



OFFICE OF THE POLICE COMMISSIONER
ONE POLICE PLAZA • ROOM 1400

June 11, 2026

Memorandum for: Deputy Commissioner, Trials

Re: **Sergeant Trevlyn Headley**
Tax Registry No. 945808
Property Clerk Division
PODS Case Nos. C-033349 & C-033457

The above-named member of the service appeared before Assistant Deputy Commissioner Vanessa Facio-Lince on March 31 and April 1, 2026, and was charged with the following:

DISCIPLINARY CASE NO. C-033349

1. Said Sergeant Trevlyn Headley, while off-duty and assigned to the 88th Precinct, on or about December 19, 2024, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, to wit: Sergeant Trevlyn Headley grabbed the hand a Member of Service known to the Department, and placed it on her thigh, causing said Member of Service to feel uncomfortable.

A.G. 332-01

**EMPLOYMENT
DISCRIMINATION**

A.G. 304-06, Page 1, Paragraph 1

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

2. Said Sergeant Trevlyn Headley, while off-duty and assigned to the 88th Precinct, on or about December 19, 2024, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, to wit: Sergeant Trevlyn Headley made inappropriate comments of a sexual nature to a Member of Service known to the Department, causing said Member of Service to feel uncomfortable.

A.G. 332-01

**EMPLOYMENT
DISCRIMINATION**

A.G. 304-06, Page 1, Paragraph 1

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

3. Said Sergeant Trevlyn Headley, while on-duty and assigned to the 88th Precinct, on or about January 1, 2025, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, to wit: Sergeant Trevlyn Headley made an inappropriate comment of a sexual nature to a Member of Service known to the Department.

A.G. 332-01

**EMPLOYMENT
DISCRIMINATION**

A.G. 304-06, Page 1, Paragraph 1

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

DISCIPLINARY CASE NO. C-033457

1. Said Sergeant Trevlyn Headley, while on duty and assigned to the 52nd Precinct, on or about January 30, 2025, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, to wit: Sergeant Headley made an inappropriate comment regarding religious attire to a Member of Service known to the Department.

A.G. 332-01

**EMPLOYMENT
DISCRIMINATION**

A.G. 304-06, Page 1, Paragraph 1

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

2. Said Sergeant Trevlyn Headley, while on duty and assigned to the 52nd Precinct, on or about January 30, 2025, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, to wit: Sergeant Headley made an inappropriate comment regarding religion to a Member of Service known to the Department.

A.G. 332-01

**EMPLOYMENT
DISCRIMINATION**

A.G. 304-06, Page 1, Paragraph 1

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

In a Memorandum dated May 20, 2026, Assistant Deputy Commissioner Facio-Lince found Sergeant Headley Guilty of Specification No. 1 and Not Guilty of Specification Nos. 2 and 3, in Disciplinary Case No. C-033349. Regarding Disciplinary Case No. C-033457, Sergeant Headley was found Guilty of Specification No. 1 and Not Guilty of Specification No. 2. Having read the Memorandum and analyzed the facts of this matter, I approve the findings but disapprove the penalty.

I have considered the totality of the circumstances and issues concerning the misconduct for which Sergeant Headley has been found Guilty and deem that a period of monitoring is warranted.

It is therefore directed that Sergeant Headley forfeit forty-five (45) vacation days, receive EEO Remedial Training, and be placed on one (1) year dismissal probation, as a disciplinary penalty.


Jessica S. Tisch
Police Commissioner



POLICE DEPARTMENT

May 20, 2026

-----X

In the Matter of the Charges and Specifications	:	Case Nos.
- against -	:	C-033349
Sergeant Trevlyn Headley	:	C-033457
Tax Registry No. 945808	:	
Property Clerk Division	:	

-----X

At: Police Headquarters
One Police Plaza
New York, NY 10038

Before: Honorable Vanessa Facio-Lince
Assistant Deputy Commissioner Trials

APPEARANCES:

For the Department: Emily Collins, Esq.
Department Advocate's Office
One Police Plaza, 4th Floor
New York, NY 10038

For the Respondent: Peter Brill, Esq.
Brill Legal Group, P.C.
176 Lexington Avenue, Suite O
New York, NY 10016

To:

HONORABLE JESSICA S. TISCH
POLICE COMMISSIONER
ONE POLICE PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10038

COURTESY • PROFESSIONALISM • RESPECT

Website: <http://nyc.gov/nypd>

CHARGES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Disciplinary Case No. C-033349

1. Said Sergeant Trevlyn Headley, while off duty and assigned to the 88 Precinct, on or about December 19, 2024, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, to wit: Sergeant Trevlyn Headley grabbed the hand of a Member of Service known to the Department, and placed it on her thigh, causing said Member of the Service to feel uncomfortable.

A.G. 332-01

EMPLOYMENT
DISCRIMINATION

A.G. 304-06, Page 1, Paragraph 1

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

2. Said Sergeant Trevlyn Headley, while off duty and assigned to the 88 Precinct, on or about December 19, 2024, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, to wit: Sergeant Trevlyn Headley made inappropriate comments of a sexual nature to a Member of the Service known to the Department, causing said Member of Service to feel uncomfortable.

A.G. 332-01

EMPLOYMENT
DISCRIMINATION

A.G. 304-06, Page 1, Paragraph 1

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

3. Said Sergeant Trevlyn Headley, while on duty and assigned to the 88 Precinct, on or about January 1, 2025, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, to wit: Sergeant Trevlyn Headley made an inappropriate comment of a sexual nature to a Member of Service known to the Department.

A.G. 332-01

EMPLOYMENT
DISCRIMINATION

A.G. 304-06, Page 1, Paragraph 1

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

Disciplinary Case No. C-033457

1. Said Sergeant Trevlyn Headley, while on duty and assigned to the 52 Precinct, on or about January 30, 2025, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, to wit: Sergeant Headley made an inappropriate comment regarding religious attire to a Member of Service known to the Department.

A.G. 332-01

EMPLOYMENT
DISCRIMINATION

A.G. 304-06, Page 1, Paragraph 1

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

2. Said Sergeant Trevlyn Headley, while on duty and assigned to the 52 Precinct, on or about January 30, 2025, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, to wit: Sergeant Headley made an inappropriate comment regarding religion to a Member of Service known to the Department.

A.G. 332-01

EMPLOYMENT
DISCRIMINATION

A.G. 304-06, Page 1, Paragraph 1

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The above-named member of the Department appeared before me on March 31 and April 1, 2026. Respondent, through her counsel, entered a plea of Not Guilty to the subject charges.

The Department called Police Officers [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] as witnesses. Respondent called Police Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and Ms. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

witnesses, and testified on her own behalf. A stenographic transcript of the trial record has been prepared and is available for the Police Commissioner's review. Having evaluated all of the evidence in this matter, I find as follows:

Disciplinary Case No. C-033349

Specification 1– Inappropriate Physical Contact (Guilty)

Specification 2– Inappropriate Comment of a Sexual Nature Made to PO [REDACTED] (Not Guilty)

Specification 3– Inappropriate Comment of a Sexual Nature Made to PO [REDACTED] (Not Guilty)

Disciplinary Case No. C-033457

Specification 1– Inappropriate Comment Regarding Religious Attire (Guilty)

Specification 2– Inappropriate Comment Regarding Religion (Not Guilty).

I further recommend that Respondent attend EEO training and that she forfeit 45 vacation days as the appropriate penalty.

ANALYSIS

These two cases stem from incidents that occurred while Respondent was working in her capacity as a probationary lieutenant.¹ Each case involves allegations of inappropriate interactions that Respondent had with subordinates in two different precincts.

Disciplinary Case No. C-033349

The first case involves allegations that occurred on two separate dates. In the first incident, it is charged that on December 19, 2024, while attending a Department sponsored holiday party, Respondent made an inappropriate comment of a sexual nature to Police Officer [REDACTED] and subjected her to unwanted physical contact in that Respondent grabbed Officer [REDACTED] hand and placed it on her thigh while posing for a picture. In the second incident, Respondent is charged with making an inappropriate comment of a sexual nature to Police Officer [REDACTED] while they were reviewing BWC footage of an arrest that they made together on January 1, 2025.

Incident 1

Officer [REDACTED] testified that in December of 2024 she had been working with Respondent for approximately two months. She described her relationship with Respondent, her then platoon commander, as cordial with “no issues” and “no concerns.” (Tr. 33-34)

Officer [REDACTED] further testified that prior to December 19, 2024, she was experiencing issues with lateness at work because pursuant to a custody arrangement, she had to exchange their children with her ex-husband outside of a precinct, causing her to be late to work at times.

¹ Respondent was demoted from the rank of lieutenant in June 2025.

Officer [REDACTED] further explained that she made her supervisors, including Respondent, aware of her situation and there was no issue at that time. (Tr. 34-35)

Officer [REDACTED] recalled that on December 19, 2024, she attended the Patrol Brooklyn North Borough Christmas Party. She went to the party with her friend, [REDACTED], and met her coworker, Officer [REDACTED] there. Officer [REDACTED] recounted that when Respondent arrived, Respondent approached her and greeted her with a kiss on "the side of the cheek," close to the side of her mouth. Officer [REDACTED] felt this was an unusual greeting because Respondent was her supervisor at the time. Nonetheless, Officer [REDACTED] continued to enjoy the party and sometime later found herself socializing with other partygoers who were near Respondent, at which point Officer [REDACTED] took a picture of her and Respondent as they sat together in a seating area on the stage. (Tr. 35-38)

At trial, Officer [REDACTED] was shown three pictures that were taken at the holiday party on December 19. (Dept. Exs. 1-3). Officer [REDACTED] acknowledged that she is depicted in all three pictures but testified that Department's Exhibit 1 is the picture that captures the incident that is the subject of Specification 1 in this case. In said picture, Officer [REDACTED] hand is on Respondent's bare thigh and one of Respondent's hands is on Officer [REDACTED] inner leg while her other arm is wrapped around Officer [REDACTED] waist.

Officer [REDACTED] recollected that when Department's Exhibit 1 was being taken, Respondent initially put her arm around her back but then changed position, grabbed Officer [REDACTED] arm and "placed it between [Respondent's] legs." Officer [REDACTED] specifically detailed that when Respondent first took her arm, directing her hand into Respondent's lap, her fist was closed. Respondent then tapped her knuckles to suggest that she should open her hand and then placed Officer [REDACTED] now open hand between Respondent's legs on her thigh.

Officer [REDACTED] could not recall exactly what Respondent was wearing that night but remembered that her thighs were exposed. Officer [REDACTED] described that Respondent's action made her feel "uncomfortable" because "that's my supervisor and it was just very strange to me." (Tr. 39-42, 53)

Officer [REDACTED] further testified that at some point during the evening, Respondent commented on her appearance, stating in sum and substance, "You look beautiful out of uniform." She also recalled that Respondent inquired about her plans following the party, asking, "Where are you going after this? What's your plan, like after?" Officer [REDACTED] responded that she was not sure what she was doing and then left the party with her friend because she was "weirded out" and uncomfortable. Officer [REDACTED] attested that she had never had a prior interaction like this one with Respondent. (Tr. 43-44)

Officer [REDACTED] testified that a few days after the holiday party, on December 23, 2024, the 88 precinct was hosting a Christmas Toy Drive that she helped organize. She was running late due to her childcare issues and advised Respondent via text message of her lateness. She also told Respondent that she had received permission from the Commanding Officer's assistant to bring her children to the precinct for the Toy Drive later that day. After arriving at the Precinct, she recalled being approached by Respondent about bringing her children, who chastised her, "Who do you think you are...I'm the supervisor, you go through me." Officer [REDACTED] then told Respondent that if it was an issue she would not bring her children to the Toy Drive. (Tr. 45)

Later that day, Respondent spoke to Officer [REDACTED] in the ICO's office. Officer [REDACTED] testified that this was the first time Respondent reprimanded her for being late and that up until that day she believed Respondent understood the circumstances causing her delays. She further explained that Respondent suggested that she change her tour to help with the tardiness.

Officer [REDACTED] perceived this to be a threat, not an accommodation, because Respondent was aware that no other tour would work for Officer [REDACTED] at that time. (Tr. 45-48)

Officer [REDACTED] further testified that the following day, at roll call, Respondent singled her out by announcing to her peers, "Thanks to Officer [REDACTED] I know you guys are all miserable." She claimed that Respondent went on to suggest that if anyone in her command was unhappy or "weak," they can "call 1800 POPPA."² Officer [REDACTED] stated that she felt like her peers were "looking at [her] differently" because of what Respondent said at roll call. (Tr. 49)

According to Officer [REDACTED] testimony, although all these interactions with Respondent made her uncomfortable, she chose not to make an EEO complaint for fear of retaliation. However, the ICO, whose office Respondent and Officer [REDACTED] used to discuss her lateness, overheard their conversation and probed Officer [REDACTED] on what was going on. Officer [REDACTED] claimed that after she shared what happened between her and Respondent, the ICO decided to report the issue to EEO on her behalf. (Tr. 50, 63, 73)

During cross examination, Officer [REDACTED] avowed that she was sober during the holiday party but did not know whether Respondent had consumed alcohol that night. Officer [REDACTED] restated that Respondent kissed her when she first walked into the party. She further explained that when Respondent kissed her on the cheek in the manner that she did, Officer [REDACTED] immediately backed away. When asked whether she expressed concern to Respondent after the kiss, Officer [REDACTED] replied "no," but affirmed that she told Officer [REDACTED] "Wow, that was weird," to which Officer [REDACTED] responded with a shrug. She approximated that there was a thirty-minute gap between when Respondent first greeted her until the pictures (Dept. Exs. 1-3)

² POPPA is an acronym for "Police Organization Providing Peer Assistance." They are a police peer network that assists officers in need of support for personal or job-related stress.

were taken. Although Officer [REDACTED] could not remember whose idea it was to take the pictures, she was certain that they were taken by Officer [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] could not recall the sequence in which the pictures were taken, but she was certain that about thirty-minutes after Department's Exhibit 1 was taken, she left the holiday party. (Tr. 55-59)

Officer [REDACTED] testified that she and Officer [REDACTED] are friends and coworkers. Officer [REDACTED] testified that she worked under Respondent for a few months and had a professional relationship with her with no issues. Although she had not worked with her for very long, Officer [REDACTED] testified that Respondent had a reputation for being "strict," expounding that "she wanted everything done by the book." (Tr. 94-96)

Officer [REDACTED] testified that she attended the party on December 19th and arrived before both Officer [REDACTED] and Respondent. Officer [REDACTED] recalled that she and Officer [REDACTED] spent roughly an hour together during the event and that Officer [REDACTED] did not express any discomfort, nor did she appear upset about anything that occurred at the party. Officer [REDACTED] added that the first time Officer [REDACTED] mentioned being uncomfortable or retaliated against by Respondent was on December 23 after an encounter that Officer [REDACTED] had with Respondent at the 88 Precinct regarding Officer [REDACTED] lateness. (Tr. 106-08)

Officer [REDACTED] testified that at the party she took several photos with various people, including some of herself, Officer [REDACTED] and Respondent, but could not recall whose idea it was to take all the photos. Regarding the photographs in evidence, Officer [REDACTED] specifically recalled that two of the three pictures were taken by her as "selfies" (Dept. Exs. 2 & 3) and that they were taken before she took the photo of Officer [REDACTED] and Respondent with their hands on each other's thighs (Dept. Ex. 1). She also testified that there was a break in time between

when the first two photos (Dept. Exs. 2 & 3) were taken and when the third photo (Department Ex. 1) was taken.

With regard to Department's Exhibit 1, Officer [REDACTED] testified that Respondent and Officer [REDACTED] were posing for the picture, and then "Lieutenant Headley took Officer [REDACTED] hand and placed it on [her] lap." Officer [REDACTED] further elaborated that before Respondent took Officer [REDACTED] hand, her hand was resting on her own lap. She also explained that after observing Respondent move Officer [REDACTED] hand to Respondent's lap, there was no noticeable difference in Officer [REDACTED] temperament or facial expression, but soon thereafter, she left the area. Officer [REDACTED] recalled that when the pictures were taken, everyone was in a seemingly good mood. Following this, Officer [REDACTED] testified that she walked away from the two, but remained at the party for a short time afterward. Officer [REDACTED] remembered that Officer [REDACTED] left the party first and did not say anything to her before leaving. (Tr. 97-105)

Respondent testified that she and her aunt, Ms. [REDACTED] [REDACTED],³ arrived at the holiday party on December 19, 2024, at around 8:30 or 9:00 p.m. and began mingling with other attendees. She recalled that Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] approached her to say hello, and she told them she would join them shortly. Respondent next recalled that she approached a group of people, including Officer [REDACTED] and made a comment to the group stating, "oh, you guys look

³ Ms. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] testified at the hearing that she attended the Patrol Brooklyn North Borough Christmas Party on December 19, 2024, with Respondent, her niece. She recalled being present when the photos were taken and identified herself in the Department's Ex. 1. She testified that she and Respondent mingled and spent some time near the stage, where they eventually sat down, and at some point, others joined them. Soon thereafter, Dept. Ex 1 was taken. Ms. [REDACTED] further testified that, based on the photo and her recollection, "everyone was having a good time." (Tr. 200-05)

beautiful...have fun at the party.” She recounted that she then walked across the stage and joined her aunt to continue “talking, hanging out and dancing.” According to Respondent, Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] approached her and asked to take a picture. Respondent replied, in sum and substance, “okay, no problem. How do you want to take the pictures? Do you want duck face? Do you want sexy pictures? What kind of pictures are we doing?” (Tr. 224-26, 243)

Respondent remembered that, before taking the photo, she sat to the right of Officer [REDACTED] who sat in the middle, while her aunt sat on the left. Respondent testified that she asked Officer [REDACTED] what kind of picture she preferred and explained that Officer [REDACTED] “indicated that she was comfortable taking whatever pictures that we wanted to take.” With that understanding, Respondent stated, “okay, you could put your hand here, and I’m going to put my hand here, is that okay with you?” She further explained that Officer [REDACTED] replied “yeah, that’s fine,” indicating to Respondent that it was okay and she was comfortable. Respondent recalled that they then took the picture, “did duck face,” stood up to view the picture, had “positive commentary” about the picture, proceeded to take more selfies and then everyone continued socializing. That was the last interaction she recalled having with Officer [REDACTED] that evening. (Tr. 227)

Respondent affirmed that at no point did Officer [REDACTED] verbally express any discomfort or appear uncomfortable during the picture-taking. She testified that as far as she was concerned, nothing unusual occurred at the party that night. Respondent admitted that she asked Officer [REDACTED] what she was doing after the party but stated that she asked that question of multiple people throughout the night and that her question was meant to simply inquire about people’s plans after the party. Respondent adamantly denied that by asking that question of Officer [REDACTED] that she wanted her to come home to sleep with her or engage in any sexual

conduct. Respondent further testified that she is not sexually interested in Officer [REDACTED] (Tr. 228-30)

Respondent remembered that a few days after the holiday party, she and Officer [REDACTED] interacted again for the first time at the 88 Precinct. On that day, Respondent spoke with Officer [REDACTED] about her ongoing lateness in the ICO's office, and he walked in while they were speaking. Following that meeting, Respondent spoke with the ICO about Officer [REDACTED] lateness, and he ran her attendance record in the database, at which point they discovered that she was not submitting the required leave forms, commonly known as 28's. Respondent explained that she instructed him to ensure the 28 forms were completed and to run the entire platoon's records. Respondent later heard through the "rumor mill" that Officer [REDACTED] felt uncomfortable at the party and an EEO complaint was subsequently filed. She claimed that this resulted in her transfer to another precinct. (Tr. 231-32)

On cross-examination, Respondent testified that prior to her transfer to the 88 Precinct, she did not know Officers [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. She added that aside from Officer [REDACTED] lateness, she had no issues with her work. Respondent testified that prior to the Christmas party, she did not inquire about the 28's for Officer [REDACTED] because she did not think she needed to since "it goes without saying." (Tr. 245-48)

When questioned about the photographs taken at the party, Respondent acknowledged that her hand was on Officer [REDACTED] thigh but denied that it was "between her legs." Respondent also admitted that she took Officer [REDACTED] hand and put it on top of her leg as depicted in Department's Exhibit 1. Respondent elaborated that she first asked Officer [REDACTED] "do you want to take playful pictures or like duck face pictures?" Respondent claimed she then had a brief "discussion" with Officer [REDACTED] and requested permission to put her hand in that

position. Respondent claimed that Officer [REDACTED] verbally informed her that she was comfortable with the positioning of her hand for the purpose of the picture. Specifically, Respondent recalled Officer [REDACTED] saying: "I'm okay with that." Respondent maintained that based upon this verbal exchange, she had Officer [REDACTED] consent to place each other's hands on one another for the picture. (Tr. 250-53)

Respondent was confronted with the testimony she gave during her EEO interview in February 2025, approximately two months after the party, in which she stated that she did not know she had to request verbal permission to touch Officer [REDACTED] leg. Respondent reiterated that she believed Officer [REDACTED] was comfortable because at no point did Officer [REDACTED] say she was uncomfortable or indicate that said physical contact was unwelcome. At trial, however, Respondent maintained that she had a brief discussion with Officer [REDACTED] prior to the picture being. Respondent stated:

I said -- are we gonna take playful pictures or sexy pictures and duck face, and I said, you could put your hand, and I placed my hand here, indicating on our thighs and she says "okay," and shrugged her shoulder. So in that moment, it did not present to me that she was uncomfortable or it was unwelcome because naturally, if somebody, boss or not, and based on my interactions with her, she would tell you, right, she's also vocal, and she would also express what she wants and doesn't want and doesn't like... it's natural for me to think, she would still respond that way. She will push my hand away, she'll pull her body away, you know, and none of those happened. (Tr. 258)

When asked whether she believed it was professional for her to put her hand on a subordinate officer's thigh, Respondent replied: "Supervisors are expected to be mindful, and that interaction was brief and there was no indication it was unwelcome." (Tr. 259)

Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] testified that he has been a member of the Department for approximately nineteen years and has been the 88 Precinct's delegate for the past two years. In his capacity as delegate, Officer [REDACTED] described his responsibilities as finding "common

ground” between supervisors and subordinates and mediating precinct situations as necessary, so that the “precinct runs smoothly.” Officer [REDACTED] recalled that in December 2024, Respondent requested to speak with him, in his capacity as a delegate, to discuss her concerns about Officer [REDACTED] regarding her tardiness and missing 28 forms. He explained that following his conversation with Respondent, he spoke with Officer [REDACTED] and the precinct ICO to ensure that everyone was on the same page. He further explained that Officer [REDACTED] assured him that she would get the forms completed. Officer [REDACTED] stated that this was his only involvement in the situation. (Tr. 132-35)

On cross examination, Officer [REDACTED] confirmed that this conversation took place on December 24, 2024. He also explained that some of the dates on which Officer [REDACTED] was late predated the December 19 holiday party, recalling that there were approximately five missed 28’s, but that December 24 was the first time Respondent approached him about her concerns. (Tr. 136-39)

Specification 1 – Inappropriate physical contact

Specification 1 charges Respondent with subjecting Officer [REDACTED] to physical contact that made her uncomfortable. It is alleged that Respondent touched Officer [REDACTED] leg while posing for a picture and that she involuntarily took Officer [REDACTED] hand and placed it on her own bare thigh. Respondent does not deny that the physical contact occurred; she contends, however, that it was consensual in nature and therefore not inappropriate. Officer [REDACTED] however, credibly testified that not only was the physical contact described unwanted, but it made her feel uncomfortable, especially given the fact that Respondent was her supervisor at the time.

First and foremost, this encounter occurred at a Department sponsored holiday party and is therefore an extension of the workplace. Even though it was a more relaxed and informal environment, that does not mean that professional boundaries are blurred. Respondent, in her position as a Lieutenant, was therefore expected to exercise the same level of professionalism and decorum at this event with her subordinates that she would while wearing her uniform.

While taking pictures with subordinates is not, on its face, inappropriate, when a supervisor asks a subordinate a question such as “are we [taking] playful pictures or sexy pictures,” as Respondent admittedly did here, the conduct shifts from innocuous behavior to inappropriate. Respondent compounded this already questionable behavior by adding the element of physical contact. According to Officer [REDACTED] credible testimony, when the picture (Dept. Ex 1) was being taken, Respondent tapped her knuckles to suggest that she should open her closed fist and then, without saying anything, placed Officer [REDACTED] now open hand on Respondent’s thigh. Officer [REDACTED] admittedly did not voice her discomfort because this was her supervisor and she just felt it was “weird.”

Given the inconsistencies between Respondent’s trial testimony and her EEO interview, this Tribunal does not credit Respondent’s version of events as it pertains to what transpired on December 19th. However, even if I credited Respondent’s trial testimony, the fact that Respondent took Officer [REDACTED] hand, placed it on her thigh and allegedly asked in sum and substance “is this ok?” implies that she knew it was inherently impermissible physical contact absent explicit and unequivocal consent. A supervisor should not put a subordinate in this position. The fact that Officer [REDACTED] did not immediately voice her discomfort, as Respondent described, does not mitigate the impropriety of this contact. Respondent’s testimony not only failed to take into consideration the inherent power imbalance that existed between a lieutenant

and a police officer she supervises but also seems to suggest that a person's failure to verbally object is implicit consent. Moreover, as a supervisor with several years of experience, Respondent should have known that this type of physical contact between a supervisor and subordinate crosses professional boundaries and threatens the integrity of the Department. I therefore find that Respondent's actions on December 19, 2024 constituted unwanted physical contact in the workplace, which was contrary to the good order, efficiency, and discipline of the Department.

Accordingly, I find Respondent Guilty of Specification 1.

Specification 2 – Inappropriate Comment of a Sexual Nature Made to Officer [REDACTED]

Respondent is charged with making comments of a sexual nature to Officer [REDACTED] over the course of the night at the holiday party that made her feel uncomfortable, including comments about her appearance and asking Officer [REDACTED] "Where are you going after this?" Based upon the testimony adduced at trial, I do not find that the Department Advocate has met their burden of proving by a preponderance of the credible evidence that Respondent is guilty of said misconduct.

Officer [REDACTED] testified that at some point during the night of the holiday party Respondent said to her: "You look beautiful out of uniform." Officer [REDACTED] did not provide any context for this statement to explain why the seemingly innocent compliment made her uncomfortable. Respondent, who did not deny making the comment, testified that it was not just made to Officer [REDACTED] but was also made to a group of people as she was greeting them on stage. Although the line between compliments and sexual harassment sometimes feels thin in professional settings, there was insufficient evidence in this record to support a finding that Respondent's comment about Officer [REDACTED] appearance crossed the line.

Similarly, Officer [REDACTED] testified that when she and her friend were going down the stairs to where the food was set up at the party, Respondent asked her: "Where are you going? Where are you going after this? Are you leaving? What's your plans?" According to Officer [REDACTED] this comment gave her the impression that Respondent was asking to go home with her because "usually we don't ask people where they're going after a party unless you want to hang out with them." (Tr. 88)

Again, Respondent did not deny asking Officer [REDACTED] what she was doing after the party but testified that was a question she asked multiple people at the party that night and it was meant to simply inquire what people were doing after the party. Respondent clearly affirmed that she went home with her aunt after the party and had no intention of going anywhere with anyone after the party.

This Tribunal does not doubt that Officer [REDACTED] may have believed that Respondent's comments had an inappropriate undertone given what had transpired when they posed for the photo. However, the comments in and of themselves are not sanctionable. It must be noted that Respondent did not persist in the inquiry, nor did she insist on joining Officer [REDACTED]. In the absence of additional evidence to bolster the conclusion that Respondent's questions were of a suggestive nature, this Tribunal is not persuaded to make such a finding.

I therefore find Respondent Not Guilty of Specification 2.

Incident 2

Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] testified that she has been an officer at the 88 Precinct for nine years and prior to January 1, 2025, she worked under Respondent for "a day or two." She described her relationship with Respondent as "professional" and denied having any issues with her in the past. (Tr. 116)

Officer [REDACTED] recalled that on January 1, 2025, she responded to a job, along with Respondent, where someone was taken into custody. After that arrest, Officer [REDACTED] reviewed her BWC with Respondent in the 124 Room at the precinct. Officer [REDACTED] recalled that while she and Respondent were reviewing the video footage, at the timestamp where Respondent placed the perpetrator's legs into the car and Respondent's backside is facing the camera, Respondent asked Officer [REDACTED] whether she "liked that?" Officer [REDACTED] responded, "I think you handled that job very well." Officer [REDACTED] further explained that Respondent did not pause the video but responded, "no, not that." Based upon Respondent's comment, Officer [REDACTED] "figured [they] weren't talking about the way she handled the job, so [she] exited the 124 room." She further testified that she was not sure what Respondent was referring to but did not want to entertain anything further. When asked what she thought Respondent was referring to when she made that comment, Officer [REDACTED] replied: "She could have been asking about if I liked what I saw, which was her butt." (Tr. 117-20)

Officer [REDACTED] did not have any further conversation with Respondent about what was depicted on the BWC. She also stated that she did not make a complaint to EEO following this exchange. Officer [REDACTED] asserted that she did not want to be a complainant in this case. (Tr. 120-23)

On cross examination, Officer [REDACTED] acknowledged that this encounter with Respondent came up in her conversation with Officer [REDACTED] when Officer [REDACTED] was complaining to Officer [REDACTED] about the way Respondent treated her on the day of the precinct toy drive. Officer [REDACTED] expounded that when Officer [REDACTED] voiced her concerns about being treated differently for not responding to Respondent's advances at the Christmas party, she then brought up the interaction she had with Respondent concerning the BWC. (Tr. 124-29)

Respondent testified that a few weeks after her interaction with Officer [REDACTED] she saw Officer [REDACTED] in 124 Room reviewing body-worn camera footage of an arrest they both participated in earlier that day. Respondent testified that when she stopped in the room, Officer [REDACTED] said "Oh, Lieu, I like how you did that," and she replied, "did what?" to which Officer [REDACTED] responded, "I like how you put the guy in the RMP," and Respondent replied "Oh, you like that?" Respondent testified that the interaction was brief and ended there. Respondent stated that the BWC footage was continuously playing while they were speaking and that she did not point out her rear-end or ask Officer [REDACTED] whether she liked looking at her rear-end on the video. (Tr. 233-34)

Specification 3 – Inappropriate Comment of a Sexual Nature Made to Officer [REDACTED]

Respondent is charged with making comments of a sexual nature to Officer [REDACTED] while reviewing BWC in that she specifically stated: "You like that." It is alleged that this remark was made while Respondent's rear-end was in the frame.

Preliminarily, it is worth noting that this Tribunal found Officer [REDACTED] testimony to be credible. She did not exaggerate or embellish details to bolster her story and did not appear to have a vested interest in the outcome of this case. However, the interaction between Respondent and Officer [REDACTED] was so brief and fleeting that there was not a sufficient basis to conclude that Respondent's comment was of a sexual nature. In fact, although she was uncomfortable and left the room, Officer [REDACTED] acknowledged that she was not certain that Respondent's statement was meant to refer to her buttocks nor did Respondent pause the BWC video or point to the screen while her buttocks were displayed. In addition, Respondent did not make follow-up remarks.

Given this limited evidence, the Tribunal finds that Respondent's comment was too vague to meet the standard of proof necessary to make a finding of sanctionable misconduct. I therefore find Respondent Not Guilty of Specification 3.

Disciplinary Case No. C-033457

The second case involves allegations that Respondent made an inappropriate comment to a subordinate about her religious attire and about her religion causing her to feel uncomfortable in the workplace. Specifically, it is alleged that on January 30, 2025; while Respondent was conducting roll call at the 52 Precinct, she made an inappropriate comment to Officer [REDACTED] about wearing a hijab. Respondent is also charged with making an inappropriate comment to Officer [REDACTED] direct supervisor, Sergeant [REDACTED] about Officer [REDACTED] decision to convert to Islam.

Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] testified, with visible emotion, that in December 2024, shortly after her mother passed away, she decided to convert to Islam. As a part of Officer [REDACTED] religious conversion, she decided to start wearing a hijab, which is a traditional Muslim head covering. Officer [REDACTED] testified that she completed the religious accommodation form required by the Department requesting to wear the hijab at work and submitted it for approval on January 24, 2025. (Dept. Ex. 5) Following this, she received an automatically generated email response from the reasonable accommodation unit, which stated in sum and substance that she should show the email to her supervisor if questioned. (Dept. Ex. 6) Officer [REDACTED] testified that her understanding of this email was that the Reasonable Accommodation Unit was in receipt of her application and that they would review and approve it. She had no reason to believe that her request would be denied. (Tr. 149-53)

Officer [REDACTED] testified that following this submission, on January 30, 2025, she was on duty and wearing her hijab with her 8-point hat over it. On that day, Officer [REDACTED] recalled attending roll call, overseen by Respondent, with whom she had worked for approximately two weeks leading up to that day. Officer [REDACTED] recollected that Respondent required the officers to “open ranks,” a process whereby officers line up to allow the supervisor to walk through and thoroughly inspect their uniforms and equipment. According to Officer [REDACTED] as Respondent inspected uniforms, she reminded all the officers that “if an immediate supervisor gives you a lawful order, you have to listen to the order ... because if you don't listen to the lawful order, it's an automatic suspension.” (Tr. 157)

Officer [REDACTED] testified that during this roll call she was standing in the back row as Respondent conducted a call-and-response drill where everyone was required to reply, “yes ma'am.” At one point, Respondent signaled to Officer [REDACTED] stating, “you, officer with the earrings,” to which Officer [REDACTED] replied, “I'm not wearing earrings.” Officer [REDACTED] further explained that the hijab was covering her ears that day, which is significant in Islamic tradition, symbolizing modesty. Respondent then ordered, “let me see.” Despite her religious beliefs, Officer [REDACTED] lifted her hijab in front of her male coworkers to show Respondent her entire ear because she “felt threatened” and did not want to be suspended after the speech Respondent just gave about following orders. Officer [REDACTED] described this act as significant to her because, in her religion, females wear the hijab as a symbol of modesty in the company of the opposite sex, and as such, she felt embarrassed after complying with Respondent's request. (Tr. 157-58)

Following roll call, Officer [REDACTED] approached Respondent to show her the automatic response she received from EEO and explain why she was wearing the hijab. As she displayed the email on her phone, Officer [REDACTED] recalled that Respondent took her phone in what she

perceived to be a condescending manner and retorted that the request was not yet approved. Officer [REDACTED] informed her that "this is what I got right now." Officer [REDACTED] then recalled that Respondent stated, in sum and substance, "but you're aware that you're gonna have to wear that in the hot, in the summer, you're gonna have to cover your neck, and you're gonna be hot." (Tr. 160) Officer [REDACTED] responded that she is aware and that is a decision she has made. She testified that this comment made her "sad" and "uncomfortable." (Tr. 160-162)

According to Officer [REDACTED] Respondent then asked to speak with Officer [REDACTED] in private and escorted her into the property room along with her delegate, Officer Feliz. While in the property room, Officer [REDACTED] explained to Respondent that her mother recently passed away, and this is why she decided to wear the hijab. According to Officer [REDACTED] Respondent informed her that the Commanding Officer of the 52 Precinct ruled that the NYPD "beanie" could not be worn inside the building because it looks unprofessional, but she would allow Officer [REDACTED] to wear the hijab only if it was covered with the NYPD beanie. Officer [REDACTED] interpreted this to mean that she could not wear the hijab inside the building and that she could only wear it outside, covered by the beanie. (Tr. 163)

In addition, Officer [REDACTED] testified that during this same conversation Respondent called her a "problem cop," which confused her. As Officer [REDACTED] explained, she did not have any command disciplines and maintained a low profile on the job. Moreover, prior to this interaction, she had no issues with Respondent. Officer [REDACTED] therefore, interpreted this comment as Respondent's disapproval of her religion and gender. (Tr. 164)

Officer [REDACTED] asserted that Respondent then instructed her to summon her immediate supervisor, Sergeant [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] testified that when Sergeant [REDACTED] joined the conversation, Respondent said to him, "Sergeant, are you aware that Officer [REDACTED] has converted

to Islam?" Officer [REDACTED] emphasized that this comment made her feel embarrassed because she did not think it needed to be announced. Respondent proceeded to tell Sergeant [REDACTED] about the exception she made, specifically that she will allow Officer [REDACTED] to wear the hijab only if it is covered with the NYPD beanie. However, Respondent added that if he sees Officer [REDACTED] with only the hijab, he can give her a Command Discipline. (Tr. 167)

Officer [REDACTED] attested that she had no further run-ins with Respondent regarding her hijab and continued to wear it "under the beanie" as instructed until her reasonable accommodation was formally approved. She testified that Respondent made no other comments about her religion or religious vestments. At trial, Officer [REDACTED] was asked why she was not wearing a hijab in the courtroom, and she replied it was because she did not feel the hijab was welcomed in the Department and Respondent had made her feel ashamed and embarrassed to wear it at work. (Tr. 168-69)

Respondent testified that her leadership style is "very firm," especially when it comes to uniform compliance. She elaborated that throughout her tenure with the Department she served in many units, with one of the most impactful being the Ceremonial Unit. During her time in the in this "prestigious unit," Respondent learned the importance of looking distinguished and keeping a pristine uniform, a concept she carried with her as a supervisor. Respondent stated:

I think that has a lot of do with seeing what the uniform represents ... We wear this uniform, a lot of cops died in this uniform...so it's important to me when I wear it, when my platoon wears it, they're going to look squared away in honor of the sacrifices people made.

As such, Respondent described her posture when she became a sergeant, and eventually a lieutenant, as "very firm," particularly when it came to uniform compliance, something she regularly inspected during roll call. (Tr. 212-18)

Respondent testified that she was transferred to the 52 Precinct in January 2025.

Respondent explained that while she was annoyed about the transfer, she did not treat officers more harshly and instead maintained the same expectations for uniform compliance as she had at the 88 Precinct. Respondent stated that she was made aware by another officer that Officer [REDACTED] was wearing a "head scarf" prior to her encounter with her on January 30, 2025. (Tr. 233-36)

Respondent recollected that on January 30, during an open-rank roll call, she approached Officer [REDACTED] who was wearing a head covering under her 8-point hat, with hair visible along the frame of her face. She further testified that she had been previously informed that Officer [REDACTED] was wearing earrings under the head covering, so Respondent asked during roll call, "any earrings?" When Officer [REDACTED] confirmed that she was not wearing earrings, she continued inspecting the rest of the officers. Respondent testified that she also asked "all the men who had a beard" to present their reasonable accommodation to her. (Tr. 237-38)

After roll call, Respondent asked the delegate to accompany her to speak with Officer [REDACTED] regarding the head covering. Respondent asked Officer [REDACTED] whether she had a reasonable accommodation and Officer [REDACTED] showed her the confirmation email for the reasonable accommodation, to which Respondent replied, "this is not an approval." As Officer [REDACTED] continued to explain, Respondent suggested moving the conversation to a more private area, so they went to the property room. Officer [REDACTED] informed Respondent that she was still awaiting approval. Respondent testified that prior to this interaction she had reached out to EEO several times for guidance in anticipation of this issue and, in the interim, determined that Officer [REDACTED] could wear the Department-issued hat knitted over her hijab. She further testified that although the Commanding Officer of the 52 Precinct prohibited the use of knitted hats inside the precinct, she stated that "because of the circumstances, I'm certain he would have allowed

it,” and denied ever telling Officer [REDACTED] that she could not wear the knitted hat inside the precinct. Respondent also explained that her comments regarding wearing the hijab in the summer were related to uniform compliance, not religion, and testified that she does not have a problem with Officer [REDACTED] because she is Muslim and a female. (Tr. 239-44)

During cross-examination, Respondent admitted that she asked Officer [REDACTED] during roll call on January 30, to confirm that she was not wearing earrings. She explained that she tapped her own ears and asked Officer [REDACTED] if she was wearing earrings, signaling Officer [REDACTED] to show her ears because she is shorter than Respondent. Respondent testified that prior to her private conversation with Officer [REDACTED] she had reached out to EEO for guidance on this issue but had not heard back. Respondent also admitted that she instructed Sergeant [REDACTED] to issue a Command Discipline if Officer [REDACTED] was seen wearing only the hijab before the reasonable accommodation is approved, as it would be a violation of uniform policy. (Tr. 269-79)

Respondent’s counsel offered Sergeant [REDACTED] transcript, from his in-person EEO interview on February 6, 2025, in evidence as Respondent’s Exhibit A. The Tribunal carefully reviewed it, and the following is a summary of the relevant portions of the interview. Sergeant [REDACTED] testified that in January 2025, he was assigned as the “C two squad” sergeant. At the time, his squad was comprised of twelve officers, including Officer [REDACTED] (Resp. Ex. A at 5)

Sergeant [REDACTED] testified that at the time, Respondent was his platoon commander. Although he had not worked with her for very long, Sergeant [REDACTED] described his interactions with Respondent as positive. He also emphasized that Respondent “zones in” on uniform appearance. Sergeant [REDACTED] recalled that when Respondent first introduced herself to the sergeants, “that was the first thing that she looked at all of us as far as from down to our boots to

ensure that they were appropriate for our uniform... She demands excellence in all respects from her sergeants and officers. And that includes uniform appearance.” (Resp. Ex. A at 15)

Regarding the incident that occurred with Officer [REDACTED] on January 30, Sergeant [REDACTED] testified that Respondent told Officer [REDACTED] to summon her squad sergeant to the property room because she wanted to speak with both of them. Respondent informed Sergeant [REDACTED] that Officer [REDACTED] was in the process of applying for a reasonable accommodation for a head covering and that in the interim, Respondent was instructing Officer [REDACTED] on how to properly have the head covering as it relates to conforming to the uniform. Specifically, Sergeant [REDACTED] stated that Respondent authorized Officer [REDACTED] to wear the head covering but instructed her that in order to conform to the uniform she had to have the NYPD knit cap or the eight point hat over it until the accommodation was approved. He denied that Respondent ever mentioned that Officer [REDACTED] could not wear the head covering. Sergeant [REDACTED] did, however, acknowledge that Respondent stated that if officers are not in compliance with uniform regulations, they could subject themselves to command discipline. (Resp. Ex. A p. 9-10, 13, 18)

Sergeant [REDACTED] testified that Respondent maintained a calm demeanor throughout this conversation, and he estimated that it lasted no more than three minutes. Sergeant [REDACTED] denied that Respondent ever asked him whether he knew that Officer [REDACTED] was becoming Muslim or that she referred to a specific religion. Sergeant [REDACTED] was asked why he thought he and Officer [REDACTED] were brought in to speak with Respondent about the head covering. Sergeant [REDACTED] posited that Respondent is “very big on uniform appearance” and that she wanted to ensure that uniform regulations were being adhered to. (Resp. Ex. A p. 16)

Specification 1 – Making an Inappropriate Comment Regarding Officer [REDACTED] Religious Attire

Respondent is charged with making an inappropriate comment regarding Officer [REDACTED] religious attire - specifically her hijab. It is undisputed that when Respondent was addressing Officer [REDACTED] pending reasonable accommodation request to wear a hijab, she stated to her in sum and substance: "you're aware that you're gonna have to wear that in the hot, in the summer, you're gonna have to cover your neck, and you're gonna be hot." (Tr. 160) Respondent claimed that she made this statement about the hijab as it relates to Officer [REDACTED] "uniform compliance." However, this was not a judgement Respondent was entitled to make. This Tribunal therefore finds the reasoning behind Respondent making such comments flawed and unpersuasive.

Although Respondent may have not intended for the comment to offend Officer [REDACTED] it nonetheless caused her to feel embarrassed and uncomfortable in her place of work. Respondent's comment also had no legitimate purpose and was not reasonably related to the Department's uniform policy or Officer [REDACTED] compliance with it. In this Tribunal's view, Respondent's comments had the undertones of a condescending forewarning that have no place in a professional setting, especially not in a conversation between a supervisor and subordinate about religious strictures.

I therefore find Respondent Guilty of Specification 1.

Specification 2 – Making an Inappropriate Comment Regarding Officer [REDACTED] Religion

Specification 2 alleges that Respondent made an inappropriate comment about Officer [REDACTED] religion when she told Sergeant [REDACTED] in sum and substance: "Sergeant, are you aware that Officer [REDACTED] has converted to Islam?" Officer [REDACTED] testified that this comment embarrassed her because she felt "this did not need to be announced." The Department Advocate

argued that Respondent had no reason to make this comment to Sergeant [REDACTED] because it was “not his business” and further emphasized that her tone was demeaning. Based upon the evidence presented at trial, this Tribunal disagrees with Department Advocate’s assessment of the context in which this comment was made and therefore finds it was not sanctionable.

Respondent had just become aware of Officer [REDACTED] request for a reasonable accommodation and rationally concluded that her direct supervisor might not be aware of it. Informing Sergeant [REDACTED] of Officer [REDACTED] religion and use of the hijab was reasonable under the circumstances and not unwarranted. Respondent did not “announce” Officer [REDACTED] religious conversion to the entire precinct. She did it in a private room with only Officer [REDACTED] and Sergeant [REDACTED] present. Her comment to the sergeant was not patently offensive, derogatory or protected by privacy laws. The fact that Officer [REDACTED] felt embarrassed by the way in which Respondent handled the situation does not mean that it was a sanctionable comment.

I therefore find Respondent Not Guilty of Specification 2.

PENALTY

In order to determine an appropriate penalty, this tribunal, guided by the Department’s Disciplinary System Penalty Guidelines, considered all relevant facts and circumstances, including potential aggravating and mitigating factors established in the record. Respondent’s employment history was also examined. *See* 38 RCNY § 15-07. Information from her personnel record that was considered in making this penalty recommendation is contained in an attached memorandum.

Respondent, who was appointed to the Department on January 7, 2008, has been found guilty of inappropriate physical contact with a subordinate (Disciplinary Case No. C-033349) and making an inappropriate comment about a subordinate’s religious attire (Disciplinary Case

No. C-033457). The charge involving sexual harassment (suggestive touching) has a presumptive penalty of 25 days. The count of making a disparaging remark regarding a person's religion carries a presumptive penalty of 20 days. The aggravated penalty for each of the counts is Termination. The Department Advocate is recommending the presumptive penalty of 25 days for the suggestive touching charge and the mitigated penalty of 10 days for the disparaging remark charge, for a total of 35 penalty days. This Tribunal disagrees with the Department Advocate's recommendation and believes a higher penalty is warranted.

It should go without saying, but it is certainly worth repeating, that this Department prides itself on cultivating a fair, safe, inclusive and accommodating work environment for all its members. The workplace must be free from discrimination and harassment. Respondent's conduct at the Department sponsored holiday party on December 19, 2024 was not only unprofessional and inappropriate but ran afoul of these basic principles.

It is also concerning that at the time of this incident, Respondent was a lieutenant tasked with vast responsibility in overseeing and supervising personnel in the 88 Precinct. In that capacity, Respondent carelessly exceeded the boundaries of her relationship with a workplace subordinate, which is an aggravating factor that this Tribunal took into consideration. Moreover, Respondent's testimony, that she believed that Officer [REDACTED] "consented" and was "ok" with what was happening, only serves to underscore her lack of awareness of the gravity of the situation and her poor judgment. Furthermore, Respondent's statement on the witness stand, that Officer [REDACTED] did not verbally object to the physical contact is also very troubling. Respondent's testimony not only emphasizes her obliviousness to the power imbalance that existed between she and her subordinate, but also sets an unrealistic standard that a person's silence, passivity, or lack of resistance implies consent. It appears that Respondent does not fully

comprehend the impact her actions had or that she created an uncomfortable work environment for a subordinate.

Respondent's misconduct expanded into a different area, when she was transferred to another precinct and made a distasteful comment to Officer [REDACTED] about her decision to wear a religious head covering. While Respondent's comment may not have been intentionally offensive about the Muslim religion, it certainly had no place in the context of her conversation with Officer [REDACTED] and was not reasonably related to the Department's uniform policy as Respondent purported it to be. A remark such as this, coming from a supervisor, constituted unacceptable workplace conduct, which warrants the presumptive penalty of 20 days.

Taking into account the totality of issues and circumstances in these matters, I recommend that Respondent forfeit a total of forty-five (45) vacation days. In addition, I recommend that Respondent receive remedial EEO training.

Respectfully submitted,



Vanessa Facio-Lince
Assistant Deputy Commissioner Trials

DISAPPROVED

JUN 11 2026

**JESSICA S. TISCH
POLICE COMMISSIONER**



POLICE DEPARTMENT CITY OF NEW YORK

From: Assistant Deputy Commissioner – Trials

To: Police Commissioner

Subject: SUMMARY OF EMPLOYMENT RECORD
SERGEANT TREVLYN HEADLEY
TAX REGISTRY NO. 945808
DISCIPLINARY CASE NOS. C-033349 & C-033457

Respondent was appointed to the Department on January 7, 2008. On her most recent performance evaluation for a probationary period spanning August 2024 through December 2024, she received a 3.5 rating of "Highly Competent/Competent." On her most recent annual performance evaluation from 2020, she was rated "Exceeds Expectations."

In 2012, Respondent forfeited 48 suspension days after pleading guilty to engaging in a physical altercation with another patron at a nightclub and recklessly engaging in conduct that created substantial risk of serious physical injury to that person. Respondent was off duty and a probationary police officer at the time of this incident.

In connection with the instant matter, Respondent was placed on Level 1 Discipline Monitoring in August 2025; that monitoring remains ongoing.

Vanessa Facio-Lince
Assistant Deputy Commissioner Trials