



BILL DE BLASIO
MAYOR

CIVILIAN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD
100 CHURCH STREET 10th FLOOR
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10007 ♦ TELEPHONE (212) 912-7235
www.nyc.gov/ccrb



FREDERICK DAVIE
CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report
July 2018
(Statistics for June 2018)

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Glossary	3
Complaints Received	4
CCRB Cases Received By Borough and Precinct	5
Allegations Received	7
CCRB Docket	10
Closed Cases	12
Resolving Cases	12
Dispositions / Case Abstracts	13
Dispositions - Full Investigations	15
Dispositions - All CCRB Cases	16
Dispositions - Allegations	17
Substantiation Rates	19
Substantiation Rates and Video	19
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints	21
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Allegations	23
Truncations	25
Complaints by PSA	26
Mediation Unit	28
Administrative Prosecution Unit	30
NYPD Discipline	31
Appendix	36

Executive Summary

The Civilian Complaint Review Board (“CCRB”) is an independent municipal Agency that investigates complaints of NYPD misconduct. Every month, the CCRB prepares an Executive Director report for its public meeting. Data for June 2018 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 76% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 91% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In June, the CCRB opened 359 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 1,547 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 22% of its fully investigated cases (page 15).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 15% of the cases it closed in June (page 12) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 24% of the cases it closed (page 16). The Agency's truncation rate was 76% (page 12). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.
- 4) For June, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 18% of cases - compared to 24% of cases in which video was not available (page 19-20).
- 5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6, 24).
- 6) In June the Police Commissioner finalized 1 decision against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases (page 30). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 3 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; no trials were conducted against respondent officers in June.

Finally, the Monthly Report contains a Table of Contents, Glossary, and Appendix, all meant to assist readers in navigating this report. The CCRB is committed to producing monthly reports that are valuable to the public, and welcomes feedback on how to make its data more accessible.

Glossary

In this glossary we have included a list of terms that regularly appear in our reports.

Allegation: An allegation is a specific act of misconduct. The same “complaint” can have multiple allegations – excessive force and discourteous language, for example. Each allegation is reviewed separately during an investigation.

APU: The Administrative Prosecution Unit is the division of the CCRB that has prosecuted “charges” cases since April 2013, after the signing of a 2012 Memorandum of Understanding between the CCRB and NYPD.

Board Panel: The “Board” of the CCRB has 13 members. Of the 13 members, five are chosen by the Mayor, five are chosen by the City Council, and three are chosen by the Police Commissioner. Following a completed investigation by the CCRB staff, three Board members, sitting as a Board Panel, will make a finding on whether misconduct occurred and will make a recommendation on what level of penalty should follow.

Case/Complaint: For the purposes of CCRB data, a “case” or “complaint” is defined as any incident within the Agency’s jurisdiction, brought to resolution by the CCRB. Cases/Complaints thus include truncations, fully investigated or ongoing cases, mediations, and completed investigations pending Board Panel review.

Disposition: The Board’s finding as to the outcome of a case (i.e. if misconduct occurred).

FADO: Under the City Charter, the CCRB has jurisdiction to investigate the following categories of police misconduct: Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy, and Offensive Language, collectively known as “FADO”.

Intake: CCRB’s intake team initially handles complaints from the public. Intake takes complaints that come via live phone calls, voicemails, an online complaint form, or in-person.

Investigation: CCRB investigators gather evidence and interview witnesses to prepare reports on misconduct allegations. An investigation ends when a closing report is prepared detailing the evidence and legal analysis, and the case is given to the Board for disposition.

Mediation: A complainant may mediate his or her case with the subject officer, in lieu of an investigation, with the CCRB providing a neutral, third-party mediator.

Truncation: When a complaint is withdrawn or there is no complainant/alleged victim available for an interview, the investigation is “truncated.”

Complaints Received

The CCRB’s Intake team processes misconduct complaints from the public and referrals from the NYPD. Under the New York City Charter, the CCRB’s jurisdiction is limited to allegations of misconduct related to Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy and Offensive Language. All other complaints are referred to the appropriate agency. Figure 1 refers to all complaints that the CCRB receives and Figures 2 and 3 refer to new cases that remain with the Agency. In June 2018, the CCRB initiated 359 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2017 - June 2018)




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2017 - June 2018)





Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (YTD 2010 - YTD 2018)



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Of the five boroughs, the largest number of misconduct complaints stemmed from incidents occurring in Brooklyn, followed by Manhattan. The 81st Precinct had the highest number at 15 incidents.

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (June 2018)




Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2018)




Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (June 2018)


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	3	67	4
5	3	68	3
6	4	69	8
7	2	70	2
9	8	71	2
10	2	72	3
13	2	73	10
14	7	75	14
18	12	76	1
19	3	77	10
20	1	78	3
23	4	79	4
24	5	81	15
25	8	83	3
26	3	84	6
28	5	88	3
30	3	90	2
32	3	100	1
33	5	101	6
34	9	102	5
40	7	103	1
41	7	104	2
42	7	105	9
43	5	106	2
44	9	107	2
45	4	108	4
46	6	109	4
47	12	110	2
48	7	111	4
49	7	112	4
50	2	113	8
52	6	114	6
60	2	115	2
61	3	120	7
62	2	121	2
63	2	122	3
		123	3
		Unknown	9

*These figures track where an incident occurred, not necessarily the Command of the officer. Please review Figures 62A-62Q for Command Level data for cases closed in 2017.

Allegations Received

As described in the previous section, the CCRB has jurisdiction over four categories of NYPD misconduct. In comparing June 2017 to June 2018, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is down, Abuse of Authority complaints are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down. Figures for the year-to-date comparison show that in 2018, complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are up, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (June 2017 vs. June 2018)




*This is the total of distinct FADO allegation types in complaints received.

Figure 8: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (% of Complaints)

	June 2017		June 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	149	35%	139	39%	-10	-7%
Abuse of Authority (A)	304	72%	256	71%	-48	-16%
Discourtesy (D)	143	34%	80	22%	-63	-44%
Offensive Language (O)	35	8%	14	4%	-21	-60%
Total FADO Allegations	631		489		-142	-23%
Total Complaints	420		359		-61	-15%

Note: the number of allegations in recently received complaints typically grows somewhat as the complaints are investigated.

Figure 9: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (YTD 2017 vs. YTD 2018)



*This is the total of distinct FADO allegation types in complaints received.

Figure 10: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation YTD (% of Complaints)

	YTD 2017		YTD 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	859	38%	835	38%	-24	-3%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1613	71%	1636	75%	23	1%
Discourtesy (D)	772	34%	613	28%	-159	-21%
Offensive Language (O)	208	9%	149	7%	-59	-28%
Total FADO Allegations	3452		3233		-219	-6%
Total Complaints	2266		2175		-91	-4%

Note: the number of allegations in recently received complaints typically grows somewhat as the complaints are investigated.

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	June 2017		June 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	296	21%	265	27%	-31	-10%
Abuse of Authority (A)	868	61%	588	60%	-280	-32%
Discourtesy (D)	209	15%	104	11%	-105	-50%
Offensive Language (O)	40	3%	15	2%	-25	-63%
Total Allegations	1413		972		-441	-31%
Total Complaints	420		359		-61	-15%

Figure 12: Total Allegations YTD (% of Total Allegations)

	YTD 2017		YTD 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	1705	23%	1771	23%	66	4%
Abuse of Authority (A)	4303	58%	4830	63%	527	12%
Discourtesy (D)	1096	15%	847	11%	-249	-23%
Offensive Language (O)	268	4%	206	3%	-62	-23%
Total Allegations	7372		7654		282	4%
Total Complaints	2266		2175		-91	-4%

The number of allegations in recently received complaints typically grows as the complaints are investigated.

CCRB Docket

As of the end of June 2018, 76% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 91% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (June 2018)

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1055	76.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	196	14.2%
Cases 8-11 Months	102	7.4%
Cases 12-18 Months*	21	1.5%
Cases Over 18 Months**	6	0.4%
Total	1380	100%

*12-18 Months: 5 cases that were reopened; 3 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 3 cases that were reopened; 4 cases that were on DA Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (June 2018)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	941	68.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	247	17.9%
Cases 8-11 Months	132	9.6%
Cases 12-18 Months*	48	3.5%
Cases Over 18 Months**	12	0.9%
Total	1380	100%

*12-18 Months: 6 cases that were reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 4 cases that were reopened; 5 cases that were on DA Hold.

An active case is here defined as an investigation; cases in mediation are excluded.

Figure 15: Number of Active Investigations (January 2017 - June 2018)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change


	May 2018		June 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	919	61%	946	61%	27	3%
Pending Board Review	426	28%	434	28%	8	2%
Mediation	159	11%	157	10%	-2	-1%
On DA Hold	10	1%	10	1%	0	0%
Total	1514		1547		33	2%

Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In June 2018, the CCRB fully investigated 15% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 24% of the cases it closed.

Figure 18: Case Resolutions (January 2017 - June 2018) (%)



Dispositions

Cases fully investigated by the CCRB generally receive one of five outcomes:

- If the alleged misconduct is found to have occurred, based on the preponderance of the evidence, the allegation is **substantiated**.
- If there is not enough evidence to determine whether or not the alleged misconduct occurred, the allegation is **unsubstantiated**.
- If the preponderance of the evidence suggests that the event or alleged act did not occur, the allegation is **unfounded**.
- If the event did occur, but was not improper by a preponderance of evidence, the allegation is **exonerated**.
- If the CCRB was unable to identify any of the officers accused of misconduct, the case is closed as **officer unidentified**.

Additionally, a case might be **mediated**, with the subject officer and complainant discussing the incident in the presence of a neutral third-party moderator, or closed as **mediation attempted**, the designation for a case in which both the officer and the civilian agree to mediate, but the civilian fails to appear twice for the scheduled mediation session or fails to respond to attempts to schedule a mediation session. Finally, a case that cannot be fully investigated due to complainant/alleged victim unavailability or lack of cooperation is **truncated**.

Case Abstracts

The following case abstracts are taken from complaints closed this month and serve as examples of what the different CCRB dispositions mean in practice:

1. Substantiated

An individual was bicycling when they observed an unmarked white van parked in the bike lane. After noticing that the last digit of the license plate was missing, the individual approached the vehicle, noticing a New York City Police Department placard on the vehicle. The individual began recording audio on their cell phone. The civilian told the officer about the missing digit on the license plate and asked for the officer's name and shield number. The officer responded, "Excuse me?" After asking for the officer's name and shield number a second time, the officer declined and stated, "I don't know who you are." The officer then rolled up the window of the vehicle and drove away. Since the officer failed to state their name and shield number when requested, as captured in the audio recording, the Board substantiated the allegation.

2. Unsubstantiated

A civilian was involved in a dispute with a store manager after being accused stealing. After leaving the store the civilian called 911, stating that the manager was harassing them. Officers spoke with the civilian and the officer informed them that the officers could not arrest or file a report against the store manager. Upon leaving, an officer allegedly asked the alleged victim, "You called us for this bullshit?" Both officers denied stating this and stated that the alleged victim began cursing at them after explaining that they could not arrest or file a report against the store manager and that the civilian threatened to take the officers' guns and shoot them in the head. Due to a lack of video footage of the incident and inconsistent statements, the Board unsubstantiated the allegation.

3. Unfounded

A civilian was fleeing from officers. The civilian jumped a fence and hid in the backyard of a house. When the officers handcuffed and brought the civilian to the front of the house, they allegedly pushed the civilian to the ground causing injuries. The civilian provided contradictory statements as to their level of intoxication during the incident, claiming both to be sober and to be “so fucked up” they could not stand. Two civilian witnesses testified that they never saw an officer pushing the civilian to the ground, use any force, or see the civilian on the ground at any point after being handcuffed. None of the officers present observed the subject officer push the civilian to the ground or use any force. Video evidence shows the civilian falling to the ground from a backyard patio umbrella, but does not depict the officers’ interaction with the individual. Given the video evidence, the officers’ and witness’ statements, and the alleged victim’s inconsistent statements, the investigation determined by a preponderance of the evidence that the officer did not push the civilian to the ground and the Board unfounded the allegations.

4. Exonerated


An individual called a power company and threatened to blow up the building. The power company called 911 and officers responded to the civilian’s home. Officers spoke with the civilian and testified that the individual was making erratic statements. The individual testified that they had made similar call to the power company for years. Officers contacted EMS and EMTs interviewed the civilian and determined that the civilian needed to be removed to the hospital, even though the civilian disagreed. The civilian was removed to the hospital for a psychiatric evaluation. As a result, the Board exonerated the allegations.

5. Officer Unidentified

An individual was standing with his daughter and wife at a bus stop. His daughter handed him a coin and he placed it in his pocket. Two officers approached the individual and instructed him to show what was in his pocket, questioning the individual as to what the daughter handed to him. The individual refused to at first, but ultimately, he showed the officers the coin. The civilians provided descriptions of the officers that varied greatly. No police documents were prepared in regards to this incident, no video footage was found, and no officers matching the contradictory descriptions of the civilians were located as working in the area at the time of the incident. Absent this evidence, the Board was unable to identify the subject officers; therefore, the complaint was closed as officers unidentified.


Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 19: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (June 2018)



Due to the reconsideration process, counts are subject to change.

Figure 20: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2018)



Due to the reconsideration process, counts are subject to change.

Dispositions - All CCRB Cases

In addition to full investigations, CCRB cases can be closed through mediation and truncation. The following table lists all the CCRB case closures for the current month and year-to-date.

Figure 21: Disposition of Cases (2017 vs 2018)

	Jun 2017		Jun 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Full Investigations								
Substantiated	18	14%	11	22%	131	20%	114	19%
Exonerated	25	19%	9	18%	116	17%	96	16%
Unfounded	5	4%	3	6%	42	6%	47	8%
Unsubstantiated	67	52%	24	47%	317	48%	286	48%
MOS Unidentified	15	12%	4	8%	59	9%	50	8%
Total - Full Investigations	130		51		665		593	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	22	56%	13	46%	91	53%	120	48%
Mediation Attempted	17	44%	15	54%	82	47%	132	52%
Total - ADR Closures	39		28		173		252	
Resolved Case Total	169	48%	79	24%	838	43%	845	43%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	42	23%	50	20%	293	26%	185	17%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	108	58%	130	51%	619	55%	607	54%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	30	16%	37	15%	183	16%	154	14%
Alleged Victim unidentified	3	2%	4	2%	17	2%	13	1%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	0	0%	30	12%	0	0%	151	14%
Miscellaneous	1	1%	2	1%	3	0%	4	0%
Administrative closure**	2	1%	0	0%	14	1%	4	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	186		253		1129		1118	
Total - Closed Cases	355		332		1967		1963	

* Closed - Pending Litigation is a truncation category added in August 2017. It indicates that the complaint was truncated due to the complainant/alleged victim's attorney.

**Administrative closure is a special category that deals with NYPD's Internal Affairs Bureau-referred cases or spin off cases with no complainant/alleged victim, and in which CCRB attempts to locate or identify a complainant/alleged victim has yielded no results.

Dispositions - FADO Allegations

“Allegations” are different than “cases.” A case or complaint is based on an incident and may contain one or more allegations of police misconduct. The allegation substantiation rate is 7% for the month of June 2018, and the allegation substantiation rate is 10% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is Abuse of Authority – substantiating 7% of such allegations during June 2018, and 12% for the year.

Figure 22: Disposition of Allegations (2017 vs 2018)

	Jun 2017		Jun 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	71	13%	18	7%	335	12%	284	10%
Unsubstantiated	224	40%	94	37%	1107	39%	1072	39%
Unfounded	24	4%	21	8%	223	8%	244	9%
Exonerated	172	30%	92	36%	828	29%	863	31%
MOS Unidentified	74	13%	29	11%	377	13%	292	11%
Total - Full Investigations	565		254		2870		2755	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	57	54%	34	47%	205	54%	265	43%
Mediation Attempted	48	46%	39	53%	173	46%	348	57%
Total - ADR Closures	105		73		378		613	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	83	17%	109	16%	631	23%	436	14%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	344	69%	379	56%	1741	62%	1701	56%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	58	12%	91	14%	362	13%	353	12%
Alleged Victim unidentified	6	1%	5	1%	37	1%	30	1%
Closed - Pending Litigation	0	0%	78	12%	0	0%	488	16%
Miscellaneous	1	0%	9	1%	9	0%	30	1%
Administrative closure	5	1%	0	0%	24	1%	14	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	497		671		2804		3052	
Total - Closed Allegations	1167		998		6052		6420	

Figure 23: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (June 2018)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	4 7%	11 18%	27 44%	10 16%	9 15%	61 100%
Abuse of Authority	12 7%	64 38%	65 39%	8 5%	18 11%	167 100%
Discourtesy	1 5%	16 84%	0 0%	1 5%	1 5%	19 100%
Offensive Language	1 14%	3 43%	0 0%	2 29%	1 14%	7 100%
Total	18 7%	94 37%	92 36%	21 8%	29 11%	254 100%


Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (YTD 2018)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	44 7%	201 31%	242 37%	99 15%	68 10%	654 100%
Abuse of Authority	197 12%	617 37%	609 36%	91 5%	171 10%	1685 100%
Discourtesy	38 11%	208 61%	12 4%	35 10%	47 14%	340 100%
Offensive Language	5 7%	46 61%	0 0%	19 25%	6 8%	76 100%
Total	284 10%	1072 39%	863 31%	244 9%	292 11%	2755 100%

Substantiation Rates

The June 2018 case substantiation rate was 22%.

Figure 25: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2017 - June 2018)




Due to the reconsideration process, counts are subject to change.

Substantiation Rates and Video


In general, investigations relying on video evidence from security cameras or personal devices result in much higher substantiation rates.

Figure 26: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations without Video (Jan 2018 - Jun 2018) (% substantiated shown)



Due to the reconsideration process, counts are subject to change.

Figure 27: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2018 - Jun 2018)
 (% substantiated shown)



Due to the reconsideration process, counts are subject to change.

Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints

After a CCRB investigative team has completed its investigation and recommended the substantiation of a complaint against an officer, a panel of three Board members determines whether to substantiate the allegation and make a disciplinary recommendation.

- “Charges and Specifications” are the most severe form of discipline. A decision to assign Charges commences a process that may result in an administrative trial in the NYPD Trial Room. An officer may lose vacation days, be suspended, or be terminated from the Department if the officer is found guilty.
- “Instructions” or “Formalized Training” are the least severe discipline, often recommended for officers who misunderstand a policy. This determination results in training at the command level (Instructions) or training at the Police Academy or NYPD Legal Bureau (Formalized Training).
- “Command Discipline” is recommended for misconduct that is moderately serious, but does not rise to the level of that associated with Charges. An officer can lose up to ten vacation days as a result of a Command Discipline.
- When the Board has recommended Instructions, Formalized Training or Command Discipline, the case is sent to the NYPD Commissioner to impose training and/or other penalties. Cases where the Board recommends charges are prosecuted by the CCRB’s Administrative Prosecution Unit.


Figure 28: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints*
(Jun 2017, Jun 2018, YTD 2017, YTD 2018)

Disposition	June 2017		June 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	5	28%	1	9%	11	8%	31	27%
Command Discipline	11	61%	2	18%	72	55%	46	40%
Formalized Training	1	6%	4	36%	33	25%	14	12%
Instructions	1	6%	4	36%	15	11%	23	20%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	18		11		131		114	

Due to the reconsideration process, counts are subject to change.

* A complaint containing a number of substantiated allegations against a number of different officers will typically generate a variety of different disciplinary recommendations. To determine the disciplinary recommendation associated with the complaint as a whole, the CCRB uses the most severe disciplinary recommendation made. The order of severity is: 1) Charges 2) Command Discipline 3) Formalized Training 4) Instructions.

Figure 29: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints* (2018)



Due to the reconsideration process, counts are subject to change.

* A complaint containing a number of substantiated allegations against a number of different officers will typically generate a variety of different disciplinary recommendations. To determine the disciplinary recommendation associated with the complaint as a whole, the CCRB uses the most severe disciplinary recommendation made. The order of severity is: 1) Charges 2) Command Discipline 3) Formalized Training 4) Instructions.

Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations

A substantiated CCRB complaint may generate multiple substantiated allegations against multiple officers. Each substantiated allegation will carry its own discipline recommendation from the CCRB Board.

The following table presents the number of officers against whom discipline recommendations have been made as a result of a substantiated CCRB complaint. Where there are multiple substantiated allegations with multiple disciplinary recommendations for an officer in a complaint, the most severe disciplinary recommendation is used to determine the overall recommendation for that officer.

Figure 30: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations*
(Jun 2017, Jun 2018, YTD 2017, YTD 2018)

Disposition	June 2017		June 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	10	32.3%	1	7.1%	16	8.4%	48	27.7%
Command Discipline	19	61.3%	4	28.6%	108	56.8%	72	41.6%
Formalized Training	1	3.2%	5	35.7%	46	24.2%	21	12.1%
Instructions	1	3.2%	4	28.6%	20	10.5%	32	18.5%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	31		14		190		173	

Due to the reconsideration process, counts are subject to change.

* The counts in this table reflect the number of distinct MOS with a substantiated allegation in each complaint.

Figure 31: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (June 2018)

The figures in this table reflect all substantiated allegations for each MOS.

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	10	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Threat to notify ACS	26	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Threat re: removal to hospital	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Threat to notify ACS	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Offensive Language	Other	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Force	Physical force	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Force	Physical force	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	107	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	122	Staten Island
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	122	Staten Island
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	122	Staten Island

Truncations

A “truncation” is a case that is not fully investigated, either because the complainant/alleged victim withdraws the complaint; is uncooperative with the investigation; is not available for the investigative team to interview; or is never identified. The CCRB constantly seeks to lower the number of truncations.

Figure 32: Truncated Allegations (June 2018)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	14	76	31	1	29	151
Abuse of Authority	78	244	46	3	42	413
Discourtesy	14	50	12	1	6	83
Offensive Language	3	9	2	0	1	15
Total	109	379	91	5	78	662

Figure 33: Truncated CCRB Complaints (June 2018)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	50	130	37	4	30	251

Figure 34: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2018)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	78	367	128	8	258	839
Abuse of Authority	293	1086	187	20	174	1760
Discourtesy	53	216	27	2	41	339
Offensive Language	12	32	11	0	15	70
Total	436	1701	353	30	488	3008

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2018)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	185	607	154	13	151	1110

*Pending Litigation is a truncation category added in August 2017. It indicates that the complaint was truncated due to the complainant/alleged victim's attorney.

Complaints Against Officers Assigned to Police Service Areas

The Police Service Areas (PSA) are commands that police New York City Housing Developments throughout the five boroughs. PSA complaints are defined as complaints that contain at least one FADO allegation against an officer assigned to a PSA command.

Figure 36: PSA Complaints Closed as % of Total Complaints Closed

	Jun 2017	Jun 2018	YTD 2017	YTD 2018
PSA Complaints	15	11	76	88
Total Complaints	355	332	1967	1963
PSA Complaints as % of Total	4.2%	3.3%	3.9%	4.5%

A single PSA complaint may contain allegations against multiple officers assigned to multiple PSA commands. The following table breaks out the different PSAs and shows the number of officers assigned to each PSA against whom FADO allegations have been made.

Figure 37: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

	Jun 2017	Jun 2018	YTD 2017	YTD 2018
PSA 1	3	3	8	13
PSA 2	3	2	16	34
PSA 3	0	2	20	10
PSA 4	0	0	5	20
PSA 5	1	6	21	15
PSA 6	2	1	16	18
PSA 7	15	0	34	36
PSA 8	6	3	10	12
PSA 9	2	1	7	13
Total	32	18	137	171

Complaints typically contain more than one allegation. The following table shows the allegations made against officers assigned to PSA commands broken out by FADO type.

Figure 38: Closed Allegations Against Officers Assigned to a PSA by FADO Type

	Jun 2017		Jun 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	8	19%	7	29%	37	20%	65	28%
Abuse of Authority (A)	25	58%	11	46%	103	57%	128	55%
Discourtesy (D)	8	19%	6	25%	32	18%	30	13%
Offensive Language (O)	2	5%	0	0%	10	5%	9	4%
Total	43	101%	24	100%	182	100%	232	100%

Dispositions of Officers Assigned to PSAs

The following tables show the Board disposition of officers assigned to a PSA with a FADO allegation made against them.

Figure 39: Disposition of PSA Officers (2017 vs 2018)

Full Investigations	Jun 2017		Jun 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	6	26%	1	17%	26	31%	14	15%
Exonerated	11	48%	2	33%	28	33%	21	23%
Unfounded	1	4%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%
Unsubstantiated	5	22%	3	50%	29	35%	56	61%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	23		6		84		92	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	4	80%	0	0%	7	47%	3	14%
Mediation Attempted	1	20%	4	100%	8	53%	18	86%
Total - ADR Closures	5		4		15		21	
Resolved Case Total	28	88%	10	56%	99	72%	113	66%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	2	50%	1	12%	9	24%	11	19%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	2	50%	2	25%	24	63%	25	43%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	0	0%	2	25%	5	13%	6	10%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%	15	26%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	1	12%	0	0%	1	2%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	4		8		38		58	
Total - Closed Cases	32		18		137		171	

* Closed - Pending Litigation is a truncation category added in August 2017. It indicates that the complaint was truncated due to the complainant/alleged victim's attorney.

**Administrative closure is a special category that deals with NYPD's Internal Affairs Bureau-referred cases or spin off cases with no complainant/alleged victim, and in which CCRB attempts to locate or identify a complainant/alleged victim has yielded no results.

Mediation Unit

Whenever mediation between a complainant/alleged victim and subject officer is suitable, it is offered by CCRB investigators. If the complainant/alleged victim and subject officer both agree to participate, a neutral, third-party mediator facilitates a conversation between the parties. “Mediation Attempted” refers to a situation in which an officer agrees to mediate and the complainant becomes unavailable (after the complainant initially agreed to mediation). The chart below indicates the number of mediations and attempted mediations in June and this year.

Figure 40: Mediated Complaints Closed

	June 2018			YTD 2018		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	13	15	28	120	132	252

Figure 41: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	June 2018			YTD 2018		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	3	3	6	25	19	44
Abuse of Authority	25	28	53	185	258	443
Discourtesy	5	8	13	48	57	105
Offensive Language	1	0	1	7	14	21
Total	34	39	73	265	348	613

Figure 42: Mediated Complaints By Borough (June 2018)

	Mediations
Bronx	3
Brooklyn	2
Manhattan	4
Queens	4
Staten Island	0

Figure 43: Mediated Allegations By Borough (June 2018)

	Mediations
Bronx	5
Brooklyn	2
Manhattan	19
Queens	8
Staten Island	0

**Figure 44: Mediated Complaints By Precinct
(Jun 2018 - YTD 2018)**

Precinct	Jun 2018	YTD 2018	Precinct	Jun 2018	YTD 2018
1	0	1	63	1	2
5	0	1	66	0	1
6	0	1	67	0	1
9	0	2	69	0	8
10	0	1	70	0	4
13	0	1	71	0	1
14	0	3	72	0	1
17	0	3	73	0	2
18	1	5	75	0	3
19	1	2	77	0	2
20	1	2	78	0	1
23	0	1	83	0	1
24	0	1	84	0	2
25	1	1	88	0	1
26	0	2	90	0	1
28	0	1	100	1	2
32	0	3	101	0	3
33	0	2	103	1	4
34	0	2	104	1	3
42	0	1	105	0	1
44	0	6	106	0	1
45	0	1	107	0	1
46	2	8	108	0	1
47	0	1	112	0	1
49	1	2	113	0	5
50	0	1	114	1	1
52	0	1	115	0	1
60	0	2	121	0	4
61	1	1	122	0	2

**Figure 45: Mediated Allegations By Precinct
(Jun 2018 - YTD 2018)**

Precinct	Jun 2018	YTD 2018	Precinct	Jun 2018	YTD 2018
1	0	1	63	1	4
5	0	1	66	0	2
6	0	1	67	0	3
9	0	5	69	0	23
10	0	1	70	0	10
13	0	2	71	0	1
14	0	8	72	0	2
17	0	5	73	0	2
18	2	15	75	0	4
19	6	8	77	0	4
20	2	3	78	0	4
23	0	1	83	0	2
24	0	1	84	0	4
25	9	9	88	0	2
26	0	4	90	0	4
28	0	1	100	2	4
32	0	8	101	0	6
33	0	2	103	3	11
34	0	3	104	2	8
42	0	2	105	0	4
44	0	11	106	0	1
45	0	4	107	0	2
46	3	13	108	0	4
47	0	2	112	0	3
49	2	3	113	0	8
50	0	1	114	1	1
52	0	1	115	0	3
60	0	9	121	0	11
61	1	1	122	0	2

Administrative Prosecution Unit

The CCRB’s Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) prosecutes police misconduct cases when the Board has recommended charges, in the NYPD Trial Room. The APU is also able to offer pleas to officers who admit guilt rather than going to trial. Following a plea agreement or the conclusion of a disciplinary trial, cases are sent to the Police Commissioner for final penalties.

Figure 46: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Jun 2018	YTD 2018
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	0	5
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. A imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. B imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Formalized Training imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Instructions imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Guilty	0	0
	Resolved by plea	1	14
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. B	0	0
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. A	0	0
	Plea set aside, Formalized Training	0	0
	Plea set aside, Instructions	0	0
	*Retained, with discipline	0	2
	Disciplinary Action Total	1	21
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	0	0
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	0
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	0	2
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total	0	2
Not Adjudicated	Charges not filed	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	1
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	0	1
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total	0	2
Total Closures	1	25	

*Retained cases are those in which the Department kept jurisdiction pursuant to Section 2 of the April 2, 2012 Memorandum of Understanding between the NYPD and the CCRB.

** When the Department keeps jurisdiction pursuant to Section 2 and does not impose any discipline on the officer, it is the equivalent of a category referred to as "Department Unable to Prosecute" (DUP). Cases are referred to as DUP when the department decides that it will not discipline an officer against whom the Board recommended discipline other than charges.

*** In some cases, the Department conducts its own investigation and prosecution prior to the completion of the CCRB's investigation. In those cases, the APU does not conduct a second prosecution.

† Under the Board's reconsideration process, an officer who has charges recommended as the penalty for a substantiated allegation may have the recommended penalty changed to something other than charges or have the disposition changed to something other than substantiated. In those cases, the APU ceases its prosecution.

NYPD Discipline

Under the New York City Charter, the Police Commissioner makes the final decision regarding discipline and the outcome of disciplinary trials.

The first chart reflects NYPD-imposed discipline for cases brought by the APU (Charges).

The chart on the following page reflects cases referred to the Police Commissioner where the Board recommended Command Discipline, Formalized Training or Instructions.

Figure 47: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	June 2018	YTD 2018
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	1
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	1	18
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	0
Formalized Training**	0	2
Instructions***	0	0
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	1	21
No Disciplinary Action†	0	2
Adjudicated Total	1	23
Discipline Rate	100%	91%
Not Adjudicated† Total	0	2
Total Closures	1	25

*Where more than one penalty is imposed on a respondent, it is reported under the more severe penalty.

** Formalized training is conducted by the Police Academy, the NYPD Legal Bureau, or other NYPD Unit.

*** Instructions are conducted at the command level.

† The case closure types that define the "Disciplinary Action", "No Disciplinary Action" and "Not Adjudicated" categories are listed in Figure 43 on the previous page.

Figure 48: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	Disposition Type*	June 2018	YTD 2018
Disciplinary Action	Terminated	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	0
	Command Discipline B	1	5
	Command Discipline A	5	44
	Formalized Training**	10	77
	Instructions***	5	28
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total		21
No Disciplinary Action	Not Guilty †	1	2
	Filed ††	0	3
	SOL Expired	0	4
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	0	18
	No Finding ††††	2	3
	Total		3
	Discipline Rate	88%	84%
	DUP Rate	0%	10%

*Where the respondent is found guilty of charges, and the penalty imposed would fall into more than one of the above listed categories, it is reported under the more severe penalty.

** Formalized training is conducted by the Police Academy, the NYPD Legal Bureau, or other NYPD Unit.

*** Instructions are conducted at the command level.

† Trial outcomes in non-APU cases typically involve MOS who turned down command discipline, prompting the police department to proceed with charges.

†† "Filed" is a term used when the police department is not required to take action against the subject officer because the officer has resigned or retired from the department, or has been terminated.

††† When the department decides that it will not discipline an officer against whom the Board recommended discipline other than charges, those cases are referred to as "Department Unable to Prosecute," or DUP.

†††† "No Finding" refers to cases which the department reports as "Administratively Closed."

Figure 49: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (June 2018)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of summons	10	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	14	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Retaliatory summons	22	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search (of person)	22	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	40	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Refusal to show search warrant	42	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	43	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	47	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	47	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	47	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	47	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	48	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	48	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	48	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	48	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Physical force	48	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	48	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	48	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	49	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle stop	67	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Chokehold	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle search	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Other	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Action	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Action	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Interference with recording	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	81	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	88	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	90	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Frisk	120	Staten Island	Formalized Training

Figure 50: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (June 2018)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Frisk	109	Queens	Forfeit vacation 5 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Search (of person)	109	Queens	Forfeit vacation 5 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Stop	109	Queens	Forfeit vacation 5 day(s)

Appendix

Over the years, the CCRB has made many types of data publicly available. In reorganizing the Monthly Report, we do not intend to remove any valuable information from the public domain. However, the Agency believes that some information is essential to place in the main body of the Monthly Report, while more granular charts and figures are better suited to the Appendix. We welcome you to contact the CCRB at www.nyc.gov or 212-912-7235 if you are having difficulty finding information on CCRB data that was formerly available.

Figure 51: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	June 2018		May 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1069	69.6%	1120	74.5%	-51	-4.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	269	17.5%	210	14.0%	59	28.1%
Cases 8 Months	52	3.4%	49	3.3%	3	6.1%
Cases 9 Months	42	2.7%	26	1.7%	16	61.5%
Cases 10 Months	24	1.6%	24	1.6%	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	18	1.2%	21	1.4%	-3	-14.3%
Cases 12 Months	20	1.3%	9	0.6%	11	122.2%
Cases 13 Months	9	0.6%	11	0.7%	-2	-18.2%
Cases 14 Months	10	0.7%	7	0.5%	3	42.9%
Cases 15 Months	6	0.4%	4	0.3%	2	50.0%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%	10	0.7%	-10	NA
Cases 17 Months	6	0.4%	1	0.1%	5	500.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	-2	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	12	0.8%	10	0.7%	2	20.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1537	100.0%	1504	100.0%	33	2.2%

Figure 52: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On CCRB Received Date

	June 2018		May 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1193	77.6%	1209	80.4%	-16	-1.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	213	13.9%	193	12.8%	20	10.4%
Cases 8 Months	47	3.1%	37	2.5%	10	27.0%
Cases 9 Months	32	2.1%	20	1.3%	12	60.0%
Cases 10 Months	16	1.0%	13	0.9%	3	23.1%
Cases 11 Months	8	0.5%	13	0.9%	-5	-38.5%
Cases 12 Months	11	0.7%	7	0.5%	4	57.1%
Cases 13 Months	6	0.4%	4	0.3%	2	50.0%
Cases 14 Months	4	0.3%	1	0.1%	3	300.0%
Cases 15 Months	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	-1	-50.0%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	6	0.4%	5	0.3%	1	20.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1537	100.0%	1504	100.0%	33	2.2%

Figure 53: CCRB Investigations Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	June 2018		May 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	737	77.9%	727	79.1%	10	1.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	121	12.8%	105	11.4%	16	15.2%
Cases 8 Months	21	2.2%	25	2.7%	-4	-16.0%
Cases 9 Months	12	1.3%	14	1.5%	-2	-14.3%
Cases 10 Months	10	1.1%	9	1.0%	1	11.1%
Cases 11 Months	11	1.2%	13	1.4%	-2	-15.4%
Cases 12 Months	10	1.1%	3	0.3%	7	233.3%
Cases 13 Months	3	0.3%	7	0.8%	-4	-57.1%
Cases 14 Months	6	0.6%	3	0.3%	3	100.0%
Cases 15 Months	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%	6	0.7%	-6	NA
Cases 17 Months	3	0.3%	0	0.0%	3	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	10	1.1%	7	0.8%	3	42.9%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	946	100.0%	919	100.0%	27	2.9%

Figure 54: CCRB DA Hold Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	June 2018	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	3	30.0%
Cases 8 Months	2	20.0%
Cases 9 Months	1	10.0%
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	1	10.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	3	30.0%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	10	100.0%

Figure 55: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2018)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	3	6.1%	20	40.8%	11	22.4%	10	20.4%	5	10.2%	0	0%
Gun fired	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	2	14.3%	7	50%	1	7.1%	2	14.3%	2	14.3%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Radio as club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Flashlight as club	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Police shield	0	0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	0	0%	3	16.7%	6	33.3%	8	44.4%	1	5.6%	0	0%
Chokehold	2	6.7%	0	0%	19	63.3%	7	23.3%	2	6.7%	0	0%
Pepper spray	8	66.7%	4	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical force	23	5.2%	186	41.7%	130	29.1%	56	12.6%	51	11.4%	0	0%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	2	15.4%	9	69.2%	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	3	9.7%	7	22.6%	14	45.2%	5	16.1%	2	6.5%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	0	0%	0	0%	8	44.4%	5	27.8%	5	27.8%	0	0%
Total	44	6.7%	242	37%	201	30.7%	99	15.1%	68	10.4%	0	0%

Figure 56: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2018)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	0	0%	11	78.6%	2	14.3%	1	7.1%	0	0%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	0	0%	20	54.1%	17	45.9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Strip-searched	5	23.8%	5	23.8%	6	28.6%	3	14.3%	2	9.5%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	4	4.7%	45	52.3%	25	29.1%	0	0%	12	14%	0	0%
Vehicle search	11	12.5%	42	47.7%	25	28.4%	0	0%	10	11.4%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	16	7.4%	147	68.1%	41	19%	4	1.9%	8	3.7%	0	0%
Threat of summons	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	7	4.6%	64	41.8%	58	37.9%	11	7.2%	13	8.5%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	2	22.2%	2	22.2%	5	55.6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	6	6.9%	15	17.2%	45	51.7%	11	12.6%	10	11.5%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	3	10%	5	16.7%	15	50%	1	3.3%	6	20%	0	0%
Property damaged	1	2.5%	6	15%	17	42.5%	3	7.5%	13	32.5%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	9	40.9%	0	0%	5	22.7%	3	13.6%	5	22.7%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	19	11.2%	4	2.4%	111	65.7%	25	14.8%	10	5.9%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	6	85.7%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	4	80%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	2	4.1%	0	0%	34	69.4%	10	20.4%	3	6.1%	0	0%
Improper dissemination of medical info	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Other	12	24.5%	26	53.1%	10	20.4%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
Seizure of property	2	12.5%	10	62.5%	3	18.8%	0	0%	1	6.2%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	0	0%	0	0%	19	79.2%	4	16.7%	1	4.2%	0	0%
Frisk	35	28.7%	26	21.3%	35	28.7%	5	4.1%	21	17.2%	0	0%
Search (of person)	9	8.4%	20	18.7%	56	52.3%	3	2.8%	19	17.8%	0	0%
Stop	22	13.3%	76	46.1%	48	29.1%	2	1.2%	17	10.3%	0	0%
Question	5	16.1%	7	22.6%	11	35.5%	0	0%	8	25.8%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Interference with recording	11	36.7%	3	10%	9	30%	2	6.7%	5	16.7%	0	0%
Search of recording device	0	0%	0	0%	6	85.7%	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%

Forcible Removal to Hospital	2	3.1%	61	93.8%	2	3.1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat re: removal to hospital	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	2	28.6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat re: immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Disseminated immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Questioned immigration status	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Search of Premises	0	0%	9	69.2%	3	23.1%	0	0%	1	7.7%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Arrest)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Frisk)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Strip-Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Vehicle Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Photo/Video)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Summons)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Photography/Videography	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	197	11.7%	609	36.1%	617	36.6%	91	5.4%	171	10.1%	0	0%

Figure 57: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2018)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	35	12%	8	2.7%	183	62.7%	28	9.6%	38	13%	0	0%
Gesture	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Action	3	7.1%	4	9.5%	21	50%	5	11.9%	9	21.4%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	38	11.2%	12	3.5%	208	61.2%	35	10.3%	47	13.8%	0	0%

Figure 58: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2018)

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	0	0%	0	0%	18	75%	4	16.7%	2	8.3%	0	0%
Ethnicity	0	0%	0	0%	1	12.5%	7	87.5%	0	0%	0	0%
Religion	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gender	2	8%	0	0%	18	72%	3	12%	2	8%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical disability	1	33.3%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%
Other	2	16.7%	0	0%	4	33.3%	5	41.7%	1	8.3%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	5	6.6%	0	0%	46	60.5%	19	25%	6	7.9%	0	0%

Figure 59: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (June 2018)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	0	0%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	0	0%
Trial commenced	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	14	16%
Charges filed, awaiting service	42	48%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	16	18%
Calendared for court appearance	3	3%
Trial scheduled	4	5%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	8	9%
Total	87	100%

CORD is the CO's Report on MOS facing discipline.
 SoEH is the Summary of Employment History.
 DCS is the Disciplinary Cover Sheet.

Figure 60: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (June 2018)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	1	6%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	9	56%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	5	31%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	0	0%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	1	6%
Total	16	100%

A Fogel response is a letter to the Trial Commissioner with comments from the CCRB on the Trial Commissioner's report and recommendation.

Figure 61: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	1	4	17	120
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	1	36	30	235
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	4	28	63	379
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	1	19	43	276
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	0	26	39	272
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	1	10	26	224
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	5	10	77
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	2	13	11	109
Special Operations Division Total	0	0	3	18
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	1
Total	10	141	242	1711
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	2	3	26
Transit Bureau Total	1	6	18	87
Housing Bureau Total	0	13	16	174
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	4	3	65
Detective Bureau Total	1	3	12	78
Other Bureaus Total	2	2	15	58
Total	4	30	67	488
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	1	5	27
Undetermined	0	1	2	17
Total	14	173	316	2243

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
001 Precinct	0	1	1	12
005 Precinct	0	1	0	16
006 Precinct	0	0	1	14
007 Precinct	0	0	1	6
009 Precinct	0	1	4	10
010 Precinct	1	1	4	10
013 Precinct	0	0	0	5
Midtown South Precinct	0	0	1	10
017 Precinct	0	0	0	5
Midtown North Precinct	0	0	4	23
Precincts Total	1	4	16	111
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	0	0	4
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	0	1	5
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	1	4	17	120

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
019 Precinct	0	3	6	21
020 Precinct	0	0	1	17
023 Precinct	0	1	2	16
024 Precinct	0	0	0	9
025 Precinct	0	0	7	16
026 Precinct	0	1	2	7
Central Park Precinct	0	1	2	4
028 Precinct	0	7	3	26
030 Precinct	0	3	0	18
032 Precinct	0	2	3	23
033 Precinct	1	1	3	32
034 Precinct	0	16	1	39
Precincts Total	1	35	30	228
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	1	0	2
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	5
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	1	36	30	235

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
040 Precinct	0	4	2	22
041 Precinct	1	4	5	28
042 Precinct	0	0	2	24
043 Precinct	0	1	3	14
044 Precinct	0	2	5	69
045 Precinct	0	2	4	18
046 Precinct	0	2	10	35
047 Precinct	3	5	13	37
048 Precinct	0	2	4	35
049 Precinct	0	1	1	21
050 Precinct	0	1	3	16
052 Precinct	0	4	10	58
Precincts Total	4	28	62	377
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	1	1
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	4	28	63	379

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
060 Precinct	0	0	0	21
061 Precinct	0	0	2	18
062 Precinct	0	1	1	13
063 Precinct	0	5	2	20
066 Precinct	0	0	1	11
067 Precinct	1	3	20	56
068 Precinct	0	4	0	14
069 Precinct	0	4	3	35
070 Precinct	0	0	6	20
071 Precinct	0	0	0	23
072 Precinct	0	1	2	20
076 Precinct	0	0	5	15
078 Precinct	0	0	1	3
Precincts Total	1	18	43	269
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	1	0	3
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	4
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	1	19	43	276

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
073 Precinct	0	3	7	35
075 Precinct	0	3	13	60
077 Precinct	0	4	4	35
079 Precinct	0	3	4	36
081 Precinct	0	4	0	33
083 Precinct	0	3	1	19
084 Precinct	0	2	6	23
088 Precinct	0	2	0	10
090 Precinct	0	0	3	8
094 Precinct	0	0	1	6
Precincts Total	0	24	39	265
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	2	0	3
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	4
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	0	26	39	272

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
100 Precinct	0	0	5	11
101 Precinct	0	1	4	47
102 Precinct	0	1	2	19
103 Precinct	0	0	3	34
105 Precinct	0	1	1	21
106 Precinct	0	2	0	16
107 Precinct	1	1	4	22
113 Precinct	0	4	7	50
Precincts Total	1	10	26	220
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	3
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	1	10	26	224

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
104 Precinct	0	0	2	9
108 Precinct	0	0	0	5
109 Precinct	0	0	2	9
110 Precinct	0	0	0	8
111 Precinct	0	0	0	7
112 Precinct	0	0	2	5
114 Precinct	0	4	4	24
115 Precinct	0	0	0	9
Precincts Total	0	4	10	76
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	1	0	1
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	5	10	77

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
120 Precinct	0	7	4	51
122 Precinct	2	3	7	29
123 Precinct	0	0	0	10
121 Precinct	0	0	0	8
Precincts Total	2	10	11	98
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	3	0	7
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	3
Staten Island Housing Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Court Section	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	2	13	11	109

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	0	2	12
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	4
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	0	0	0
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	1
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	0	1	1
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	0	0	3	18

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Chiefs Office	0	0	0	1
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	1

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Bronx Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Queens Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Surface Transportation Enforcement Division (STED)	0	0	0	0
Bus Unit	0	0	2	3
Traffic Control Parking Enforcement District	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Tow Units	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Summons Enforcement	0	0	0	0
Traffic Command Intersection Control	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Intelligence Unit	0	0	0	0
Highway District	0	1	0	2
Highway Unit #1	0	0	1	9
Highway Unit #2	0	0	0	4
Highway Unit #3	0	1	0	7
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	1
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Division Total	0	2	3	26

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Authority Liaison	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Inspections	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Spec. Invest. Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Crime Analysis	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Patrol Operations	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	0	0	0	2
TB DT02	0	2	4	16
TB DT03	0	0	4	15
TB DT04	0	0	3	10
TB DT11	0	0	0	5
TB DT12	0	0	0	2
TB DT20	0	0	0	3
TB DT23	0	0	0	1
TB DT30	0	0	0	3
TB DT32	0	0	2	4
TB DT33	0	0	2	5
TB DT34	0	0	0	3
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	2	2	10
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	1	0	2
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	2
TB Anti-Terrorism	1	1	1	3
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	1	6	18	87

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	0	0	3	13
PSA 2	0	1	2	32
PSA 3	0	0	1	9
PSA 4	0	0	0	20
PSA 5	0	1	5	14
PSA 6	0	1	1	18
PSA 7	0	5	0	36
PSA 8	0	4	3	12
PSA 9	0	0	1	15
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Bronx/Queens	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Investigations	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Elevator Vandalism Unit	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Operations and Misc. Commands	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	0	13	16	174
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	1	0	5
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	0	13	16	174

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Queens Narcotics	0	0	0	11
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	0	0	2
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	4
Bronx Narcotics	0	3	1	13
Staten Island Narcotics	0	0	2	8
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	0	16
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	1	0	9
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	2
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	4	3	65

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 620: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	3
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Special Victims Division	1	1	3	8
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	1	1	14
Detective Borough Bronx	0	0	1	9
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	0	2	15
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	0	3	15
Detective Borough Queens	0	1	2	13
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	0	1
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	1	3	12	78

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	2	2
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	2	2	13	51
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	1
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	3
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	0
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	1
Other Bureaus Total	2	2	15	58

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.

Figure 62Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Jun 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Jun 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - Legal Bureau	0	0	0	0
DC Training	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy Training	0	0	0	2
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	0	0	0	0
Police Commissioner Office	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Division	0	0	0	0
Chief of Community Affairs	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Juvenile Section	0	0	0	0
School Safety Bronx/Manhattan	0	0	0	0
School Safety Queens/Brooklyn	0	0	3	4
Office of Equal Employment	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Operations	0	0	0	1
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	1	2	17
Chief of Department	0	0	0	3
Department Advocate	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Public Information	0	0	0	0
Crime Prevention	0	0	0	0
First Deputy Commissioner	0	0	0	0
Office of Management, Analysis and Planning	0	0	0	0
Quality Assurance Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Counterterrorism	0	0	0	0
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	1	5	27

Table shows MOS command as recorded at the time of complaint.