

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Ben Spiegelman	Team: Squad #07	CCRB Case #: 202508620	☐ Force	☒ Discourt.	☐ U.S.
			☒ Abuse	☒ O.L.	☐ Injury
Incident Date(s) Monday, 03/10/2025 3:23 PM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	18 Mo. SOL 9/10/2026	Precinct: 113		
Date/Time CV Reported Tue, 03/18/2025 3:54 PM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Social Media	Date/Time Received at CCRB Tue, 08/26/2025 12:20 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. CPT Larry Meyers	00000	939030	OFFICE TRP

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. PO Khevon Pinnock	30827	978972	113 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Inv. Div. Recommendation
A . CPT Larry Meyers	Abuse: Captain Larry Meyers entered § 87(2)(b) in Queens.	A . Within NYPD Guidelines
B . CPT Larry Meyers	Off. Language: Captain Larry Meyers made remarks to an individual based upon the gender of an individual.	B . Substantiated
C . CPT Larry Meyers	Discourtesy: Captain Larry Meyers spoke discourteously to an individual.	C . Substantiated

Case Summary

This complaint was generated by IAB from a social media video on March 18, 2025. The CCRB obtained this complaint on August 26, 2025, by IAB referral.

On March 10, 2025, at approximately 3:23 p.m., Cpt. Larry Meyers and PO Khevon Pinnock, then both of the 113th Precinct, went to § 87(2)(b) in Queens to perform a domestic violence home visit on the resident, § 87(2)(b). When they arrived, § 87(2)(b) answered the door and refused to provide her name and to let the officers in. When she attempted to close the door, Cpt. Meyers placed his foot in the threshold to keep the door from closing (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority, Entry of Premises – Within NYPD Guidelines**). A male individual wearing a mask then came to the door and did not provide his identification. § 87(2)(b) provided her name and as the officers were leaving, Cpt. Meyers told the male individual that he was “pussy too” for wearing a mask inside (**Allegation B: Offensive Language, Gender – Substantiated**) (**Allegation C: Discourtesy, Discourteous Word – Substantiated**).

The CCRB obtained BWC footage from Cpt. Meyers (**Board Review 01**) and PO Pinnock (**Board Review 02**) capturing the entirety of the incident.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Captain Larry Meyers entered § 87(2)(b) in Queens.

Allegation (B) Offensive Language: Captain Larry Meyers made remarks to an individual based upon the gender of an individual.

Allegation (C) Discourtesy: Captain Larry Meyers spoke discourteously to an individual.

The investigation was unable to contact any of the civilians involved in this incident.

At the 3:00 time mark of Cpt. Meyers’ BWC (**Board Review 01**), Cpt. Meyers approaches the door of § 87(2)(b) and greets § 87(2)(b) remarking that he has never met her before and asking where § 87(2)(b) is. § 87(2)(b) replies that § 87(2)(b) is not at home. At the 3:12 time mark, Cpt. Meyers asks if § 87(2)(b) knows where § 87(2)(b) is and asks if the officers can come inside. § 87(2)(b) shakes her head no. At 3:17, Cpt. Meyers asks who § 87(2)(b) is and how can he know if she lives there. § 87(2)(b) shrugs her shoulders and raises her right arm and at the 3:25 time mark attempts to close the door. At 3:28, the door can be heard impacting something and does not close. Cpt. Meyers repeats his question of how the officers can know § 87(2)(b) lives at the residence and asks for her name again. § 87(2)(b) states that the officers cannot enter and that she does not have to tell the officers her name. At 3:34, Cpt. Meyers asks how he can know § 87(2)(b) lives there and a male individual can be heard saying “you can’t do that” to Cpt. Meyers. Cpt. Meyers greets the male individual, who is standing behind § 87(2)(b) and asks for his name. At 3:41, the male individual gestures towards Cpt. Meyers’ feet and says that Cpt. Meyers “can’t do that.” Cpt. Meyers again asks how he can know § 87(2)(b) and the male individual live there, states that he is not asking to come in, and asks who they are. At 3:50, § 87(2)(b) starts recording Cpt. Meyers and Cpt. Meyers says that § 87(2)(b) can record his name. At 3:56, § 87(2)(b) asks if she can close the door. Cpt. Meyers says no and asks how he can know they live there. At 4:05, Cpt. Meyers says that they know what the officers are there for and that it is not § 87(2)(b) or the male individual. § 87(2)(b) responds that she does not know what the officers are there for. At 4:10, Cpt. Meyers asks if § 87(2)(b) can call § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) asks if she has to by law and Cpt. Meyers states that he needs her name to know that she lives here. § 87(2)(b) states that her name is § 87(2)(b). At 4:21, Cpt. Meyers states that that is all he needed and turns to leave. At 4:28, Cpt. Meyers says that § 87(2)(b) and the male individual “don’t act tough when § 87(2)(b)

kicks the door in” and § 87(2)(b) states that she does not know who § 87(2)(b) is and that she is not from Queens. At the 4:37 time mark, Cpt. Meyers asks the male individual, who can be seen wearing a mask, if he wears a mask in the house. The male individual responds that he does and at the 4:40 time mark, he says to the male individual “you’re pussy too.”

At the 3:29 time mark of PO Pinnock’s BWC (**Board Review 02**), Cpt. Meyers is talking to § 87(2)(b). When § 87(2)(b) attempts to close the door, Cpt. Meyers can be seen placing his foot in the threshold of the door and against the door, preventing it from closing.

The notes of Cpt. Meyers’ memo book entry, read into the record during his statement (Board Review 03), stated “10-75 F looking for § 87(2)(b) not home and strange people came to the door. Captain unsure what is going on and who belongs and who does not. Very combative female/male with mask, refusing to give information. Captain feared for all safety, but continued conversation. Did not enter house. Unknown female came back to the car and put § 87(2)(b) on the phone, who stated it was her niece and she was safe. § 87(2)(b) was sorry for behavior of “guests.” § 87(2)(b) female kept up nasty behavior. No force alleged or used.”

Cpt. Meyers stated (**Board Review 03**) that he and PO Pinnock went to § 87(2)(b) to perform a domestic violence home visit for the resident, § 87(2)(b) who had been a victim of multiple domestic violence incidents in the past. Though he had her phone number, Cpt. Meyers did not reach out to § 87(2)(b) ahead of time, as he did not want to put § 87(2)(b) or himself at risk if § 87(2)(b) abuser, § 87(2)(b) was present. When the officers arrived and knocked on the door, a female individual Cpt. Meyers did not know answered the door, opening it only partially. Cpt. Meyers asked for her pedigree information, and she declined to provide it and did not invite Cpt. Meyers in, which raised his suspicions and concerns for § 87(2)(b) as in his prior experiences with domestic violence home visits, people usually welcome officers and are friendly with them. As Cpt. Meyers continued to speak to the female individual, a male wearing a non-medical mask came to the door. The male’s mask made Cpt. Meyers more suspicious and made him wonder if § 87(2)(b) home was being burglarized. Cpt. Meyers is familiar with § 87(2)(b) appearance and did not believe the male to be him. Cpt. Meyers continued to ask for both individuals’ pedigree information, which they refused to provide. While speaking to the two individuals, Cpt. Meyers put his foot on the threshold of the door to prevent it from closing. Cpt. Meyers wished to keep speaking with the individuals to learn about § 87(2)(b) wellbeing and he was concerned for officer safety. While speaking with the male individual, Cpt. Meyers said that he was “pussy too.” Cpt. Meyers did not have a specific reason for using profanity or for using the word “pussy” and did not say it for any tactical purpose. The female individual then identified herself as § 87(2)(b) and Cpt. Meyers chose to return to his vehicle.

People v. Garvin, 30 N.Y.3d 174 (2017) (**Board Review 04**), citing *Payton v. New York*, 445 US 573 (1980), officers are considered entering a residence once passing the entry threshold of the residence and, absent exigent circumstances or consent, such an entry cannot reasonably be made without a warrant.

Per *People v. Doll*, 21 N.Y.3d 665 (2013) (**Board Review 05**), officers may make warrantless entry where 1) the police have reasonable grounds to believe that there is an emergency at hand and an immediate need for their assistance for the protection of life or property, 2) the search is not primarily motivated by intent to arrest and seize evidence, and 3) there exists some reasonable basis to associate the emergency with the area or place to be entered and/or searched.

NYPD Patrol Guide, Section 200-02 (**Board Review 06**) pledges that the NYPD will, among other things, maintain a higher standard of integrity than is generally expected of others and value human

life, respect the dignity of each individual, and render services with courtesy and civility.

In *PD v Pichardo*, DAO-DCT Case Number 2015-15015 (**Board Review 07**), an officer was found guilty of speaking discourteously when the statements made served no legitimate purpose but to belittle.

It is undisputed that Cpt. Meyers crossed the threshold with his foot to prevent § 87(2)(b) from closing the door when she attempted to do so. § 87(2)(g)

it is recommended **Allegation A** be closed as **Within NYPD Guidelines**.

§ 87(2)(g)

it is recommended that **Allegations B and C** be closed as **Substantiated**.

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first CCRB complaint to which § 87(2)(b) has been a party.
- CPT Larry Meyers (939030) has been a member of service for 20 years and five months. He has been the subject of 32 closed complaints and 61 FADO&U allegations, four of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g)
 - 200614034 involved one substantiated "Abuse of Authority - Search (of person)" allegation for which the Board recommended Charges. NYPD imposed Instructions.
 - 201810259 involved one substantiated "Abuse of Authority - Failure to provide RTKA card" allegation for which the Board recommended Command Lvl Instructions. NYPD imposed Instructions.
 - 202103469 involved one substantiated "Abuse of Authority - Property damaged" allegation for which the Board recommended Command Discipline A; and one substantiated "Discourtesy - Action" allegation for which the Board recommended Command Discipline A. NYPD imposed Command Discipline - A.

Mediation and Civil Histories

- This complaint was not suitable for mediation.
- As of December 16, 2025, the New York City Office of the Comptroller has no record of a Notice of Claim being filed regarding this incident (**Board Review 08**).

RPBP History

- This complaint did not contain any allegations of Racial Profiling/Bias-Based Policing.

Squad No.: 7

Squad No.:	<u>7</u>		
Investigator:	<u>Ben Spiegelman</u>	<u>Inv. Ben Spiegelman</u>	<u>16 January 2026</u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Squad Leader:	<u>Vanessa Rosen</u>	<u>Manager Vanessa Rosen</u>	<u>January 16, 2026</u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Reviewer:	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date