



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

**Letitia James
Attorney General**

September 17, 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 Police Officer Harmanjot Singh
OAG Matter No. 1-817977768
Tax No. 966857

Dear Commissioner Tisch,

We have reviewed your agency's referral of Police Officer Harmanjot Singh pursuant to Executive Law Section 75(5)(b). Based on our review, we have concluded that Police Officer Singh engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving unlawful stops, frisks, and searches while assigned to the 42nd Precinct.

Our findings are based on the following incidents:

CCRB #202300229: On January 7, 2023, at approximately 9:50 p.m., Complainant 1 was walking down Crotona Park East in the Bronx when officers, including Officer Singh, exited their unmarked vehicle and approached him. Officer Singh, the first officer to reach him, grabbed his arm and held him as the other officers approached. Once the other officers arrived, some of them also grabbed and held onto Complainant 1. Officer Singh, while maintaining his hold on Complainant 1's arm with one hand, used his other hand to pat the outside of Complainant 1's jacket and then, seconds later, to pat Complainant 1's back. Officers did not find any weapons or contraband. In his statement to the Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB), Officer Singh testified that he observed Complainant 1 going between vehicles and looking inside them. Officer Singh also stated that he saw Complainant 1 bend over and seemingly place an object by a car's wheel well. Officer Singh could not recall if Complainant 1 had anything in his hands before bending down, nor could he recall if there were any bulges in Complainant 1's clothing. None of the officers saw Complainant 1 with any specific item that could have been contraband.

CCRB determined that the officers lacked reasonable suspicion that Complainant 1 had committed, was committing, or was about to commit a crime and that they also lacked

reasonable suspicion that Complainant 1 was armed or posed a threat to safety. Thus, CCRB substantiated the allegation that Officer Singh unlawfully stopped and frisked Complainant 1. CCRB substantiated the allegations that Officer Singh and the officers involved were required to but did not activate their body-worn cameras and did not provide Complainant 1 with their business cards. CCRB substantiated an additional allegation against Officer Singh for providing a false statement when he testified that he did not frisk Complainant 1, even after being shown a video of the encounter. The NYPD imposed Schedule B Command Discipline with a penalty of ten vacation days.¹

CCRB #202311680: On December 1, 2023, at approximately 12:58 p.m., Complainant 2 was driving in the vicinity of 3rd Avenue and East 166th Street in the Bronx when officers, including Officer Singh, stopped his vehicle. Officers initiated the stop because they observed darkly tinted windows on the vehicle. Officers approached the vehicle and asked for Complainant 2's license and registration, which Complainant 2 provided without incident. In his statement to CCRB, Officer Singh testified that, when officers drove alongside Complainant 2's vehicle prior to the stop, Officer Singh saw Complainant 2 extend his right arm to the floorboard on the driver's side and then to the center console. Based on this action, Officer Singh asked Complainant 2 if he had any weapons in the vehicle, to which Complainant 2 said no. Sergeant Danny Aguilar then directed Officer Singh to take Complainant 2 out of the vehicle. When asked to do so, Complainant 2 complied with the order. Sergeant Aguilar brought Complainant 2 to the back of the vehicle and asked him if officers could search his vehicle. Complainant 2 did not provide consent and mentioned he needed to speak with his lawyer. Officer Singh testified that, even though Complainant 2 did not provide consent to search the vehicle, officers did not need Complainant 2's consent because the stop was considered a *Terry Stop*. Therefore, after Officer Singh saw Sergeant Aguilar nod in his direction, which Officer Singh interpreted as a "signal," Officer Singh searched the vehicle. He searched underneath the driver side seat, underneath the passenger side seat, in the center console, in the door wells, and in the pockets located behind the passenger and driver side seats. No weapons were recovered.

CCRB determined that, while the vehicle stop was lawful, the observations of Complainant 2 prior to the stop were not sufficient to provide officers with the founded suspicion of criminality needed to question him, nor were the observations sufficient to provide officers with the probable cause needed to search the vehicle after Complainant 2 had been removed from the vehicle. Thus, CCRB found that Officer Singh's questioning of Complainant 2 and search of the vehicle were unlawful. However, given that Officer Singh testified that he searched the vehicle based on instructions from his supervisor Sergeant Aguilar, CCRB recommended that the allegation of an unlawful vehicle search be pled only to Sergeant Aguilar. CCRB substantiated the allegation that Officer Singh improperly questioned Complainant 2. The NYPD imposed Schedule A Command Discipline.

CCRB #202405685: On December 29, 2023, at approximately 5:10 p.m., Complainant 3 was at the intersection of East 173rd Street and Fulton Avenue in the Bronx when officers, including Officer Singh, exited their vehicle and approached him. When Officer Singh reached Complainant 3, Officer Singh held out his hand near Complainant 3. When Complainant 3 takes one or two steps backward, officers began touching him. Officer Singh

grabbed Complainant 3's lower left jacket pocket and clutched a cylindrical object. Then seconds later, Officer Singh unzipped the sweater under Complainant 3's jacket to reveal a plastic drink bottle in the area under Complainant 3's lower left jacket pocket. In his statement to CCRB, Officer Singh testified that he observed Complainant 3 for about 5-10 seconds, and that, when Complainant 3 looked at officers, Complainant 3 looked nervous. Officer Singh stated that, after looking at officers, Complainant 3 cinched his arm and moved a rectangular object about size inches long underneath his jacket. Officer Singh believed the object was a firearm. He also testified that the area, Crotona Park, had "a lot of gunpoint robberies" in the last year.

CCRB determined Officer Singh's observation of a rectangular bulge, his vague assertion of robberies in a park which spanned more than 127 acres, and his observation of Complainant 3 looking nervous were not sufficient to provide officers with reasonable suspicion to believe that Complainant 3 had a firearm on his person. Thus, CCRB substantiated the allegations that Officer Singh unlawfully stopped and frisked Complainant 3. CCRB also substantiated the allegation that Officer Singh unlawfully searched Complainant 3. Upon frisking Complainant 3, Officer Singh should have concluded, as did another officer on scene, that the cylindrical bottle did not feel consistent with a firearm and so did not justify a search. The NYPD imposed Schedule B Command Discipline with a penalty of one vacation day.

CCRB #202405848: On June 9, 2024, at approximately 1:09 a.m., Complainant 4 was sitting on a bench at the intersection of Louis Nine Boulevard and Intervale Avenue in the Bronx when Officer Singh and Sergeant Danny Aguilar, exited their vehicle and approached him. When officers reached Complainant 4, they spoke to him and shined a flashlight onto his bag which was on the bench inches away from him. Officer Singh stated to Complainant 4 that officers suspected he was drinking. Officer Singh simultaneously opened Complainant 4's bag, without asking Complainant 4 for consent, and looked inside, revealing a roll of toilet paper. In his statement to CCRB, Officer Singh testified that, while driving by, he saw Complainant 4 mumbling and loudly talking to himself, which made Officer Singh think Complainant 4 was intoxicated. Officer Singh also reported that he smelled liquor on Complainant 4's breath and saw a cylindrically shaped object in the bag, which he believed to be a bottle of liquor. Officer Singh did not suspect that the bag contained a weapon.

CCRB determined that Officer Singh searched Complainant 4's bag without any suspicion that a weapon might be inside and that Officer Singh's suspicion of a bottle of liquor being contained in the bag was not sufficient justification to search the bag. Officer Singh testified that he did not ask Complainant 4 for permission to search the bag because he was not sure it belonged to Complainant 4 since the bag was on the other side of the bench. CCRB determined that, given the proximity of the bag to Complainant 4, Officer Singh's explanation of his uncertainty about the owner of the bag was insufficient. Thus, CCRB substantiated the allegation that Officer Singh unlawfully searched Complainant 4. CCRB also substantiated the allegation that Officer Singh failed to provide Complainant 4 with a business card. The NYPD imposed Schedule B Command Discipline.

Based on the above incidents, we conclude that Officer Singh engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving unlawful stops, frisks, and searches. We recommend that repeated

misconduct be considered as aggravating factors when imposing discipline for substantiated violations, per NYPD's Discipline Matrix (in the context of abuses of authority, an officer's act of misconduct being "the same as a prior act of misconduct," or "subject to a presumptive penalty that is equal to or greater than the presumptive penalty of [a] prior act of misconduct" are aggravating factors, as are the officer "exhibit[ing] bad faith, intentionally violat[ing] procedural or legal standards, or recklessly disregard[ing] those standards," and "fail[ing] to report incident or make required activity log entry").² To prevent future misconduct, we request that NYPD develop a plan for addressing Officer Singh's conduct that includes monitoring and training on search and seizure to ensure his compliance with the law and NYPD policy.

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 records of the plan described above and documentation of any training provided.

Thank you,

LETITIA JAMES
Attorney General of the State of New York

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