



STATE OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

LETITIA JAMES
ATTORNEY GENERAL

DIVISION OF SOCIAL JUSTICE
LAW ENFORCEMENT MISCONDUCT INVESTIGATIVE OFFICE

June 20, 2025

Commissioner Jessica Tisch
New York City Police Department
One Police Plaza
New York, NY 10038

Via Email

Re: Letter regarding Executive Law § 75(5)(b) Referral of Captain Thomas Redmond,
OAG Matter No. 1-794587227

Dear Commissioner Tisch,

We have reviewed your agency's referral of Captain Thomas Redmond pursuant to Executive Law Section 75(5)(b). Based on our review, we have concluded that Captain Redmond engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving abuse of authority, including unlawful searches and threats of force.

Our findings are based on the following incidents:

- **CCRB 202006684:** On October 2, 2020, Complainant One was driving his vehicle when he was stopped by two officers. Immediately thereafter, Sergeant (now Captain) Thomas Redmond and an additional officer arrived on scene. All four officers approached Complainant One and his passenger. An officer directed Complainant One and the passenger out of the car. He and another officer frisked both men. All the officers, including Sgt. Redmond, searched the vehicle. No officer was depicted providing a reason or seeking consent for the frisks or search of the vehicle on the body-worn camera footage. Following the frisks and search of the vehicle, the officers left the scene and did not issue a summons or provide business cards to Complainant One.

The CCRB investigated this incident. During the interviews, officers alluded to the smell of marijuana as the basis for the stop. However, the CCRB found this testimony to be "vague, yet still inconsistent," and lacking evidentiary support. Consequently, the CCRB substantiated the allegation that Sgt. Redmond's search of the vehicle was an abuse of authority because he did not have a sufficient legal basis for the search. The CCRB also substantiated an allegation that Sgt. Redmond abused his authority by failing to explain the reason for law enforcement activity to Complainant One, in violation of NYC Administrative

Code § 14-174. Finally, the CCRB substantiated the abuse of authority allegation that Sgt. Redmond failed to offer Complainant One a business card at the end of the encounter as required by NYC Administrative Code § 14-174 and NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure § 203-09.¹

A panel of the CCRB met on April 22, 2022 to review the case and submitted the findings to NYPD that day. The CCRB recommended that charges be filed against now-Lieutenant² Redmond and three other subject officers. NYPD did not serve charges with respect to Lt. Redmond, citing its receipt of CCRB's findings twelve calendar days before the expiration of the statute of limitations, which was on May 4, 2022. Notwithstanding the short SOL, NYPD did serve charges on two of the other subject officers, who ultimately resolved their cases with guilty pleas.

- **CCRB 202103942:** On June 30, 2021, Lt. (now Captain) Thomas Redmond and Officer Davidoff attempted to arrest Complainant Two's son. Complainant Two approached the officers while her son was handcuffed in front of her house and asked to take possession of her son's cell phone. Lt. Redmond pulled out his taser and pointed it at both individuals. When Lt. Redmond told Complainant Two to back up, she put her hands in the air while backing up, yet he sparked the taser anyway and told her to move further. She complied. Complainant Two's son was visibly distressed and crying that he had just gotten a new job and was afraid he would lose it, but also complied with instructions to get in the police vehicle.

A panel of the CCRB met on October 17, 2022 to review the case and submitted the findings to NYPD on October 18, 2022. The CCRB substantiated the allegation that Lt. Redmond abused his authority in threatening her with the use of force in violation of NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure § 221-08, which only permits the use a taser against persons actively resisting arrest, exhibiting active aggression, or to prevent individuals from injuring themselves or other person(s) actually present. The CCRB found that none of these criteria were met here. Complainant Two was not under arrest, did not exhibit aggression, and did not attempt to injure herself or others. The CCRB also substantiated the abuse of authority

¹ Similarly, on August 19, 2020, a complainant was pulled over by an unmarked police vehicle in which Sgt. (now Captain) Thomas Redmond and two other officers were riding. One of the officers approached the driver's side window, asked for the complainant's license and registration, stated he smelled marijuana, and asked him to step out of the vehicle. A second unmarked vehicle arrived on scene with four additional officers. An officer frisked the complainant. He and other officers searched the back, front and trunk of the vehicle. At the conclusion of their search, the officers left the scene without issuing a summons or providing business cards. The CCRB substantiated the abuse of authority allegation, finding that Sgt. Redmond failed to supervise and ensure that the officers under his command provided business cards to the complainant as required by NYC Administrative Code § 14-174 and NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure § 203-09. The CCRB recommended Schedule B Command Discipline. NYPD declared the matter to be previously adjudicated with the imposition of Schedule A Command Discipline and closed it administratively.

² Redmond was promoted from Sergeant to Lieutenant on January 29, 2021.

allegation against Lt. Redmond for threatening Complainant Two's son with the use of force. The use of force on a handcuffed or restrained individual must be necessary to prevent injury, escape, or to overcome active physical resistance or assault under NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure § 221-01. Though her son initially refused to get into the police vehicle, he was crying in handcuffs when Lt. Redmond pointed the taser at him and threatened to use it.

The CCRB recommended Schedule B Command Discipline, however, no discipline was imposed for these substantiated allegations.

In explaining the departure from the CCRB recommendations, the Police Commissioner's Penalty Departure stated that "[t]he situation involving the individual who was resisting arrest was clearly dangerous and posed a risk to the officers' safety." However, Lt. Redmond's body-worn camera footage portrayed Complainant Two's son, who was distressed but not violent or aggressive, being restrained by PO Davidoff. When Complainant Two asked for the cell phone and backed away with her hands in the air, she also did not pose any danger or safety risks to either officer. When speaking to CCRB, Lt. Redmond acknowledged that using force was not justified against either party at this time. The departure from the CCRB recommendation therefore was not warranted.

- **CCRB 202106132:** On October 1, 2021, Complainant Three parked his car in front of his girlfriend's house and refused to move when Lt. (now Captain) Redmond and another officer approached and told him to do so. Complainant Three exited the car and reentered through the passenger side to collect his items. The other officer attempted to open the driver's side door, but Complainant Three held it shut from the inside. Lt. Redmond then took out his taser and pointed it at Complainant Three through the partially closed window.

A panel of the CCRB met on January 19, 2023 to review the case and submitted the findings to NYPD on January 20, 2023. The CCRB substantiated the abuse of authority allegation against Lt. Redmond for threatening to use force against Complainant Three. The CCRB concluded that Complainant Three was not exhibiting active aggression, actively resisting, or threatening to physically injure himself or others. Therefore, Lt. Redmond was not justified in pointing the taser at him under Patrol Guide Procedure § 221-08.

The CCRB recommended Command Discipline – B, however, no discipline was imposed for this substantiated allegation.

The Police Commissioner's Penalty Departure stated that Complainant Three's statement of "Touch my car" was significant enough constitute "active aggression" when he entered the vehicle. Therefore, NYPD declared Lt. Redmond pointing of his taser to have been justified under Patrol Guide Procedure § 221-08. However, under § 221-08, the statement must be a "threat or overt act of an assault (through physical or verbal means), coupled with the present ability to carry out the threat or assault, which reasonably indicates that an assault or injury to any person is imminent" to be active aggression and justify the use of the taser. In this case, Complainant Three reached across the center console to close the door and did not make any aggressive movements towards the officers, indicate that he had a weapon or had an intent to harm them. Further, the statement "Touch my car," particularly when assessed in the context

of these actions, does not convey a threat of assault. Accordingly, this departure from the CCRB recommendation was improper.

Based on the above incidents, we conclude that Captain Redmond has engaged in a pattern of abusing authority in violation of NYPD policy. We are not recommending specific discipline, however, to prevent future misconduct, NYPD should monitor Captain Redmond's performance and provide training to ensure his compliance with NYPD policies and appropriate supervision of his subordinates.

Pursuant to Executive Law § 75(5)(c), please provide a written response within 90 days as to NYPD's response to these recommended remedial actions and an explanation for NYPD's decision not to file charges against Captain Redmond due to a short SOL, while nonetheless serving charges on two other subject officers.

Thank you,

LETITIA JAMES
Attorney General of the State of New York

By: Emily Winograd Leonard
Assistant Attorney General
Law Enforcement Misconduct Investigative Office