

CHARGES AND SPECIFICATIONS

1. Said Police Officer Shreeganesh Meade, while off-duty and assigned to the Midtown North Precinct, on or about November 10, 2017, in New York County, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, in that said Police Officer Meade operated a motor vehicle while intoxicated with a BAC of 0.13.

P.G. 203-10, Page 1, Paragraph 5

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

NY VTL §1192(2)

DRIVING WHILE
INTOXICATED

2. Said Police Officer Shreeganesh Meade, while off-duty and assigned to the Midtown North Precinct, on or about November 10, 2017, in New York County, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, in that said Police Officer Meade operated a motor vehicle while his ability to do so was impaired by the consumption of alcohol.

P.G. 203-10, Page 1, Paragraph 5

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

NY VTL §1192(1)

DRIVING WHILE
IMPAIRED

3. Said Police Officer Shreeganesh Meade, while off-duty and assigned to the Midtown North Precinct, on or about November 10, 2017, in New York County, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, in that said Police Officer Meade was unfit for duty due to his consumption of alcohol.

P.G. 203-04, Page 1, Paragraphs 1 & 2

FITNESS FOR DUTY

4. Said Police Officer Shreeganesh Meade, while off-duty and assigned to the Midtown North Precinct, on or about November 10, 2017, in New York County, engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, in that said Police Officer Meade did fail to remain at the scene of an accident.

P.G. 203-10, Page 1, Paragraph 5

PROHIBITED CONDUCT

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The above-named member of the Department appeared before me on October 22, 2025.

All parties appeared, on consent, by video. Respondent, through his counsel, entered a plea of

Guilty to the subject charges, and testified in mitigation of the penalty. 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, including Respondent's Guilty plea, I find Respondent Guilty, and recommend the forfeiture of 30 days previously served on suspension without pay, 35 additional vacation days, one-year dismissal probation, ordered breath testing, and counseling.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE IN MITIGATION

In the early morning hours of November 19, 2017, Respondent, who was off duty at the time, was involved in a motor vehicle accident in the vicinity of West 48th Steet and 12th Avenue in New York County. Respondent, who was driving a Toyota 4Runner, crashed into the center median as he was traveling northbound on 12th Avenue. Respondent admits that he was intoxicated and unfit for duty at the time he was operating the vehicle, and that he failed to remain at the scene of the accident.

Respondent testified that in the hours leading up to the collision, he was at his grandmother's home, where he consumed alcohol with the home health aide. Specifically, he had three drinks containing rum. At approximately 0300 hours, he left her house and was heading home. There were no other people inside the 4Runner he was driving, but he had his two German Shepherd dogs in the back seat; they were pets that he shared with his girlfriend at the time. As he was driving on 12th Avenue, Respondent took his eyes off the road to look at his phone while he was texting, and crashed into the center median. Respondent claimed that he blacked out from the impact, suffered a traumatic brain injury, and the next thing he remembered was waking up at the hospital with the Duty Captain at his bedside. Although he could not recall the details of what occurred in the immediate aftermath of the collision, after reviewing

surveillance video (Dept. Ex. 1), Respondent acknowledged that he exited the vehicle and left the location on foot. Before leaving, he also opened the rear passenger door, and the two dogs ran out of the vehicle and north on 12th Avenue, where they were later struck by moving vehicles. One of the dogs was killed, the other was injured. Respondent went to the hospital, where a Duty Captain and lieutenant found him to be unfit for duty. Respondent confirmed that blood drawn from him at the hospital was tested, and the result was a blood alcohol content of 0.13, well above the legal limit of 0.08. (Tr. 62-64, 66-68, 71-82, 90)

The surveillance footage in evidence looks out toward 12th Avenue, where the collision occurred. At 0:24, Respondent's vehicle can be seen crashing into the center median. Fifteen seconds later, the two dogs emerge from the vehicle: they both circle around the car and head north on 12th Avenue. At 1:02, the vehicle reverses a few feet, then moves forward into the divider again. Seconds later the car backs up several feet before moving forward and coming to a stop. At 1:31, an individual (the 911 caller) approaches on foot on the driver's side. The operator (Respondent) exits the vehicle and walks off. (Dept. Ex. 1)

There was some disagreement between the parties regarding the statement of the 911 caller, who initially reported that he saw Respondent walking away from the scene with two bottles of vodka in his hands. Respondent maintained he was not drinking vodka that night. In a follow-up call with IAB on the afternoon of November 10, the 911 caller was asked additional questions about his observations. A recording of that call was introduced into evidence as Department Exhibit 2. The caller stated that he was working a block away when he heard the accident. He ran over to the scene and saw the driver exit the vehicle, which had collided with a divider. The caller was within approximately five feet of the driver, who had blood on his face and head and appeared to be in shock. He observed the driver walking away from the location

carrying two bottles in his hand, heading south toward the Intrepid. According to the caller, he initially thought they were vodka bottles, though he later clarified that he did not see the labels on the bottles, and so for all he knew they could have been bottles of Poland Springs water.

(Dept. Ex. 2)

In addition to testifying about the circumstances surrounding the vehicle accident, Respondent provided background information regarding personal matters that he asked to be considered when assessing his actions that day. He testified that he was just six-years-old when his father passed away, and his mother committed suicide when he was 10, so he was raised by his grandparents. Around the time of the incident, Respondent was taking care of his elderly grandmother who was suffering from Parkinson's Disease. At the same time, he was looking after his grandfather, who had dementia and was in a nursing home. According to Respondent, "It was definitely not an easy time." In order to cope with the pain he felt, Respondent turned to alcohol. He stated that he did not consume alcohol while on duty, but had drinks after work with colleagues and on his days off. (Tr. 43-44, 47, 50, 68-70)

After his arrest in this case, which occurred 15 months subsequent to the incident, Respondent faced another hardship: a woman with whom he was in a serious relationship was struck and killed by a taxi. In the face of these difficulties, Respondent pressed on. He testified that he joined the National Guard in 2018, where he served until April 2025. Among other assignments there, he worked as a medic during the COVID-19 pandemic. He also obtained his EMT license and has worked on and off at a hospital. (Tr. 45-46, 51-58)

Respondent testified that he is proud to be a police officer with the NYPD. He enjoys the work and is "not afraid to go out there and be in situations." Regarding his alcohol problem, Respondent stated that he has not had any alcohol for about one year. (Tr. 51, 58-59)

Respondent offered into evidence copies of several certificates and commendations he has been awarded over the years. (Resp. Ex. A) These include certificates of appreciation for his work with the National Guard, including his efforts during the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as documents reflecting periods of perfect attendance with the Department. He also submitted seven letters from colleagues, friends and family attesting to his good character. (Resp. Ex. B). In those letters, the authors emphasize Respondent's commitment to his community, loved ones, and the Department, his passion and authenticity, and his exceptional character and professionalism. Former colleagues note how they have been positively impacted by working with him, describing Respondent's diligence and exceptional work ethic, someone who leads by example with a proactive approach to policing, an honorable man who goes out of his way to help others. They also discuss how Respondent is humble and learns from his mistakes, someone who has managed personal tragedies and hardships with courage and strength. The letters portray Respondent as an extremely valuable member of the Department who continues to serve with honor and distinction.

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 also was examined. *See* 38 RCNY § 15-07. Information from his personnel record that was considered in making this penalty recommendation is contained in an attached memorandum.

Respondent, who was appointed to the Department on July 6, 2010, has pled guilty to operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated, and related charges, stemming from an incident on

November 10, 2017. Respondent admitted that after having several drinks containing rum, he operated his car on 12th Avenue, where he crashed into the center median. He let his two dogs out of the car and they ran off, only to be struck by moving vehicles. Respondent, who was admittedly unfit for duty at the time, walked away rather than remain at the scene of the accident.

The presumptive penalty for driving while intoxicated is a forfeiture of 30 suspension days, an additional 20 vacation days, dismissal probation, counseling, and ordered breath testing. The Department Advocate is seeking the presumptive penalty in this case, along with an additional 15 vacation days due to aggravating factors. Specifically, the Advocate asks for an additional five days for the collision with an object, five days for leaving the scene of the collision, and five days for the harm to the pet dogs, bringing the total number of penalty days to 65 days. Counsel for Respondent argues that dismissal probation is not necessary, because Respondent has demonstrated that he is an “incredible asset” to the Department, who, in the face of hardships, has taken positive steps to turn his life around.

On the one hand, it is to Respondent’s credit that he has overcome personal and professional hardships, and continued to thrive as a valuable member of the community and this Department. The certificates in evidence are a testament to Respondent’s outstanding work with the National Guard. The letters submitted on his behalf consistently portray Respondent as a selfless, dedicated individual who is committed to helping others, someone who devotes himself to working for the well-being of the community.

Nevertheless, the events of November 10, 2017, are deeply troubling, and there must be appropriate accountability. Members of the service are required to maintain the standards established by the Department for their conduct, including when they are off duty. With his actions, Respondent failed to live up to that expectation. He operated an automobile in an

intoxicated condition, during which he crashed his vehicle into a median on a busy roadway in New York City. It is quite fortunate that no one else was injured as a result of Respondent's dangerous behavior that night.

Although this is a somewhat unusual situation where eight years have elapsed since the date of the incident, Respondent was assigned to the Military and Extended Leave Desk for a large portion of that time, and returned to Midtown North in 2025. Given Respondent's exceedingly poor judgment in this case, where he chose to operate a motor vehicle after having consumed enough alcohol to yield a 0.13 blood alcohol reading, it makes sense to ensure that Respondent's future performance is sufficiently scrutinized with a period of monitoring.

On balance, the presumptive penalty of 30 suspension days, 20 vacation days, and dismissal probation is warranted here, as well as an additional 15 vacation days for the collision, for leaving the scene, and for dangerously allowing the dogs to run off, bringing the total number of penalty days to 65 days. Taking into account the totality of the facts and circumstances in this matter, I recommend that Respondent forfeit thirty (30) days previously served on suspension without pay, thirty-five (35) additional vacation days, undergo ordered breath testing and counseling, and that Respondent be DISMISSED from the New York City Police Department, but that his dismissal be held in abeyance for a period of one (1) year pursuant to Section 14-115(d) of the Administrative Code, during which time he remains on the force at the Police Commissioner's discretion and may be terminated at any time without further proceedings.

APPROVED
DEC 16 2025
Jessie Tisch
JESSICA S. TISCH
POLICE COMMISSIONER

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff S. Adler
Assistant Deputy Commissioner Trials



POLICE DEPARTMENT CITY OF NEW YORK

From: Assistant Deputy Commissioner – Trials

To: Police Commissioner

Subject: SUMMARY OF EMPLOYMENT RECORD
POLICE OFFICER SHREEGANESH MEADE
TAX REGISTRY NO. 949315
DISCIPLINARY CASE NO. C-032029

Respondent was appointed to the Department on July 6, 2010. Before being assigned to MELD, Respondent received the rating of “Exceeds Expectations” in 2018. He has been awarded three medals for Excellent Police Duty.

Respondent has no formal disciplinary history.

In connection with the instant matter, Respondent was suspended without pay from February 11, 2019, through March 12, 2019. He was also placed on Level 1 Disciplinary Monitoring in December 2017, which was upgraded to Level 2 after charges and specifications were filed. Monitoring remains ongoing.

For your consideration.

Jeff S. Adler
Assistant Deputy Commissioner Trials