



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

**Letitia James  
Attorney General**

May 13, 2026

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 PO Kaseem Pennant,  
OAG Matter No. 1-817983348  
Tax No.: 965405

Dear Commissioner Tisch,

We have reviewed your agency's referral of Police Officer Kaseem Pennant pursuant to Executive Law Section § 75(5)(b). Based on our review, we have concluded that Officer Pennant engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving unjustified threats of force and stops, frisks, and searches in violation of the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 12 of the New York State Constitution.

Our finding is based on the following incidents:

- CCRB 202312117: On December 13, 2023, at approximately 3:45 PM, Complainant 1 was walking alongside another individual on East 180th Street and Prospect Avenue, in the Bronx, when an unmarked police car stopped in front of them and Officer Pennant and three other officers exited and approached them. As Officer Pennant approached, Complainant 1 began to move backwards informing Officer Pennant not to touch him and that he did not give him consent to search him. While walking towards him, Complainant 1 alleged that Officer Pennant flinched toward him in an intimidating, aggressive manner. Officer Pennant described this move as a stutter step which is a trick that he has done multiple times to see if suspects run from him. CCRB noted that Officer Pennant understood that by flinching individuals would find this to be a physically threatening gesture. Officer Pennant then grabbed Complainant 1 to prevent him from running and to conduct a frisk. Officer Pennant pushed Complainant 1 in the center of his chest, causing him to lose his balance, hitting a gate next to the sidewalk. Officer Pennant then attempted to frisk Complainant 1's hoodie pocket but could not do so because Complainant 1 began hunching over and stating, "That's my scarf." Officer Pennant gave multiple orders for Complainant 1 to stop hunching over but he did not comply, so

Officer Pennant restrained him, squeezed outside of his pocket, and determined the object inside was soft, likely a scarf. Officer Pennant told CCRB that he believed Complainant 1 had a firearm on him after claiming to observe that his pocket was heavily weighed down by an object with a straight edge, but, upon review of Officer Pennant's BWC, CCRB found there was no apparent straight edge. CCRB determined that because the object was found to be a scarf, a soft object that would not give the appearance of a straight edge, the stop, the force used to effectuate the stop, and the frisk lacked the requisite level of suspicion. CCRB also determined that flinching to determine if Complainant 1 would flee was not logical and had no reasonable police purpose because Officer Pennant had already stopped him and thus violated NYPD policy. CCRB recommended that charges be preferred, but a decision regarding discipline is pending.

- CCRB 202401001: On January 16, 2024, at approximately 7:52 PM, Complainant 2 was stopped in front of 661 East 180th Street in the Bronx where he was frisked and searched by Officer Pennant and Officer Phong Le, also of the 48th Precinct. Officer Le indicated in his statement to CCRB that he initiated the stop based on his observation that Complainant 2's left jacket pocket was weighed down lower than his right by an L-shape object, consistent with a firearm. Officer Pennant later pulled up in an unmarked car with another officer and frisked Complainant 2 because, he said, Officer Le was frisking him, and he was following Officer Le's lead. He also acknowledged lifting Complainant 2's jacket "unintentional[ly]" as he looked for his fallen BWC. CCRB determined that Officer Pennant lacked justification for the search and frisk of Complainant 2. Furthermore, CCRB found that during the incident, Officer Pennant failed to provide Complainant 2 with his badge number after it was requested four times, and, when Complainant 2 followed Officer Pennant back to his vehicle to photograph his name plate, Officer Pennant swatted the phone away, ordered Complainant 2 to back up, and threatened to use force. CCRB determined Officer Pennant made an inappropriate threat of force using profanity that was also impermissible as it served no legitimate purpose and failed to provide his business card at the conclusion of the stop. CCRB recommended that charges be preferred, but a decision regarding discipline is pending.
- CCRB 202409146: At approximately 5:47 PM on August 6, 2024, Officer Pennant and other officers pulled Complainant 3's vehicle over in front of 701 East Tremont Avenue in the Bronx for having excessively dark window tints. Officer Pennant searched the vehicle for a firearm, asserting to CCRB that he had received intelligence that Complainant 3 had a firearm in his vehicle or apartment, that they did see an unlawful knife in the car, and the driver consented to the search. CCRB determined that the search of Complainant 3's vehicle was unreasonable because officers did not inform Complainant 3 of his right to deny the search of his vehicle, negating the consent, which was given after a part of the vehicle (the trunk) had already been impermissibly accessed. The knife inside Complainant 3's vehicle was not a switchblade or illegal and was found after he was removed from the vehicle and therefore did not pose a threat to the officers. Additionally, CCRB did not credit Officer Pennant's testimony regarding intelligence because he was the only officer who claimed there was any such information. CCRB also substantiated the failure to provide a business card. NYPD imposed Command

Discipline, Schedule B, causing Officer Pennant to forfeit one vacation day, and formalized training.

- CCRB 202408981: On August 31, 2024, at approximately 7:20 PM, Complainant 4 was walking in the vicinity of Boston Road and West Farms Square, in the Bronx, when Officer Pennant stopped him and frisked his fanny pack, over Complainant 4's objection. Officer Pennant told Complainant 4 that he "look[ed] suspicious like [he] had a firearm." The frisk was negative and the officers returned to their unmarked vehicles. CCRB notes that at no point within the BWC footage it is apparent that there are discernible shapes on Complainant 4's fanny pack despite Officer Pennant's claim that he saw an "L-shaped object." CCRB states it does not seem reasonable that Officer Pennant would have been able to discern an L-shaped object on Complainant 4's fanny pack from his distance and that in no other footage is it visible thus, determining that the initial stop and frisk of Complainant 4 was unlawful. Both allegations made by Complainant 4 pertaining to an unlawful stop and frisk were substantiated. NYPD imposed Command Discipline, Schedule B, causing Officer Pennant to forfeit two vacation days, and formalized training.

Based on the above incidents, we conclude that Officer Pennant engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving use of force threats and unlawful stops, frisks and searches.

We recommend that NYPD develop a plan for preventing further violations that includes monitoring and training to ensure Officer Pennant's compliance with the Fourth Amendment. In addition, Officer Pennant's repeated misconduct should be considered an aggravating factor 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