

High Number of Stop and Frisks may Signal New York Civil Rights Violations, Attorney Says.

Stop and frisks in certain areas of New York heavily populated by African-Americans and Latinos result in a higher quantity of criminal charges and violations.

NEW YORK, NEW YORK — December 8, 2010 – Each year in New York City, the New York Police Department stops and frisks over 300,000 individuals. A likely [civil rights violation](#), people who get stopped and frisked in East Harlem are the most likely to end up facing some level of criminal charge or violation. Approximately half of the people stopped in this area of New York either get arrested or hit with a summons. Only one other precinct, Harlem, in upper west Manhattan, has numbers over 40%

The average in New York City is 15%.

NYPD Deputy Police Commissioner Paul Browne said the numbers in East Harlem were inflated because officers filled out stop-and-frisk reports when they didn't have to. [New York civil rights violation attorney](#) David Perelman would like to believe this statement is true.

“It's a constitutional right of American citizens to be free from unwarranted intrusions by government authorities. A police officer may legally stop and frisk an individual in an effort to reduce crime, but that officer must have a reasonable suspicion of illegal activity,” said Perelman of New York, a [civil rights violation attorney](#) for over two decades.

There has been a growing perception over recent years that the NYPD has [violated civil rights](#) in an effort to achieve quantifiable law enforcement gains.

As New York [civil rights violation attorneys](#) understand, correct stop-and-frisks should result in felony and misdemeanor as opposed to an increase in the number of summonses issued. However, nearly 80% of those hit with charges in East Harlem got the lower level summons.

“Stop-and-frisk does not ever mean police have the ability to stop people for no reason. Then it becomes a violation in New York of civil rights,” attorney Perelman added.

Recently reported in the news is that a civil liberties group filed a federal lawsuit challenging the use of stop and frisk searches by Philadelphia police. The civil liberties group argues that the policy violates the civil rights of certain minority groups. In New

York, [civil rights violation attorneys](#) and advocates have also challenged the use of stop and frisk for reasons that include racial profiling, illegal stops and privacy rights.

“When used correctly by the NYPD, stop and frisk search can reduce crime and serve as an effective law enforcement tool. However, if individuals or groups of individuals continue to believe they have been subjected to discrimination or harassment that violated their New York civil rights,” attorney Perecman said, “A big worry for the police should be that this controversial procedure can damage their relationship with the community, as well as bring [civil rights violations cases](#) against them.”

About David Perecman and The Perecman Firm, PLLC:

For the past 30 years, the New York false arrest, excessive force by police, police negligence, and civil rights violation attorneys at The Perecman Firm, PLLC have championed all types of cases including civil rights violations. David Perecman, founded his Firm in 1983 after winning a \$600,000.00*** verdict in an unlawful detention case. He is a Board Director and the past Secretary and Treasurer of the New York State Trial Lawyers Association (NYSTLA) and a chair of its Labor Law Committee. Mr. Perecman's achievements have brought him recognition as an Honoree in the National Law Journal's Hall of Fame, in New York Magazine's "The Best Lawyers in America" and The New York Times Magazine "New York Super Lawyers, Metro Edition" for the years 2007-2010.

The Firm has recovered millions of dollars for its clients. Among the more recent victories, Mr. Perecman won a \$15 million verdict* for a construction accident, a \$5.35 million dollar verdict** for an automobile accident, and a \$40 million dollar structured settlement for medical malpractice****.

*later settled while on appeal for \$7.940 million

** later settled for \$3.5 million

*** later settled for \$90,000.00

**** total potential payout

"Lawyer Advertising"

"Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome."