the latch on the door with a police baton, and that the woman was sitting on the couch during the search and did not make another call.

The woman provided a photograph of the latch, which appeared to have been forcibly broken, and her cell phone records indicated two calls, made five minutes apart.

The CCRB found that the officers searched the apartment improperly and that Detective McCrossen failed to provide his name and shield number. It also found that the officers made false statements to the CCRB when they stated that they had unscrewed the latch and the woman had not made a second call, as contradicted by the photograph of the damaged latch and the records of the phone call.

The NYPD downgraded the allegation of an improper search and a false official statement to a technical violation, noting that PO McCrossen "failed to conduct a proper computer check regarding a warrant, resulting in an improper entry and search."

## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Leanne Fornelli	Team: Squad #16	CCRB Case #: 201508062	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Tuesday, 09/15/2015 7:02 AM	Location of Incident: [REDACTED]	Precinct:	18 Mo. SOL 3/15/2017	EO SOL 3/15/2017	
Date/Time CV Reported Tue, 09/15/2015 10:01 AM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Wed, 09/23/2015 1:23 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Witness(es)	Home Address
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. DT3 John McCrossen	6353	§ 87(2)(b)	WARRSEC
2. DT3 Michael Greaney	7490	§ 87(2)(b)	WARRSEC

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. DT3 Cornelius O'Shea	741	§ 87(2)(b)	WARRSEC

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A . DT3 John McCrossen	Abuse of Authority: Det. John McCrossen refused to provide his name and shield number to § 87(2)(b).	A . § 87(2)(g)
B . DT3 John McCrossen	Abuse of Authority: Det. John McCrossen entered and searched § 87(2)(b).	B . § 87(2)(g)
C . DT3 Michael Greaney	Abuse of Authority: Det. Michael Greaney entered and searched § 87(2)(b).	C . § 87(2)(g)
D . DT3 John McCrossen	Other: There is evidence suggesting that Det. John McCrossen provided a false official statement in violation of PG 203-08.	D . § 87(2)(g)
E . DT3 Michael Greaney	Other: There is evidence suggesting that Det. Michael Greaney provided a false official statement in violation of PG 203-08.	E . § 87(2)(g)

### Case Summary

On September 15, 2015, at approximately 7:02 a.m., detectives from Bronx Warrant Section arrived at § 87(2)(b)'s and § 87(2)(b)'s residence, located at § 87(2)(b) to execute a bench warrant. The following was alleged: Det. John McCrossen refused to provide his name and badge number to § 87(2)(b) while speaking over the telephone (**Allegation A**), and he and Det. Michael Greaney entered and searched the residence (**Allegation B and C**). No summons was issued and no arrest was effected as a result of this incident. There is evidence suggesting that Det. McCrossen and Det. Greaney provided a false official statement to the CCRB (**Allegations D and E**).

Video from nearby businesses was acquired and it contained no footage of the incident. On September 19, 2015, § 87(2)(b) published an article about the incident and this case was consequently placed on the sensitive case list (Board Review 02).

### Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- As § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) asserted their intention to file a lawsuit for damages incurred as a result of the incident, this case was rendered ineligible for mediation.
- This report has been submitted pending the results of a FOIL request, sent on December 9, 2015, for any notice of claim filed in connection with the incident (Board Review 03). On December 9, 2015, the undersigned investigator spoke to § 87(2)(b) the attorney representing § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) in their claim. § 87(2)(b) agreed to email the undersigned investigator the notice of claim and stated that no 50-H hearing has yet been scheduled. On December 9, 2015, § 87(2)(b) emailed the notice of claim (Board Review 04), dated October 29, 2015, which states the following: § 87(2)(b) endured an immeasurable amount of pain and suffering, shock, embarrassment and mental anguish as a result of the unlawful activity of the NYPD and its officers. No amount sought is specified.
- On December 9, 2015, a search of Office of Court Administration records revealed no criminal convictions for either § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b).

### Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first CCRB complaint filed by § 87(2)(b) (Board Review 05) and the first involving § 87(2)(b) (Board Review 06).
- Det. McCrossen has been a member of service (MOS) for 18 years and has 4 CCRB allegations pled against him in 3 other cases (Board Review 07). § 87(2)(g)
- Det. Greaney has been an MOS for seven years and has 33 CCRB allegations pled against him in 12 other cases (Board Review 08). In CCRB 201017328, the Board recommended charges for two allegations of abuse of authority (frisk and search of person). The NYPD disposition and penalty for the frisk was instructions and no disciplinary action was applied for the search of person. In CCRB 201207978, the Board recommended charges for an allegation of force (physical force), and the NYPD disposition and penalty are pending as of this writing.

### Additional Witnesses

The investigation determined via public records searches that § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) resided at § 87(2)(b) at the time of the incident. Contact attempts to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were exhausted as per agency standards. On November 5, 2015, § 87(2)(b) (Board Review 09) informed the undersigned investigator that she did not witness any part of the incident. § 87(2)(b) said that she has lived in the building for three years and she never knew of a young male living in § 87(2)(b) the incident location. § 87(2)(b) said that before § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) a female and her § 87(2)(b) daughter lived in § 87(2)(b).

### **Findings and Recommendations**

#### **Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: Det. John McCrossen refused to provide his name and shield number to § 87(2)(b)**

§ 87(2)(b) (Board Review 10) said that she had just awoken from sleep and was doing her regular stretching exercises when a banging on her apartment door startled and slightly scared her. She considered not answering the door, but went to the middle of her living room and said, “Who is it?” A voice said, “New York police.” § 87(2)(b) said, “Hold on for a minute.” § 87(2)(b) reentered her bedroom and called her husband § 87(2)(b) with her cellphone. § 87(2)(b) told § 87(2)(b) that New York police were banging on the door and she did not know why. § 87(2)(b) asked § 87(2)(b) if she should open the door. § 87(2)(b) told § 87(2)(b) to open the door, but to leave the security chain lock fastened. § 87(2)(b) also told § 87(2)(b) to hand the officers the cellphone so that he could speak to them and ask about their names and badge numbers, and a search warrant. After § 87(2)(b) spoke to § 87(2)(b) over the telephone for a minute or two, she opened the apartment door and left the chain lock fastened.

§ 87(2)(b) said that two plainclothes officers identified via investigation as Det. McCrossen and Det. Greaney stood at the door. After the detectives showed § 87(2)(b) a photograph of an individual identified via investigation as § 87(2)(b) (detailed further in Allegation B), § 87(2)(b) handed her cellphone through the door to Det. McCrossen. § 87(2)(b) was not on speakerphone, but was speaking loudly enough for § 87(2)(b) to hear. § 87(2)(b) first asked Det. McCrossen for his name and badge number. § 87(2)(b) was not paying attention to Det. McCrossen’s response because she was shaken up, but she did not hear Det. McCrossen state his name and badge number. § 87(2)(b) also asked Det. McCrossen what the detectives were there for and asked about a warrant. § 87(2)(b) could not recall what Det. McCrossen said except, “Just know we’re NYPD. That’s all you need to know.” When Det. McCrossen handed the cellphone back to § 87(2)(b) told her not to let the officers in because Det. McCrossen did not want to provide his badge number and the detectives did not have a warrant.

On September 15, 2015, § 87(2)(b) was interviewed by the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) (Board Review 11; Board Review 12). § 87(2)(b) made no allegation that § 87(2)(b) asked for Det. McCrossen’s name and badge number over the telephone, and she was not asked about what she overheard during their conversation.

§ 87(2)(b) (Board Review 13) said that he was in New York City for work when he received a call from § 87(2)(b) who said that two plainclothes officers were at the door and wanted to search the apartment. § 87(2)(b) asked § 87(2)(b) if the officers allowed her to read a search warrant and she answered no. § 87(2)(b) told § 87(2)(b) to ask for a search warrant, and if she read it and the officers had a right to search the apartment, then she should allow the

officers to search. § 87(2)(b) told § 87(2)(b) that she was speaking to the officers through the open door with the chain lock fastened. § 87(2)(b) told § 87(2)(b) to hand the cellphone to the officers through the door so that he could speak to one of them, and she did so. § 87(2)(b) spoke to the detective identified via investigation as Det. McCrossen.

§ 87(2)(b) said that he asked Det. McCrossen for his full name and shield number. Det. McCrossen said, "All you need to know is that I'm a New York City police officer and I have a search warrant to search your place." § 87(2)(b) asked Det. McCrossen to hold on for a minute. § 87(2)(b) put the cellphone on the seat of his truck and took out his second cellphone, which he used to call 911 and he was connected to the Mount Vernon Police Department (MVPD). After speaking with Det. McCrossen again and after the call was disengaged, § 87(2)(b) called IAB, the telephone number for which he obtained from MVPD to report the incident.

§ 87(2)(b) called IAB after the incident (Board Review 14; Board Review 15). § 87(2)(b) alleged that he asked Det. McCrossen for his identification when the cellphone was handed over, and Det. McCrossen refused to provide this information. On September 15, 2015, § 87(2)(b) was interviewed by IAB in regard to the incident (Board Review 16; Board Review 17), and he said that he asked Det. McCrossen for his name and badge number over the telephone and Det. McCrossen refused to provide it.

Det. McCrossen (Board Review 18) said that he told § 87(2)(b) when she answered the door that he had to come inside the apartment and take a look for § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) said that her husband § 87(2)(b) does not allow anyone into the house. § 87(2)(b) said that § 87(2)(b) was on the line and handed the cellphone to Det. McCrossen through the door. Det. McCrossen could not understand anything § 87(2)(b) was saying because of his level of agitation. Det. McCrossen did not hear § 87(2)(b) ask him for his name and badge number, and Det. McCrossen did not provide this information. In response to a request for a name and badge number, Det. McCrossen did not say anything similar to "All you need to know is that I'm a New York City police officer and I have a search warrant to search your place." Det. McCrossen did not in any way ignore a request for his name and badge number. Det. McCrossen handed the cellphone back to § 87(2)(b) in less than 30 seconds and said, "I don't understand what he's saying."

Det. Greaney (Board Review 19) said that after § 87(2)(b) stated that § 87(2)(b) told her that she may never allow anyone in the residence, she called § 87(2)(b) on the cellphone. § 87(2)(b) handed the cellphone to Det. McCrossen through the door which had the chain lock fastened. Det. McCrossen spoke to § 87(2)(b). Det. Greaney could hear a voice on the other end of the telephone and could not decipher what was said. Over the telephone, Det. McCrossen stated his name, and said that the detectives were from the NYPD and with the Warrant Squad. Det. McCrossen told § 87(2)(b) that the detectives were seeking an individual who used the address as his residence. Det. McCrossen also said that if § 87(2)(b) wanted him to call the MVPD, he could do this. Det. McCrossen handed the cellphone back to § 87(2)(b).

Det. Cornelius O'Shea of Bronx Warrant Section (Board Review 20), Det. McCrossen's and Det. Greaney's third partner, said that he did not witness the incident because he was at the rear of the location performing security.

Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 states that members of service must provide their name and shield number to anyone who requests this information (Board Review 21).

§ 87(2)(g)



§ 87(2)(g)  
[REDACTED]

**Allegation B – Abuse of Authority: Det. John McCrossen entered and searched**

§ 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]

**Allegation C – Abuse of Authority: Det. Michael Greaney entered and searched**

§ 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]

It is undisputed that the officers entered and searched the residence, but some of the details are in dispute, particularly in regard to what § 87(2)(b) said to indicate her consent. § 87(2)(b) (Board Review 10) testified that after she opened the apartment door with the chain lock fastened, the detectives showed her a photograph of an individual identified via investigation as § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) said that she did not know and had never seen § 87(2)(b). After Det. McCrossen handed the cellphone back to § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(b) told her over the telephone that he had called MVPD, and he instructed her not to let the officers inside. § 87(2)(b) said, “I’m sorry, but my husband told me not to open the door. I’m not opening the door.” As she said this, she closed the door. § 87(2)(b) was going to lock the door when the detectives pushed it in, thereby pushing § 87(2)(b)’s hand and body away. § 87(2)(b) fell into the kitchen counter about three feet behind her. § 87(2)(b) did not know if the detectives used any tool to open the door. The entire screw that secured the chain lock came out of the wall. § 87(2)(b) thought the screw came out with one push, but she could not say for certain. § 87(2)(b) was uncertain how the telephone call with § 87(2)(b) ended, but thought she may have hung up. Det. McCrossen and Det. Greaney entered the apartment. § 87(2)(b) never told the officers that they could enter, never invited them inside and never unfastened the chain lock. While Det. McCrossen stood with § 87(2)(b), Det. Greaney searched the rooms of the apartment. After three to five minutes, both detectives left before MVPD officers could arrive. On September 15, 2015, § 87(2)(b) was interviewed by IAB (Board Review 11; Board Review 12) and her statement was consistent with her CCRB testimony.

§ 87(2)(b) (Board Review 13) said that when he put Det. McCrossen on hold and was transferred to the MVPD on his other cellphone, he told them that plainclothes officers were at his residence. § 87(2)(b) was not shown a search warrant and the officers wanted to search the apartment. § 87(2)(b) requested that uniformed MVPD officers go to the residence. When § 87(2)(b) hung up with MVPD and spoke to Det. McCrossen again, he stated that MVPD was on their way and said, “Do not enter my residence until they get there and then, only if you have a search warrant signed by a judge and after you show it to the Mount Vernon officer, if you have a search warrant, you can enter.” Det. McCrossen did not respond. At this time, § 87(2)(b) heard § 87(2)(b) scream, which shocked him. The call was disengaged on § 87(2)(b)’s end of the line. On September 15, 2015, § 87(2)(b) was interviewed by IAB (Board Review 11; Board Review 12) § 87(2)(g) [REDACTED]

§ 87(2)(g) : § 87(2)(b) got back on the telephone with § 87(2)(b) and she said the officers knocked the door in on her and were leaving. § 87(2)(b) told § 87(2)(b) not to let them leave until she acquired identification. § 87(2)(b) called after the officers, and said that they did not stop and kept going. § 87(2)(b) went outside and did not see the officers when she got there.

Det. McCrossen (Board Review 18) said that he alone was assigned the case involving § 87(2)(b). A bench warrant was issued for § 87(2)(b) and listed the incident location as his residence. The address listed on the bench warrant would have been provided by § 87(2)(b) at the time of his most recent arrest. Det. McCrossen did computer checks that confirmed the incident location was his current residence. A criminal justice check revealed that § 87(2)(b) provided this address to Central Booking in 2014. The incident location was the only address that Det. McCrossen's searches yielded for § 87(2)(b). No surveillance was conducted to determine if § 87(2)(b) was coming or going from the residence. Det. McCrossen spoke to no other residents or landlord of the incident location. Det. McCrossen was informed that the public records searches conducted for § 87(2)(b) with CCRB databases yielded an address in Florida as his last known residence. Det. McCrossen's searches did not yield these results to his recollection.

Det. McCrossen said that he and Det. Greaney went inside the location and directly to § 87(2)(b). Det. McCrossen's narrative of the events was consistent with § 87(2)(b)'s with the exception of the following: After Det. McCrossen spoke to § 87(2)(b) over the telephone, § 87(2)(b) repeated that no one could come inside her residence and that § 87(2)(b) did not allow this. § 87(2)(b) then said, "Do what you have to do to get in," and walked away from the door, leaving it ajar with the chain lock fastened. § 87(2)(b) said nothing else indicative of consent. Although § 87(2)(b) stated that she did not know § 87(2)(b) and nothing about her aroused any suspicion, Det. McCrossen did not entirely believe her. In Det. McCrossen's experience, some people are willing to give up people who are inside their apartments, but they do not want to appear entirely cooperative if the person is inside their residence. Det. McCrossen felt this was a possibility with § 87(2)(b) because of her statement, "Do what you have to do to get in." He asserted that if § 87(2)(b) truly did not want the officers to enter, she would have closed and locked the door, which she did not do and at no time attempted to do. After § 87(2)(b) walked away from the door, Det. Greaney tapped the side of the screw of the chain lock in the doorjamb with his asp. Det. Greaney then wiggled the screw, thereby backing it out of the fastener attached to the molding of the door. The chain came off of the wall in less than one minute. Det. McCrossen took no part in opening the door, but watched Det. Greaney do this. Det. McCrossen and Det. Greaney walked into the apartment and § 87(2)(b) was sitting on the couch in the living room. The door never made contact with § 87(2)(b) as the officers opened it. § 87(2)(b) never screamed or made any sound of alarm when the officers entered, and she never lost her balance inside the apartment. When the detectives entered, § 87(2)(b) was still holding her cellphone as if she was using it, but did not speak into it. § 87(2)(b) remained on the cellphone for the entire incident and was still on the cellphone when the detectives left. Det. Greaney opened all doors and looked inside the other rooms. After three to five minutes, the detectives left the apartment. Nothing and no one of interest was found in the apartment, and nothing was found evidencing that § 87(2)(b) lived in the apartment.

Det. McCrossen reviewed the warrant investigative data for § 87(2)(b) case (Board Review 22). Det. McCrossen said they were complete and there were no further investigative actions taken. The document shows that Det. McCrossen entered the information for the investigative data on September 21, 2015. The document states that on September 10, 2015, Det.

McCrosen received the bench warrant with a photograph. Det. McCrosen conducted database searches and it is unclear from the document whether they were done before or after the incident date, but Det. McCrosen testified that they were done before. The searches include the following: A search for § 87(2)(b) previous arrests was conducted on BADS which yielded 2 total arrests, and the incident location was the address listed on these arrests. A warrant search was conducted that yielded no additional warrants or I-cards. A criminal justice check yielded one interview with the incident location listed as the address. A search of Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) for a rap sheet yielded an FBI number, a social security number and an "FL" number. On December 11, 2015, the undersigned investigator spoke to staff from DCJS and the investigator was informed that the "FL" number is most probably a Florida Department of Corrections number. The staff could not think of anything else the number could be, but was prohibited from conducting checks with the number to determine for certain that it was a Florida Department of Corrections number. Det. McCrosen's warrant investigative data contained a narrative about what occurred during the entry and search that was consistent with his CCRB testimony.

§ 87(2)(g)

Det. Greaney did not know how Det. McCrosen's investigation led him to the incident location, as this was not discussed. When § 87(2)(b) said that she did not know § 87(2)(b) Det. Greaney did not entirely believe her because people frequently lie to officers. After § 87(2)(b) said, "I'm not opening the door. Do what you have to do. I'm not opening it," and walked away from the door, Det. Greaney used his asp to open the door as described in Det. McCrosen's testimony. While Det. Greaney did this, he and Det. McCrosen kept asking § 87(2)(b) to open the door.

Det. O'Shea (Board Review 20) said that he did not witness the incident because he was at the rear of the location performing security.

On October 13, 2015, § 87(2)(b) emailed the undersigned investigator two photographs of § 87(2)(b) s and § 87(2)(b) s door (Board Review 23), which show the screw of the chain lock unattached from the doorframe.

On October 28, 2015, a LexisNexis search was conducted for § 87(2)(b) (Board Review 24). The results revealed two Florida addresses as his most recent, from June 2011 to September 2015. The incident location is listed as an address from November 2014 to July 2015. § 87(2)(b) s cellphone records from the date of the incident (Board Review 25) reveal the following: At 7:12 a.m., § 87(2)(b) called a telephone number and the call lasted for 2 minutes and 44 seconds. At 7:17 a.m., § 87(2)(b) called the same telephone number and the call lasted for 2 minutes and 47 seconds. Ten seconds after the second call ended, § 87(2)(b) called 911.

A bench warrant is the equivalent of a search warrant, People v. Smith, 806 N.Y.S.2d (2005) (Board Review 26). Absent consent or exigent circumstances, law enforcement officials may not search a third party residence for the subject of an arrest warrant without first obtaining a search warrant. Without a search warrant, an officer may only enter premises when there is a reasonable belief that the subject of the arrest warrant is within. Officers may not rely on information given by the subject of the arrest warrant about their place of residence when this information was given six months earlier, People v. Fakoya, Akinde and Adegoke, 901 N.Y.S.2d 909 (2009) (Board Review 27).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b)



§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

**Allegation D – Other: There is evidence suggesting that Det. John McCrossen provided a false official statement in violation of PG 203-08.**

**Allegation E – Other: There is evidence suggesting that Det. Michael Greaney provided a false official statement in violation of PG 203-08.**

Det. McCrossen (Board Review 18) and Det. Greaney (Board Review 19) testified to the following: § 87(2)(b) said something similar to, “Do what you have to do to get in.” § 87(2)(b) who had called § 87(2)(b) on the cellphone, left the door open with the chain lock fastened when she walked away from the door. Det. Greaney used his asp to loosen the screw attaching the chain lock to the doorframe, thereby opening the door. When the officers entered, § 87(2)(b) sat on the couch in the living room and remained on the cellphone for the duration of the incident.

Det. McCrossen’s and Det. Greaney’s testimonies address the crux of this case because they were used to establish § 87(2)(b)’s consent with which they justified their entry and search.

§ 87(2)(g) [redacted]  
[redacted] § 87(2)(b) [redacted]  
[redacted]s cellphone records that at the time of the incident, she placed two calls of approximately two minutes each to § 87(2)(b) [redacted] and these calls were made five minutes apart. § 87(2)(g) [redacted]

[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]

§ 87(2)(g) [redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]

Members of service are prohibited from making false official statements, Patrol Guide Procedure 203-08 (Board Review 28).

§ 87(2)(g) [redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]

---

Pod: 16

Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_ L. Fornelli \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature Print Date

Pod Leader: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title/Signature Print Date

Attorney: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title/Signature Print Date



**Eric Gonzalez**  
District Attorney

**DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
KINGS COUNTY**

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

**[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: JOHN MCCROSSEN**

**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:**

THE NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATION(S), DATED 3/13/09, AGAINST MOS MCCROSSEN:

1. MEMOBOOK INCOMPLETE
2. DEPARTMENT RULES VIOLATION-OTHER DEPARTMENT RULES
3. FAIL TO NOTIFY IAB

ACTION TAKEN: LETTER OF INSTRUCTION ISSUED  
CASE CLOSED ON 1/18/12

**Disclosure # 2:**

THE PEOPLE ARE AWARE OF THE FOLLOWING FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS ACTION(S) AND/OR STATE TORT CIVIL LAWSUIT(S) IN WHICH THE INDICATED OFFICER HAS BEEN NAMED AS AN INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANT. NOTE, THE DISPOSITION INFORMATION MAY NOT BE CURRENT:

1. WALEEDA DAVIS V. CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL., 22806/2012E FILED IN BRONX COUNTY SUPREME COURT

**Disclosure#3:**

THE NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATION(S), DATED 1/5/12, AGAINST MOS MCCROSSEN:

1. DEPARTMENT RULES VIOLATION-MISUSE OF TIME

CASE CLOSED ON 2/15/12

**Disclosure #4:**

THE NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATION(S), DATED 9/15/15, AGAINST MOS MCCROSSEN:

1. PURSUANT TO AN IAB INVESTIGATION CARRIED UNDER IAB LOG #15-27368, IT WAS DETERMINED THAT MOS MCCROSSEN FAILED TO CONDUCT A PROPER COMPUTER CHECK REGARDING A WARRANT, RESULTING IN AN IMPROPER ENTRY AND SEARCH A LOCATION IN MOUNT VERNON, NEW YORK

ACTION TAKEN: WARNED AND ADMONISHED  
CASE CLOSED ON 3/1/17

**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 #5:**

CCRB CASE: 201508062

REPORT DATE: 09/23/2015

INCIDENT DATE: 09/15/2015

OTHER MISCONDUCT NOTED:

1. OMN - False official statement

SUBSTANTIATED CCRB ALLEGATION(S):

1. Abuse - Refusal to provide name/shield number  
NYPD DISPOSITION: SUBSTANTIATED, PENALTY: INTRUCTIONS, COMMAND DISCIPLINE B
2. Abuse - Premises entered and/or searched  
NYPD DISPOSITION: SUBSTANTIATED, PENALTY: COMMAND DISCIPLINE B

Eric Gonzalez  
District Attorney  
Kings County