



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

**Letitia James  
Attorney General**

December 9, 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 Lieutenant Christopher Crain, OAG Matter No. 1-817982808

Dear Commissioner Tisch,

The Office of the New York State Attorney General has reviewed your agency's referral of Lieutenant Christopher Crain pursuant to Executive Law Section § 75(5)(b). Based on our review, we have concluded that Lieutenant Crain engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving biased based policing and unlawful searches and seizures in violation of the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 12 of the New York State Constitution.

Our findings are based on the following incidents:

- CCRB 202303889: On March 17, 2023, at approximately 9:44 PM, Complainant 1 was standing at the Northeast corner of Crimmins Avenue and East 141st Street in the Bronx, when he was stopped by several police officers, including Lt. Christopher Crain, none of whom activated their body-worn cameras. Complainant 1 was then frisked by one of the officers (not Lt. Crain). The frisk was negative for contraband and the officers returned to their unmarked vehicles. Complainant 1 recorded the officers and requested their information. Complainant 1 kicked a police vehicle and was arrested for criminal mischief. The officers used force to effect this arrest, including Lt. Crain, who used his knee to strike Complainant 1's face while he was laying on the ground during the handcuffing process. CCRB determined that initial stop and frisk of Complainant 1 was unlawful. However, those allegations were not substantiated against Lt. Crain as to the initial stop because he was acting in reliance of his fellow officers' observations in deciding to stop Complainant 1, and as to the frisk, because he did not participate in the frisk. CCRB concluded that Lt. Crain's knee strike was excessive and also that he failed to activate his BWC as required by policy.
- CCRB 202302435: At approximately 7:31pm on March 22, 2023, Complainant 2 was at the corner of Concord Avenue and East 145th Street in the Bronx when he was stopped and

frisked by Lt. Crain and Police Officer Ryan Hennessy. Other officers, including Officer Martinez Cabrera were present on scene as well. Lt. Crain asked for Complainant 2's identification, and informed Complainant 2 he was being stopped for a jaywalking violation. Review of BWC footage by CCRB revealed that Complainant 2 did not jaywalk. Complainant 2 initially refused to provide identification, and Lt. Crain placed Complainant 2 under arrest. Lt. Crain, Officer Hennessy, and Officer Cabrera searched Complainant 2's person. Complainant 2 then was released without a summons. Complainant 2 alleged that Lt. Crain and Officer Hennessy's law enforcement actions against Complainant 2 were motivated at least in part by Complainant 2's race. As to Lt. Crain, CCRB substantiated an improper stop, frisk, arrest, and search of Complainant 2. CCRB also substantiated an abuse of authority because Lt. Crain provided a false official statement against Complainant 2 in that Lt. Crain testified before CCRB that he did not know the meaning of the pedestrian crossing traffic sign that appeared on the corner of where Complainant 2 crossed the street. Lastly, CCRB substantiated an abuse of authority because Lt. Crain took law enforcement action based upon the actual or perceived race of Complainant 2.

- CCRB 202400056: On December 20, 2023, at approximately 8:14 p.m., Lt. Crain, Police Officer Hennessy, and Police Officer Ivan Cruz conducted a pedestrian stop of Complainant 3, who was standing next to Complainant 4's car, outside of 475 Brook Avenue in the Bronx. PO Hennessy and PO Cruz immediately frisked Complainant 3. The officers had just received a gun call wherein the description was regarding a black male with a black nine-millimeter pistol at the location where Complainant 3 was stopped. Lt. Crain simultaneously conducted a vehicle stop of Complainant 4. Lt. Crain made comments to Complainants 3 and 4 that insulted their manner of speaking and their intelligence. It was alleged that Lt. Crain, PO Cruz, and PO Hennessy were unlawfully motivated by Complainant 3's race when they stopped and frisked him. Complainant 4 was issued a parking summons for double parking and a C summons for idling her vehicle because of this incident. As to Lt. Crain, CCRB substantiated an unlawful stop of Complainant 3, courtesy when addressing Complainants 3 and 4, and an abuse of authority because Lt. Crain and Officers Hennessy and Cruz took law enforcement action based upon actual or perceived race of Complainant 3.

Per the CCRB NYPD Officer History as of November 18, 2025, the disposition for each of these complaints is listed as "APU Decision Pending."

Based on the above incidents, we conclude that Lt. Crain engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving unlawful searches and seizures, excessive force, and biased-based policing.

In addition, OAG is aware of six state court cases against Lt. Crain. Two are listed as disposed and four remain active, one of which is discussed above (CCRB 202302435) and is Bronx Supreme Court Index Number 819614/2024E.<sup>1</sup> We also identified two federal lawsuits against Lt. Crain. One was dismissed for failure to prosecute (SDNY 19-cv-2351) and the other, which included claims of false arrest and excessive force, was settled (SDNY 13-cv-256).

---

<sup>1</sup> Each of the six state court cases were filed in Bronx Supreme Court and bear the following Index Numbers: 22740/2018E; 29398/2020E; 808031/2021E; 805489/2024E; 808068/2025E; 819614/2024E.

We recommend that NYPD develop a plan for preventing further violations that includes monitoring and training to ensure his compliance with the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments. In addition, Lt. Crain's repeated misconduct should be considered an aggravating factor, and his supervisory role should be considered, when imposing discipline in connection with the above complaints or for future violations, per NYPD's Discipline Matrix ("conduct demonstrating a pattern of behavior that indicates an inability to adhere to Department rules and standards" and "prior disciplinary history").

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: Nia Stanford  
Assistant Attorney General  
Law Enforcement Misconduct Investigative Office  
Office of the New York State Attorney General