



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

**Letitia James
Attorney General**

July 9, 2026

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 Neil Narayan
OAG Matter No. 1-794586387
Tax No. 966239

Dear Commissioner Tisch,

We have reviewed your agency's referral of Detective Neil Narayan pursuant to Executive Law Section 75(5)(b). Based on our review, we have concluded that Detective Narayan engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving abuse of authority in that he engaged in repeated unlawful stops and frisks and used unjustified force while he was an officer assigned to the 75th Precinct.

Our findings are based on the following incidents:

- **CCRB 201909309:** On October 25, 2019, a minor was arrested and brought to the 75th Precinct. Her family members and friends, a group of approximately five people, went to the precinct to inquire about her arrest. At the precinct, they were pushed out by officers. Then Officer Narayan stepped outside with the group, and he pushed the complainant into the street without justification. The Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) substantiated allegations that Officer Narayan unjustifiably used force against the complainant. NYPD did not impose discipline for this misconduct.
- **CCRB 202207912:** On November 9, 2022, the complainant was walking down the street when he was stopped by Officer Narayan and his partners. The officers stated that he was stopped because they observed a bulge in his pocket. The officers questioned the complainant but did not frisk him. One of the officers shined their flashlight towards the pocket but it did not reveal any indication of a gun. The CCRB substantiated the allegation of abuse of authority in stopping the complainant because the officers lacked reasonable suspicion to justify the stop. Officer Narayan received formalized training.

- **CCRB 202305532:** On June 20, 2023, the complainant was double parked on the street. Officer Narayan and his partners approached and ordered the complainant out of the car. Once the complainant exited his vehicle, he and his vehicle were searched without his consent. When Officer Narayan took the complainant's car keys out of his pocket and attempted to give it to his partner, the complainant attempted to knock the key out of the officer's hands. In response, Officer Narayan pushed the complainant to the ground and proceeded to punch his face multiple times. CCRB concluded that while the initial approach of the complainant's vehicle was justified, the officers abused their authority when they ordered him out of the vehicle and searched his person and car, and Officer Narayan used force unjustifiably. The administrative trial decision regarding these charges remains pending.
- **CCRB 202500109:** On January 4, 2025, the complainant alleged that as he was walking home with a friend and entering his building, he was grabbed from behind by Det. Narayan and frisked. Det. Narayan grabbed his sweatpants pocket and, finding no contraband, walked away from the complainant. Det. Narayan testified to CCRB that while patrolling in the vicinity, he received a radio run of shots being fired in the area with no description of the perpetrator. He observed the complainant walking and observed a bulge in his pants pocket that was weighted and swinging. He stated that the complainant started to walk faster upon making eye contact with the detective. He believed that the item in his pocket was a gun. He exited his vehicle and walked towards the complainant who had entered the building. He went up to him, grabbed him, and frisked the pocket that had the bulge. He stated that he felt multiple objects but did not believe that any were a gun. CCRB substantiated the allegation of abuse of authority in that Det. Narayan lacked reasonable suspicion to forcibly stop and frisk the complainant. Citing *P. v. Thorne*, 207 A.D.3d 73 (2022), CCRB concluded that walking at a fast pace does not raise the level of suspicion to justify a forcible stop. Citing *People v. Hill*, 262 A.D.2d 879 (1999), CCRB reasoned that a pocket bulge does not provide reasonable suspicion to justify a forcible stop and a frisk.

We recommend that Detective Narayan receive additional training on the law of search and seizure and NYPD policy on use of force.

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 including documentation of any training provided.

Thank you,

LETITIA JAMES
Attorney General of the State of New York

By: Mihea Kim
Assistant Attorney General
Law Enforcement Misconduct Investigative Office