

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, APPELLATE DIVISION,
FOURTH JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

People v. Robinson

2026 NY Slip Op 00676 · No. 61 KA 24-01452 · Decided February 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The New York Appellate Division, Fourth Department, affirmed a judgment convicting Lorenzo Robinson upon his guilty plea to criminal possession of a weapon in the second degree. The court held that an anonymous 911 call, corroborated by officers' prompt observations matching the detailed suspect description, provided reasonable suspicion for a stop and frisk, and rejected the defendant's constitutional challenge to Penal Law § 265.03 under New York State Rifle & Pistol Assn. v. Bruen.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Fourth Judicial Department
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Curran, J.P.; Bannister, J.; Smith, J.; Ogden, J.; DelConte, J.
JURISDICTION	New York Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Fourth Department
DECIDED	February 11, 2026
DOCKET	61 KA 24-01452
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant appealed from a judgment of Supreme Court, Monroe County, convicting him upon his guilty plea of criminal possession of a weapon in the second degree. He challenged the denial of suppression of tangible evidence and statements and the constitutionality of Penal Law § 265.03 under New York State Rifle & Pistol Assn., Inc. v. Bruen.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed whether the suppression-hearing record established reasonable suspicion for the police level-three encounter and whether Penal Law § 265.03 was constitutional under Bruen.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published precedential opinion
PARTIES	Lorenzo Robinson v. The People of the State of New York

TOPICS

search and seizure

fourth amendment

criminal procedure

suppression of evidence

appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal procedure

constitutional criminal law

search and seizure

firearms law

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the anonymous 911 call, together with the officers' prompt and close-proximity corroboration of the caller's noncriminal and criminal information, established reasonable suspicion for a level-three stop and frisk.
2. Whether the denial of suppression of the firearm and statements obtained after the stop and frisk was erroneous.
3. Whether Penal Law § 265.03 is unconstitutional under New York State Rifle & Pistol Assn., Inc. v. Bruen.

HOLDINGS

1. An anonymous 911 call may establish reasonable suspicion for a level-three police encounter when, under the totality of the circumstances, the report is sufficiently reliable and police promptly corroborate the caller's description, location, and other information, even if strict Aguilar-Spinelli compliance is absent.
2. Suppression was properly denied because the officers had reasonable suspicion to stop and frisk defendant based on the sufficiently corroborated anonymous 911 report.
3. Penal Law § 265.03 is not unconstitutional under Bruen; Bruen did not invalidate New York's criminal possession of a weapon statutes.

KEY QUOTATIONS

*"[T]he appropriate test" in evaluating whether there is reasonable suspicion to engage in a level three encounter based on an anonymous tip "is whether an anonymous tip is sufficiently reliable to provide reasonable suspicion under the totality of the circumstances"" (*1)*

*"The police were able to corroborate [the] information [contained in the 911 call] within one minute of receiving the dispatch and [were] within [close proximity of] the reported location, [where] they observed a . . . suspect matching the description provided,"" (*2)*

*"The police were duty-bound to investigate the radio report of [an armed menacing], and they could not ignore their own contemporaneous observation of [an individual] matching the caller's description and location"" (*2)*

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Police received an anonymous 911 call reporting an armed menacing and describing a Black man with a white beard wearing a baseball cap and black jacket with reflectors, accompanied by another man wearing orange shoes. Within approximately one minute, officers arrived at a location about one-half mile from their prior

location and encountered defendant and another man who precisely matched the reported descriptions. During a pat-down that began on the right side of defendant's pants, an officer immediately observed a handgun handle protruding from his pocket.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Supreme Court, Monroe County, rendered judgment on August 22, 2024, after defendant pleaded guilty to criminal possession of a weapon in the second degree. The court denied suppression relief. The Appellate Division unanimously affirmed the judgment and remitted the matter for proceedings pursuant to CPL 460.50(5).

DISPOSITION

affirmed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The matter is remitted to Supreme Court, Monroe County, for proceedings pursuant to CPL 460.50(5).

CASES CITED

- People v. Moore, 6 NY3d 496, 499 (2006)
- Florida v. J.L., 529 U.S. 266, 272 (2000)
- People v. William II, 98 NY2d 93, 99 (2002)
- People v. Argyris, 24 NY3d 1138, 1140-1141 (2014), rearg denied 24 NY3d 1211 (2015), cert denied 577 U.S. 1069 (2016)
- People v. Williams, 177 AD3d 1312, 1313 (4th Dept. 2019)
- People v. Leighton R., 2025 NY Slip Op 06534, *3-*4
- Alabama v. White, 496 U.S. 325, 328-329 (1990)
- People v. Tantaio, 178 AD3d 1391, 1393 (4th Dept. 2019), lv denied 35 NY3d 945 (2020)
- New York State Rifle & Pistol Assn., Inc. v. Bruen, 597 U.S. 1 (2022)
- People v. Mancuso, 225 AD3d 1151, 1153 (4th Dept. 2024), lv denied 43 NY3d 964 (2025)
- People v. Brinson, 240 AD3d 1376, 1378 (4th Dept. 2025)
- People v. Johnson, 2025 NY Slip Op 06528, *3