EASTERN DISTRICT OF N	EW YORK	
ADHYL POLANCO,	Plaintiff	Docket No.
-agains THE CITY OF NEW YORK, POLICE DEPARTMENT,		COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND
	Defendants.	

Plaintiff Adhyl Polanco, as and for his complaint by his undersigned counsel, alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This is a suit to obtain relief for employment discrimination on the basis of Plaintiff's race and national origin; for violation of the plaintiff's 1st Amendment rights to free speech, and to obtain relief for retaliation to which the plaintiff has been subjected for reporting and complaining of the NYPD's illegal quota system, by the City of New York (hereinafter referred to as "the City" and the New York City Police Department (hereinafter referred to as "the NYPD").

VENUE

2. Venue is proper in the United District Court for the Southern District of New York pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1391(b) and (c) and 42 U.S.C. 2000e-5(f)(3) in that the central offices of defendants are within this district, a substantial part of the events giving rise to this claim arose in this district and records relevant to the practices complained of herein are located in this district.

JURY DEMAND

3. Plaintiff demands trial by jury in this action on each and every one of his claims.

JURISDICTIONAL PREREQUISITE

- 4. Plaintiff filed a charge of discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and a right to sue letter was issued on July 1, 2015.
- 5. The jurisdiction of this court is invoked pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5(f)(3), 28 U.S.C. §\$1331 and 1343(3), and 28 U.S.C. §1376(a) for claims arising under the New York State Human Rights Law and the New York City Human Rights Law based on the doctrine of supplemental jurisdiction in that such claims arise from a common nucleus of operative fact, and are so intertwined with other matters pending before the Court as to make exercise of supplemental jurisdiction appropriate.

PARTIES

- 6. The Plaintiff, Adhyl Polanco is a Latin-American male.
- 7. Plaintiff Adhyl Polanco is currently employed as a Police Officer by the NYPD.
- 8. At all times relevant, Plaintiff was an "employee" of the NYPD and of the CITY within the meaning of the relevant statutes.
- 9. Upon information and belief, the NYPD is a domestic government agency and is engaged in business in the state of New York, with an office and place of business in the City of New York, State of New York.
- 10. Upon information and belief, the City is a domestic government agency and is engaged in business in the State of New York, with an office and place of business in the City of New York, State of New York.
- 11. At all times relevant to this action, CITY was an "employer" for purposes of the common

law of New York and the relevant statutes.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 12. Plaintiff Adhyl Polanco was hired by the NYPD on July 11, 2005. In 2009, plaintiff made a statement to the media about the existence of quotas in the issuance of summons and arrests warrants in the NYPD and the NYPD targeting minority communities in order to obtain the summons and arrest numbers required by the quota. The substance of Officer Polanco's statements was his opposition to the unfair, racially discriminatory and illegal mandatory enforcement activity which targets the minority African-American and Latino Community to which Officer Polanco belongs.
- On or about November 2009, while assigned to the 41st Precint of the NYPD, Officer Polanco spoke to the media regarding the misconduct and corruption within the precint. He reported that the Supervisors of the precint were aggressively using threats of termination and negative employment actions such as low performance evaluations and punitive postings, to compel police officers to issue borderline and illegal summons and make borderline and illegal arrests in order to achieve a goal of a certain number of arrests and a certain number of summons set by the department for the precint, for that quarter.
- 14. On or about November 2009, while assigned to the 41st Precint of the NYPD, Officer Polanco called the Internal Affairs Bureau of the NYPD to report misconduct and corruption within the precint. He reported that the Supervisors of the precint were aggressively using threats of termination and negative employment actions such as low performance evaluations and punitive postings, to compel police officers to issue borderline and illegal summons and make borderline and illegal arrests in order to

- achieve a productivity goal of a certain number of arrests and a certain number of summons set by the department for the precint, for that quarter.
- 15. In December 2009, Officer Polanco reported to the Internal Affairs Bureau of the NYPD that he was experiencing retaliation for his earlier report regarding the corruption and misconduct in the 41 precint.
- In December 2009, Officer Polanco was retaliated against for his opposition to the racially discriminatory quota practices of the NYPD, in that after being falsely and pretextually charged with insubordination, he was heavily punished as follows: 30 days suspension without pay; 1500 days suspension with pay; over 400 days of punitive posting in VIPER; over 1500 days on restricted duty psychological hold without cause; no vacation for four years; no overtime for four years; no night differential pay for four years; no training for four years; and placement on level two performance monitoring for over four years.
- 17. On December 23, 2009, Officer Polanco was further retaliated against for his opposition to the racially discriminatory quota practices of the NYPD by being punished as follows: 30 days suspension without pay; no paid detail; no vacation for a year and placement on performance monitoring.
- 18. In January 2010, Officer Polanco was further retaliated against for his opposition to the racially discriminatory quota practices of the NYPD by being placed on modified assignment transfer out of command and placed on mental watch through 2015.
- 19. On March 1st 2010, Channel 7 Eyewitness news broadcast an interview on television with Officer Polanco where he exposed the ongoing illegal quota activity within the 41st Precint and the NYPD at large.

- 20. On August 25, 2010, the Village Voice Newspaper published an interview with Officer Polanco where he exposed the illegal quota activity within the 41st Precint and the NYPD at large.
- 21. Beginning from March 2010 through December 2014, Officer Polanco was further retaliated against for his opposition to the racially discriminatory quota practices of the NYPD by being placed on performance monitoring, being suspended with pay, and being placed on dismissal probation for one year from December 2013 to December 2014.
- 22. From October 2014 to till date, in retaliation for his opposition to the racially discriminatory and illegal quota practices of the NYPD, plaintiff was further punished by being placed on dismissal probation and on mental watch.
- 23. From October 2014 till date, in retaliation for his opposition to the racially discriminatory and illegal quota practices of the NYPD, plaintiff was further punished by being placed on performance monitoring.
- 24. From October 2014, till date, plaintiff has been subjected to a hostile working environment as a result of his race and national origin. Plaintiff's locker was vandalized by being pasted over with photographs of PBA Union Leader Patrick Lynch and on January 23, 2015, plaintiff was accosted at the premises of the 94th precint by police officer Steve Trugilio who verbally abused plaintiff calling him a "fucking bitch". Plaintiff complained about this treatment to the internal affairs bureau but no action was taken. Plaintiff also requested a transfer out of this precint as his safety is under threat in this environment but his request was not addressed.
- 25. From October 2014 till date, plaintiff has been assigned to less desirable jobs than his white counterparts, with similar age and time on the police force.

- 26. From October 2014 till date, Plaintiff has been reprimanded and sanctioned, in a more severe manner than his white counterparts, for failing to meet monthly summons and arrests quotas.
- 27. The discriminatory actions of the Defendants are ongoing and continue to this day.
- 28. In April 2010, plaintiff was deposed as a witness and gave testimony in a Federal Class Action Law Suit regarding the NYPD's stop and frisk practice and how it unfairly targets the minority community. The substance of Officer Polanco's testimony was that the NYPD targets the minority community in order to attain high levels of enforcement activity numbers mandated by illegal quotas and police officers suffered punishment in their employment for not participating in the illegal quota activity.
- 29. After plaintiff was identified as a witness in the stop and frisk federal class action lawsuit, the retaliation against the plaintiff intensified.
- 30. On or about March 2013, the plaintiff testified as a witness during the trial of a federal class action law suit regarding the NYPD's stop and frisk practice and how it unfairly targets the minority community. The substance of Officer Polanco's testimony was that they NYPD targets the minority community in order to attain high levels of enforcement activity numbers mandated by illegal quotas and police officers were punished in their employment for not participating in the illegal quota activity.

AS AND FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

- 31. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each allegation set forth above in support of this count.
- 32. The Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of his race, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §2000(e) et seq.

AS AND FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

- 33. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each allegation set forth above in support of this count.
- 34. The Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of his race, in violation of New York State Executive Law (Human Rights Law) §296.

AS AND FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

- 35. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each allegation set forth above in support of this count.
- 36. The Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of his race, in violation of Administrative Code of the City of New York.

AS AND FOR A FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- 37. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each allegation set forth above in support of this count.
- 38. The Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff because he complained about the racially discriminatory and illegal quota practices of the NYPD, in violation of the Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §2000(e) et seq.

AS AND FOR A FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- 39. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each allegation set forth above in support of this count.
- 40. The Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff because he complained about the racially discriminatory and illegal quota practices of the NYPD, in violation of New York State Executive Law.

AS AND FOR A SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- 41. Plaintiff adopts and incorporates each allegation set forth above in support of this count.
- 42. In light of the foregoing therefore, the Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff because he complained about the racially discriminatory and illegal quota practices of the NYPD, in violation of the Administrative Code of the City of New York.

AS AND FOR A SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- 43. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each allegation set forth above in support of this count.
- 44. The Defendants have violated the plaintiff's rights to free speech under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

AS AND FOR AN EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- 45. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each allegation set forth above in support of this count.
- 46. The Defendants have violated the plaintiff's right to free speech under Article 1, §8 of the New York State Constitution.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Adhyl Polanco demands judgment as follows:

- a. Against the Defendants, declaring the acts and practices complained of herein are in violation of the Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Human Rights Law of the City of New York and the Laws of the State of New York;
- b. Enjoining and permanently restraining these violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Human Rights Law of the City of New York and the Laws of the State of New York;
- c. Directing Defendants to take such affirmative action as is necessary to ensure the effects of these unlawful employment practices are eliminated and do not continue to affect Plaintiff's employment opportunities;
- d. Directing Defendants to make him whole for all earnings Plaintiff would have received but for Defendants' unlawful conduct, including, but not limited to, wages, pension, bonuses, and other lost benefits;
- e. Issue a declaration that the defendants violated plaintiff's rights to freedom of expression

under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article 1, §8 of the

New York State Constitution.

f. Issue an injunction ordering the defendants to cease from engaging in any further action

in retaliation for Officer Polanco's exercise of his free speech rights and ordering the

defendants to restore to Officer Polanco all benefits he lost as a result of adverse

employment action to reverse any retaliatory actions taken against Officer Polanco.

g. Directing the defendants to pay compensatory damages to the plaintiff.

h. Directing Defendants to pay Plaintiff an additional amount as compensatory damages for

his pain and suffering;

i. Directing Defendants to pay Plaintiff an additional amount as punitive damages for their

willful and/or reckless disregard for Plaintiff's statutory rights;

j. Awarding Plaintiff such interest as is allowed by law;

k. Awarding Plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees and costs;

l. Trial by Jury; and

m. Granting such and further relief as this Court deems necessary and proper.

Dated:

New York, New York August _3_, 2015

Respectfully submitted

Emeka Nwokoro Nwokoro & Scola, Esquires Attorneys for Plaintiff 82 Wall Street, Suite 610 New York, NY 10005

(212) 785-1060

Case 1:15-cv-05083-WFK-CLP Document 11 Filed 09/01/15 Page 1 of 2 PageID #: 14

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. SEEF METRIC PROPERTY OF THE United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the

purpose of initiating the civil of	locket sheet. (ŠĒE INSTRŪCTIONS ON NEX	T PAGE OF THIS F	ORM.)	is in the factor of the ase of	t the clerk of court for the
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS		
ADHYL POLANCO			THE CITY OF NEW	W YORK and NEW YOR	K CITY POLICE
(b) County of Residence of	f First Listed Plaintiff		County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant	
	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES C	ONLY)
			NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	ONDEMNATION CASES, USE TO OF LAND INVOLVED.	HE LOCATION OF
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Known)		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. C	L ITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plainti
O 1 U.S. Government	ઍ 3 Federal Question		(For Diversity Cases Only)		and One Box for Defendant)
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citiz		FF DEF 1 □ 1 Incorporated or Pri of Business In T	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in It		en of Another State	2	
	• •		•	3	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place on "X" in One Box Only)	Fo	reign Country		
CONTRACT	TORTS	red de la Re	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL	LINJURY 0 62	25 Drug Related Seizure	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 375 False Claims Act
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 365 Personal ☐ 315 Airplane Product ☐ Product		of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 400 State Reapportionment
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability 0 367 Health C		90 Other	28 USC 157	☐ 410 Antitrust☐ 430 Banks and Banking
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Pharmac			PROPERTY RIGHTS	430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act				☐ 820 Copyrights	☐ 460 Deportation
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Product Liability ☐ 368 Asbestos			S30 Patent 840 Trademark	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine Injury P	Product			480 Consumer Credit
(Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 345 Marine Product Liability PERSONAL		LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 370 Other Fr		Act	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle ☐ 371 Truth in		20 Labor/Management	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 380 Other Pe		Relations IO Railway Labor Act	O 864 SSID Title XVI	© 891 Agricultural Acts
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury 385 Property		il Family and Medical	□ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information
	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Product		Leave Act		Act
REAL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER P		0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	896 Arbitration
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	₹ 440 Other Civil Rights Habeas Com		Income Security Act	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	O 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of
220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 463 Alien De		, -	or Defendant)	Agency Decision
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 442 Employment ☐ 510 Motions ☐ 443 Housing/ Sentence			☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	☐ 950 Constitutionality of
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations			26 USC 7609	State Statutes
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 535 Death Pe	-	IMMIGRATION		
	Employment Other: 0 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - 0 540 Mandam		2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration		
	Other 🗍 550 Civil Rig		Actions		1
	☐ 448 Education ☐ 555 Prison C				1
	☐ 560 Civil Det Condition		i		
	Confinen	nent			
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)				
	noved from 3 Remanded from the Court Appellate Court			rred from	ct
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which The Civil Rights Act of 1964 at	h you are filing (L	o not cite jurisdictional state	yes unless diversity);	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of cause: A suit to obtain relief for emplo				
VII. REQUESTED IN	☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS A		EMAND S		.6.1
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.	CHON D	\$5,000,000.00	JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: Yes ONo
VIII. RELATED CASE(S)					
IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 02/21/16	SIGNATURE	OF ATTORNEY O	F RECORD		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		Marino			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	\sim				
BEGERAT "	OT 0 IP + 00 T 173	··· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	TIDOD	\$40 EB	·op

Case 1:15-cv-0508 CATION COMPARED A FIRST PAGE 2 of 2 PageID #: 15 Local Arbitration Rule 83.10 provides that with certain exceptions, actions seeking money damages only in an amount not in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a certification to the contrary is filed.
I, C. NWOKOV, counsel for Maintiff, do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is ineligible for compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s):
monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs,
the complaint seeks injunctive relief,
the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following reason
DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - FEDERAL RULES CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1
Identify any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more or its stocks:
RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form)
Please list all cases that are arguably related pursuant to Division of Business Rule 50.3.1 in Section VIII on the front of this form. Rule 50.3.1 (a) provides that "A civil case is "related" to another civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of facts and legal issues or because the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the same judge and magistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that "A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil

NY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2)

case: (A) involves identical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power of a judge to determine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the

1.)	Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk County:
2.)	If you answered "no" above: a) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk County?
	b) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District?
Suttolk	answer to question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or a majority of the defendants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or County, or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau olk County? [Note: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the County in which it has the most significant contacts).
	BAR ADMISSION
I am cur	Tently admitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court. Yes No
Are you	currently the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court? Yes (If yes, please explain) No

Mikmaeneka Mnokolo

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Signature:

court."

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

	fo	or the
	Eastern Distric	t of New York
ADHYL POLANCO		
ADITIET GEANGO)
)
Plaintiff(s))
V.		Civil Action No.
THE CITY OF NEW YORK, and NEW POLICE DEPARTMENT	YORK CITY)
)
)
Defendant(s))
		A CIVIL ACTION
THE CIT To: (Defendant's name and address) C/O COF	Y OF NEW YORK REORATION COUR	ISEI
CITY OF	NEW YORK, LAW	
	RCH STREET RK, NY 10007	
14244 10	1111, 141 10007	
A lawsuit has been filed against	you.	
Within 21 days after service of t	his summons on ve	ou (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you
are the United States or a United States a	agency, or an office	or or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ.
P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on	the plaintiff an ans	wer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of
whose name and address are:	ne answer or motion	n must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
whose hame and address are.		
If you fall to many 1 to 1	1 1 6 1. 111	
You also must file your answer or motion	by detault will be e	entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
and the same and your union or or more	it water the court.	
		DOUGLAS C. PALMER
		CLERK OF COURT
Date:		
		Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

UNITED	STATES	DISTRICT	COIRT
		DISTINCT	COUNT

	for the
Eas	stern District of New York
ADHYL POLANCO	
ABITIET GEARGO)
)
	j
Plaintiff(s)	
THE CITY OF NEW YORK, and NEW YORK POLICE DEPARTMENT	CITY Civil Action No.
)
Defendant(s)	
SUM	MONS IN A CIVIL ACTION
NEW YORK CIT To: (Defendant's name and address) 1 POLICE PLAZ	Y POLICE DEPARTMENT
NEW YORK, NY	
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plai	amons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. Intiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of yer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
If you fail to respond, judgment by defa You also must file your answer or motion with t	bult will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. The court.
	DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT
Date:	
<i></i>	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk