



**Office of the New York State
Attorney General**

**Letitia James
Attorney General**

December 9, 2025

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

Via email

Re: Executive Law § 75(5)(b) Referral of Detective Alyssa Trigueno
OAG Matter No. 1-817980528

Dear Commissioner Tisch,

The Office of the New York State Attorney General has reviewed your agency's referral of Detective Alyssa Trigueno pursuant to Executive Law Section 75(5)(b).¹ Based on our review, we have concluded that Detective Trigueno engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving unlawful searches and seizures while assigned to a Manhattan North public safety team.

Our findings are based on the following incidents:

- **CCRB 202307187:** On October 13, 2022, Complainant 1A and Complainant 1B were sitting double parked in a car with the ignition running. Officers Trigueno, Debbie Jimenez, and Michael Delia approached the car and, according to Complainant 1A, Officer Delia repeatedly requested consent to search the car. The officers testified that they conducted the stop because of the Vehicle and Traffic Law violations and to determine the driver's ability to drive because they smelled marijuana emanating from the car. Officer Delia testified that he asked for consent to search based on the driver's nervousness and location in a high-crime area, but it was disputed whether the driver consented. The officers asked both individuals to exit the vehicle. While Officer Jimenez frisked Complainant 1A, Officer Trigueno asked Complainant 1B for consent to frisk him because he was wearing a hoodie and given the high-crime area. Officer Trigueno testified that Complainant 1B raised his arms, which she interpreted as consent, but that he never verbally consented, and she never advised him that he could decline consent. She then frisked his jacket and pants pockets. Officer Delia then searched the car and found a gun within a zippered fanny pack.

¹ Officer Trigueno was promoted recently, on October 3, 2025, to Detective Third Grade.

The CCRB substantiated the allegation that Officers Trigueno and Jimenez abused their authority when they frisked the car occupants because they lacked any specific articulable reason to believe they possessed any weapons and failed to advise them of the right to refuse consent. Further, regardless of whether Complainant 1A consented to the vehicle search, Officer Delia failed to advise him of the right to decline consent, rendering the search of the vehicle improper.

The CCRB recommended that Officer Trigueno receive a penalty of Command Discipline – A, and the NYPD imposed a penalty of Command Discipline – A.

- **CCRB 202400315:** On December 26, 2023, Complainant 2 was standing behind the trunk of a parked car. Officers were driving by and then stopped the vehicle, got out, and approached Complainant 2. Officer Trigueno reported that, as the officers were driving by, Complainant 2 stated to them, “I got something for your [expletive]” and placed both his hands on his jacket while crouching down and zipping his jacket. Although the officers did not see any visible bulge in Complainant 2’s pocket, Officer Trigueno squeezed his right and left jacket pockets and ran her hands over his shirt and pants. Another officer, Emanuel Crespo, also ran his hands over Complainant 2’s clothing.

During the interaction, officers also argued with Complainant 2. At one point during the exchange, Officer Trigueno said to Complainant 2, “stupid [expletive] retard.”

The CCRB substantiated the allegations that Officers Trigueno and Crespo abused their authority by stopping and frisking Complainant 2. It found that Complainant 2’s actions had equally innocuous explanations and that the officers did not observe anything on his person which resembled a weapon. The CCRB also substantiated the allegation that Officer Trigueno spoke discourteously and used offensive language regarding Complainant 2’s actual or perceived disability when she called him a “retard.”

The CCRB recommended that charges be brought for the stop, frisk, and discourtesy and offensive language. Officer Trigueno received a Command Discipline A forfeited three vacation days.

- **CCRB 202400926:** On January 2, 2024, officers approached Complainant 3 to stop him for jaywalking. Complainant 3 fled. Officers pursued and stopped him. Officers then frisked and searched various parts of his person. Officer Trigueno frisked his two front coat pockets. She did not feel anything inside the pockets during the frisk. She then searched the pockets to confirm that there was nothing inside them.

The CCRB substantiated the allegations that Officer Trigueno abused her authority by frisking and searching Complainant 3’s coat pockets. It found that she lacked sufficient basis for frisking and searching Complainant 3’s person because she admittedly did not know why she and other officers were pursuing Complainant 3 and was doing so to assist fellow officers. When she arrived on scene, she joined other officers frisking Complainant 3, though she had not seen anything that resembled a weapon in

Complainant 3's front coat pockets, and then subsequently searched the pockets despite not feeling anything during the frisk.

The CCRB also substantiated the allegation that Officer Trigueno abused her authority by failing to offer Complainant 3 a business card at the conclusion of the incident. It found that, while the incident resulted in Complainant 3 receiving a summons listing one of the officers who searched him, Officer Trigueno and other officers who frisked or searched him knew that their names would not be listed on the summons. Therefore, it was necessary for them to provide him their business cards.

The CCRB recommended that Officer Trigueno receive a penalty of Command Discipline – B. The NYPD imposed a penalty of Command Discipline – B, with the forfeiture of one vacation day and the requirement of formalized training.

Based on the above incidents, we conclude that Detective Trigueno engaged in a pattern of unlawful stops, frisks, and searches. To prevent future misconduct, we request that NYPD develop a plan for addressing Detective Trigueno's conduct that includes training to ensure compliance with the law and NYPD policy as well as at least Level I monitoring, which is required when an officer has two or more substantiated FADO complaints within five years.

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.

Thank you,

LETITIA JAMES
Attorney General of the State of New York

By: Lillian Marquez
Deputy Bureau Chief
Law Enforcement Misconduct Investigative Office