



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
November 2018
(Statistics for October 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	27
Complaints by PSA	28
Mediation Unit	30
Administrative Prosecution Unit	32
NYPD Discipline	33
Appendix	38

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 October 2018 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 79% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 93% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In October, the CCRB opened 459 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 1,787 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 17% of its fully investigated cases (page 15).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 44% of the cases it closed in October (page 12) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 53% of the cases it closed (page 16). The Agency's truncation rate was 47% (page 12). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.
- 4) For October, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 26% of cases - compared to 10% 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, 24-26).
- 6) In October the Police Commissioner finalized 2 decisions against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases (page 32). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 8 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 2 trials were conducted against respondent officers in October.

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 October 2018, the CCRB initiated 459 new complaints.

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




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2017 - October 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 44th Precinct and 75th Precinct had the highest number at 19 incidents.

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




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




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


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	9	67	12
5	2	68	1
6	4	69	4
7	6	70	10
9	7	71	10
10	4	72	2
13	6	73	14
14	17	75	19
17	4	76	3
18	10	77	3
19	3	78	6
20	2	79	5
22	2	81	8
23	3	83	6
25	6	84	4
26	4	88	4
28	2	90	12
32	10	94	1
33	4	100	2
34	6	101	9
40	9	102	5
41	6	103	7
42	4	104	6
43	5	105	4
44	19	106	7
45	1	107	6
46	12	108	1
47	8	109	2
48	2	110	3
49	10	111	4
50	3	112	1
52	7	113	10
60	9	114	6
61	1	115	8
62	3	120	15
63	3	121	3
66	3	122	4
		123	4
		Unknown	12

*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 October 2017 to October 2018, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is up, Abuse of Authority complaints are up, 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 up, Abuse of Authority are up, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down.

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




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

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

	October 2017		October 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	169	43%	179	39%	10	6%
Abuse of Authority (A)	293	74%	354	77%	61	21%
Discourtesy (D)	109	28%	98	21%	-11	-10%
Offensive Language (O)	20	5%	19	4%	-1	-5%
Total FADO Allegations	591		650		59	10%
Total Complaints	395		459		64	16%

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)	1480	39%	1486	38%	6	0%
Abuse of Authority (A)	2758	72%	2958	76%	200	7%
Discourtesy (D)	1249	33%	1038	27%	-211	-17%
Offensive Language (O)	329	9%	246	6%	-83	-25%
Total FADO Allegations	5816		5728		-88	-2%
Total Complaints	3822		3900		78	2%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	October 2017		October 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	323	24%	315	23%	-8	-2%
Abuse of Authority (A)	831	62%	923	66%	92	11%
Discourtesy (D)	149	11%	130	9%	-19	-13%
Offensive Language (O)	27	2%	25	2%	-2	-7%
Total Allegations	1330		1393		63	5%
Total Complaints	395		459		64	16%

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

	YTD 2017		YTD 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	2952	24%	3080	23%	128	4%
Abuse of Authority (A)	7406	59%	8477	63%	1071	14%
Discourtesy (D)	1777	14%	1476	11%	-301	-17%
Offensive Language (O)	422	3%	331	2%	-91	-22%
Total Allegations	12557		13364		807	6%
Total Complaints	3822		3900		78	2%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of October 2018, 79% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 93% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

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

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1286	79.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	222	13.6%
Cases 8-11 Months	83	5.1%
Cases 12-18 Months*	32	2.0%
Cases Over 18 Months**	5	0.3%
Total	1628	100%

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

**Over18 Months: 2 cases that were reopened; 4 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1180	72.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	238	14.6%
Cases 8-11 Months	134	8.2%
Cases 12-18 Months*	62	3.8%
Cases Over 18 Months**	14	0.9%
Total	1628	100%

*12-18 Months: 11 cases that were reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 3 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 - October 2018)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change


	September 2018		October 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	1043	57%	1104	62%	61	6%
Pending Board Review	608	33%	524	29%	-84	-14%
Mediation	165	9%	148	8%	-17	-10%
On DA Hold	12	1%	11	1%	-1	-8%
Total	1828		1787		-41	-2%

Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In October 2018, the CCRB fully investigated 44% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 53% of the cases it closed.

Figure 18: Case Resolutions (January 2017 - October 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

Four individuals were stopped by three officers for failing to signal. One individual was placed under arrest for driving with a suspended license. An officer instructed two other individuals to exit the vehicle. Upon doing so, they were frisked. The officer was unable to articulate any reason to believe the two individuals constituted a threat to his safety, or were armed and dangerous. As a result, the Board substantiated the abuse of authority allegations for improper frisk against the officer.

2. Unsubstantiated

Prior to transporting an individual to Central Booking, an officer allegedly verbally threatened the individual with use of force. In her statement, the officer stated that she made a statement-of-fact about circumstances under which she may need to use force against the individual, but denied making any threats of force. Due to the lack of video footage capturing the allegation, as well as inconsistent statements, the Board unsubstantiated the allegation.

3. Unfounded

An individual called 911 to report a dispute with her husband. Four officers responded. The individual removed her cellphone to record the incident, and an officer allegedly informed her that she could not record the officers. The event information and video evidence confirmed four officers responded to the incident—none of whom matched the description provided of the subject officer. Video evidence also showed the individual holding a cellphone throughout the incident. No officers were heard telling the individual she could not record the incident. All the officers also denied telling the individual that she could not record. In light of the video

evidence and officers' concurrent statements, the investigation determined by a preponderance of the evidence that an officer did not tell the individual she could not record the incident. The Board unfounded the allegation.

4. Exonerated


An individual left his vehicle double parked while he entered a restaurant. Upon returning to his vehicle, he was stopped by two officers, who asked to see his license. The individual refused to provide his license and in response, the officers threatened to tow his car. As the officers had no way to verify the individual's identity, they could have taken him into custody and removed him to the stationhouse for processing. In that instance, they would have also been justified in removing his vehicle so that it no longer obstructed vehicular traffic. The Board exonerated the threat to seize property allegation.

5. Officer Unidentified

An individual was driving in Brooklyn and honked her horn at a minivan that had abruptly stopped in front of her. In response, an unidentified officer allegedly spoke discourteously towards her. The officer then entered the driver's seat of a black town car and drove off. No police documents were prepared in regards to this incident and no video footage was found. Records requested from the potential command did not reflect any officers assigned to unmarked vehicles or traveling to the area of the incident. An NYPD Fleet Services request yielded negative results for any police vehicles that matched the vehicle description provided. An additional query for vehicles present at the incident location at the time of the incident also yielded negative results. Due to unsuccessful attempts at photo viewing sessions with the alleged victim, and the inability to identify potential subject officers, the Board closed the allegation as officer unidentified.


Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 19: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (October 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)

	Oct 2017		Oct 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Full Investigations								
Substantiated	20	22%	38	17%	226	20%	202	19%
Exonerated	12	13%	51	23%	196	17%	194	18%
Unfounded	5	5%	23	10%	67	6%	85	8%
Unsubstantiated	50	54%	97	44%	553	49%	512	47%
MOS Unidentified	5	5%	13	6%	90	8%	87	8%
Total - Full Investigations	92		222		1132		1080	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	24	44%	23	53%	165	52%	199	47%
Mediation Attempted	31	56%	20	47%	153	48%	225	53%
Total - ADR Closures	55		43		318		424	
Resolved Case Total	147	54%	265	53%	1450	43%	1504	44%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	28	23%	52	22%	441	23%	352	18%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	58	47%	111	48%	1045	55%	1011	52%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	21	17%	34	15%	298	16%	275	14%
Alleged Victim unidentified	2	2%	5	2%	29	2%	37	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	9	7%	31	13%	35	2%	255	13%
Miscellaneous	3	2%	0	0%	7	0%	6	0%
Administrative closure**	2	2%	0	0%	32	2%	7	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	123		233		1887		1943	
Total - Closed Cases	270		499		3337		3448	

* 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 9% for the month of October 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 10% of such allegations during October 2018, and 12% for the year.

Figure 22: Disposition of Allegations (2017 vs 2018)

	Oct 2017		Oct 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	50	10%	85	9%	565	11%	503	10%
Unsubstantiated	227	45%	360	39%	2055	41%	1929	39%
Unfounded	41	8%	73	8%	388	8%	424	9%
Exonerated	130	26%	327	35%	1421	28%	1538	31%
MOS Unidentified	56	11%	77	8%	600	12%	540	11%
Total - Full Investigations	504		922		5029		4934	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	73	52%	42	44%	369	53%	429	41%
Mediation Attempted	67	48%	53	56%	328	47%	617	59%
Total - ADR Closures	140		95		697		1046	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	62	21%	89	14%	959	21%	790	15%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	153	52%	330	52%	2866	62%	2851	55%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	37	13%	91	14%	592	13%	621	12%
Alleged Victim unidentified	13	4%	10	2%	74	2%	93	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	18	6%	106	17%	77	2%	807	15%
Miscellaneous	7	2%	7	1%	23	0%	43	1%
Administrative closure	4	1%	0	0%	47	1%	22	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	294		633		4638		5227	
Total - Closed Allegations	938		1651		10364		11209	

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	9	57	76	32	17	191
	5%	30%	40%	17%	9%	100%
Abuse of Authority	58	226	247	29	40	600
	10%	38%	41%	5%	7%	100%
Discourtesy	14	61	4	11	16	106
	13%	58%	4%	10%	15%	100%
Offensive Language	4	16	0	1	4	25
	16%	64%	0%	4%	16%	100%
Total	85	360	327	73	77	922
	9%	39%	35%	8%	8%	100%


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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	69	353	392	157	134	1105
	6%	32%	35%	14%	12%	100%
Abuse of Authority	360	1115	1124	165	286	3050
	12%	37%	37%	5%	9%	100%
Discourtesy	65	377	22	69	98	631
	10%	60%	3%	11%	16%	100%
Offensive Language	9	84	0	33	18	144
	6%	58%	0%	23%	13%	100%
Total	503	1929	1538	424	536	4930
	10%	39%	31%	9%	11%	100%

Substantiation Rates

The October 2018 case substantiation rate was 17%.

Figure 25: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2017 - October 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 - Oct 2018) (% substantiated shown)



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

Figure 27: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2018 - Oct 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*
(Oct 2017, Oct 2018, YTD 2017, YTD 2018)**

Disposition	October 2017		October 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	2	10%	5	13%	25	11%	44	22%
Command Discipline	6	30%	20	53%	110	49%	83	41%
Formalized Training	5	25%	4	11%	52	23%	31	15%
Instructions	7	35%	9	24%	39	17%	44	22%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	20		38		226		202	

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*
(Oct 2017, Oct 2018, YTD 2017, YTD 2018)**

Disposition	October 2017		October 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	2	8.7%	7	13.2%	32	10.2%	66	22.3%
Command Discipline	8	34.8%	23	43.4%	161	51.3%	118	39.9%
Formalized Training	5	21.7%	7	13.2%	71	22.6%	50	16.9%
Instructions	8	34.8%	16	30.2%	50	15.9%	62	20.9%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	23		53		314		296	

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.

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Action	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Offensive Language	Race	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Offensive Language	Gender	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Offensive Language	Gender	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Question	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	61	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	61	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Force	Other	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Pepper spray	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Pepper spray	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	102	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	102	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	105	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Threat re: removal to hospital	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	110	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	110	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	110	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle stop	112	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle stop	112	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory summons	112	Queens

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command LVI Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	113	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	114	Queens

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 (October 2018)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	4	103	36	4	53	200
Abuse of Authority	75	180	38	5	40	338
Discourtesy	5	37	14	1	13	70
Offensive Language	5	10	3	0	0	18
Total	89	330	91	10	106	626

Figure 33: Truncated CCRB Complaints (October 2018)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	52	111	34	5	31	233

Figure 34: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2018)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	127	651	232	22	424	1456
Abuse of Authority	538	1802	313	61	298	3012
Discourtesy	105	339	57	9	68	578
Offensive Language	20	59	19	1	17	116
Total	790	2851	621	93	807	5162

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2018)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	352	1011	275	37	255	1930

*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

	Oct 2017	Oct 2018	YTD 2017	YTD 2018
PSA Complaints	13	24	142	167
Total Complaints	270	499	3337	3448
PSA Complaints as % of Total	4.8%	4.8%	4.3%	4.8%

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

	Oct 2017	Oct 2018	YTD 2017	YTD 2018
PSA 1	2	1	30	17
PSA 2	0	16	27	68
PSA 3	1	3	26	26
PSA 4	2	2	10	42
PSA 5	2	2	34	29
PSA 6	4	2	24	22
PSA 7	4	5	61	58
PSA 8	5	4	25	24
PSA 9	1	5	17	25
Total	21	40	254	311

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

	Oct 2017		Oct 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	6	22%	19	39%	91	27%	121	29%
Abuse of Authority (A)	14	52%	23	47%	180	53%	221	52%
Discourtesy (D)	4	15%	5	10%	54	16%	57	14%
Offensive Language (O)	3	11%	2	4%	15	4%	22	5%
Total	27	100%	49	100%	340	100%	421	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)

	Oct 2017		Oct 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Full Investigations								
Substantiated	0	0%	2	10%	34	24%	26	16%
Exonerated	4	36%	8	40%	49	34%	39	24%
Unfounded	1	9%	0	0%	2	1%	6	4%
Unsubstantiated	6	55%	10	50%	59	41%	93	57%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	11		20		144		164	
Mediation Closures								
Mediated	0	0%	2	100%	11	33%	8	24%
Mediation Attempted	4	100%	0	0%	22	67%	25	76%
Total - ADR Closures	4		2		33		33	
Resolved Case Total	15	71%	22	55%	177	70%	197	63%
Truncations / Other Closures								
Complaint withdrawn	0	0%	3	17%	13	17%	18	16%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	3	50%	11	61%	48	62%	59	52%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	3	50%	4	22%	10	13%	13	11%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	0	0%	0	0%	4	5%	23	20%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	6		18		77		114	
Total - Closed Cases	21		40		254		311	

* 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 October and this year.

Figure 40: Mediated Complaints Closed

	October 2018			YTD 2018		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	23	20	43	199	225	424

Figure 41: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	October 2018			YTD 2018		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	7	6	13	45	50	95
Abuse of Authority	30	41	71	304	446	750
Discourtesy	4	6	10	70	100	170
Offensive Language	1	0	1	10	21	31
Total	42	53	95	429	617	1046

Figure 42: Mediated Complaints By Borough (October 2018)

	Mediations
Bronx	4
Brooklyn	11
Manhattan	5
Queens	3
Staten Island	0

Figure 43: Mediated Allegations By Borough (October 2018)

	Mediations
Bronx	10
Brooklyn	20
Manhattan	8
Queens	4
Staten Island	0

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

Precinct	Oct 2018	YTD 2018	Precinct	Oct 2018	YTD 2018
1	0	1	68	0	1
5	1	2	69	0	9
6	0	2	70	0	4
9	0	4	71	0	3
10	0	2	72	0	2
13	1	3	73	0	3
14	0	5	75	1	5
17	1	4	77	1	4
18	0	5	78	0	2
19	0	3	79	1	2
20	1	3	81	3	3
23	0	2	83	0	1
24	0	3	84	0	2
25	0	3	88	0	1
26	0	2	90	0	2
28	1	3	94	0	1
32	0	4	100	0	3
33	0	4	101	0	4
34	0	3	102	1	2
40	1	2	103	0	4
42	0	1	104	0	4
43	1	1	105	0	1
44	0	6	106	0	1
45	0	1	107	0	1
46	1	9	108	0	2
47	0	3	110	0	1
49	0	2	111	0	1
50	0	3	112	1	4
52	1	2	113	0	5
60	0	3	114	1	4
61	1	2	115	0	3
62	0	1	121	0	4
63	1	4	122	0	3
66	0	2	123	0	1
67	3	5	NA	0	1

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

Precinct	Oct 2018	YTD 2018	Precinct	Oct 2018	YTD 2018
1	0	1	68	0	4
5	2	3	69	0	26
6	0	3	70	0	10
9	0	8	71	0	4
10	0	9	72	0	3
13	1	7	73	0	3
14	0	12	75	1	8
17	1	6	77	2	7
18	0	15	78	0	7
19	0	9	79	3	6
20	3	6	81	6	6
23	0	2	83	0	2
24	0	5	84	0	4
25	0	11	88	0	2
26	0	4	90	0	8
28	1	5	94	0	1
32	0	11	100	0	6
33	0	6	101	0	12
34	0	7	102	1	3
40	2	3	103	0	11
42	0	2	104	0	11
43	2	2	105	0	4
44	0	11	106	0	1
45	0	4	107	0	2
46	2	15	108	0	6
47	0	7	110	0	1
49	0	3	111	0	2
50	0	8	112	2	7
52	4	5	113	0	8
60	0	12	114	1	4
61	1	2	115	0	7
62	0	2	121	0	11
63	2	7	122	0	4
66	0	4	123	0	1
67	5	9	NA	0	1

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	Oct 2018	YTD 2018
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	0	7
	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	0	20
	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	1
	*Retained, with discipline	0	2
	Disciplinary Action Total		0
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	2	3
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	1
	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		2
Not Adjudicated	Charges not filed	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	1	4
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	0	4
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total		1
Total Closures		3	44

*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*	October 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	4
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	23
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	0
Formalized Training**	0	2
Instructions***	0	1
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	0	30
No Disciplinary Action†	2	6
Adjudicated Total	2	36
Discipline Rate	0%	83%
Not Adjudicated† Total	1	8
Total Closures	3	44

*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*	October 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	1
	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	1
	Command Discipline B	1	10
	Command Discipline A	6	68
	Formalized Training**	7	130
	Instructions***	2	45
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total		16
No Disciplinary Action	Not Guilty †	0	1
	Filed ††	0	5
	SOL Expired	0	4
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	7	43
	No Finding ††††	1	6
	Total		8
	Discipline Rate	67%	81%
	DUP Rate	29%	14%

*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 (October 2018)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	6	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of arrest	13	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	13	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	13	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	23	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Question	23	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Question	23	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	30	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Other	30	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Other	32	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Threat of arrest	43	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Threat of arrest	43	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	44	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	F	Physical force	47	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	47	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	47	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle search	52	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Question	52	Bronx	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Other	70	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	78	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	81	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	81	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	81	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Interference with recording	81	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Interference with recording	81	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	83	Brooklyn	Instructions

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	F	Physical force	88	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle search	102	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Other	102	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	120	Staten Island	No Discipline

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

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	48	Bronx	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Other	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)
Substantiated (Charges)	D	Word	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)

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

	October 2018		September 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1304	73.4%	1261	69.4%	43	3.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	258	14.5%	289	15.9%	-31	-10.7%
Cases 8 Months	45	2.5%	80	4.4%	-35	-43.8%
Cases 9 Months	53	3.0%	36	2.0%	17	47.2%
Cases 10 Months	21	1.2%	35	1.9%	-14	-40.0%
Cases 11 Months	16	0.9%	29	1.6%	-13	-44.8%
Cases 12 Months	22	1.2%	19	1.0%	3	15.8%
Cases 13 Months	11	0.6%	17	0.9%	-6	-35.3%
Cases 14 Months	13	0.7%	12	0.7%	1	8.3%
Cases 15 Months	9	0.5%	11	0.6%	-2	-18.2%
Cases 16 Months	6	0.3%	5	0.3%	1	20.0%
Cases 17 Months	3	0.2%	6	0.3%	-3	-50.0%
Cases 18 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	14	0.8%	16	0.9%	-2	-12.5%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1776	100.0%	1816	100.0%	-40	-2.2%

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

	October 2018		September 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1419	79.9%	1387	76.4%	32	2.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	234	13.2%	270	14.9%	-36	-13.3%
Cases 8 Months	40	2.3%	46	2.5%	-6	-13.0%
Cases 9 Months	25	1.4%	24	1.3%	1	4.2%
Cases 10 Months	8	0.5%	24	1.3%	-16	-66.7%
Cases 11 Months	12	0.7%	26	1.4%	-14	-53.8%
Cases 12 Months	15	0.8%	14	0.8%	1	7.1%
Cases 13 Months	8	0.5%	8	0.4%	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	4	0.2%	6	0.3%	-2	-33.3%
Cases 15 Months	3	0.2%	4	0.2%	-1	-25.0%
Cases 16 Months	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	-2	NA
Cases 18 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	5	0.3%	5	0.3%	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1776	100.0%	1816	100.0%	-40	-2.2%

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

	October 2018		September 2018		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	848	76.8%	817	78.3%	31	3.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	144	13.0%	124	11.9%	20	16.1%
Cases 8 Months	23	2.1%	27	2.6%	-4	-14.8%
Cases 9 Months	23	2.1%	13	1.2%	10	76.9%
Cases 10 Months	12	1.1%	12	1.2%	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	10	0.9%	14	1.3%	-4	-28.6%
Cases 12 Months	11	1.0%	7	0.7%	4	57.1%
Cases 13 Months	5	0.5%	11	1.1%	-6	-54.5%
Cases 14 Months	10	0.9%	2	0.2%	8	400.0%
Cases 15 Months	4	0.4%	3	0.3%	1	33.3%
Cases 16 Months	3	0.3%	3	0.3%	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 18 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	9	0.8%	10	1.0%	-1	-10.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1104	100.0%	1043	100.0%	61	5.8%

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

	October 2018	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	2	18.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	1	9.1%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	2	18.2%
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	1	9.1%
Cases 13 Months	1	9.1%
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	1	9.1%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	3	27.3%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	11	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	8	9.5%	37	44%	16	19%	11	13.1%	12	14.3%	0	0%
Gun fired	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	2	9.1%	11	50%	4	18.2%	3	13.6%	2	9.1%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	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	25%	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
Vehicle	0	0%	0	0%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	1	10%	6	60%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	0	0%	3	9.1%	14	42.4%	15	45.5%	1	3%	0	0%
Chokehold	5	10.2%	0	0%	25	51%	12	24.5%	7	14.3%	0	0%
Pepper spray	10	58.8%	7	41.2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical force	36	4.7%	308	39.8%	237	30.7%	92	11.9%	100	12.9%	0	0%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	0	0%	7	77.8%	2	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	3	16.7%	11	61.1%	2	11.1%	2	11.1%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	4	10.8%	8	21.6%	17	45.9%	6	16.2%	2	5.4%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	0	0%	1	2.9%	16	47.1%	9	26.5%	8	23.5%	0	0%
Total	69	6.2%	392	35.4%	353	31.9%	157	14.2%	136	12.3%	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%	14	66.7%	4	19%	3	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	21	9.6%	141	64.4%	48	21.9%	2	0.9%	7	3.2%	0	0%
Strip-searched	5	13.9%	9	25%	15	41.7%	5	13.9%	2	5.6%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	6	3.8%	72	46.2%	64	41%	0	0%	14	9%	0	0%
Vehicle search	18	12.7%	61	43%	50	35.2%	1	0.7%	12	8.5%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	21	8.4%	166	66.7%	47	18.9%	5	2%	10	4%	0	0%
Threat of summons	2	14.3%	7	50%	2	14.3%	3	21.4%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	12	3.9%	126	41%	113	36.8%	24	7.8%	32	10.4%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	2	14.3%	4	28.6%	7	50%	1	7.1%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	15	9.2%	23	14.1%	82	50.3%	23	14.1%	20	12.3%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	3	6.2%	14	29.2%	20	41.7%	2	4.2%	9	18.8%	0	0%
Property damaged	2	3.1%	12	18.5%	25	38.5%	5	7.7%	21	32.3%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	14	41.2%	0	0%	11	32.4%	3	8.8%	6	17.6%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	24	9.1%	5	1.9%	183	69.3%	34	12.9%	18	6.8%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	6	85.7%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	5	71.4%	1	14.3%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	5	6.8%	2	2.7%	52	71.2%	11	15.1%	3	4.1%	0	0%
Improper dissemination of medical info	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Other	29	33%	38	43.2%	16	18.2%	0	0%	5	5.7%	0	0%
Seizure of property	2	6.1%	24	72.7%	6	18.2%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	0	0%	0	0%	27	75%	4	11.1%	5	13.9%	0	0%
Frisk	55	26.4%	47	22.6%	68	32.7%	7	3.4%	31	14.9%	0	0%
Search (of person)	32	16.2%	35	17.8%	98	49.7%	5	2.5%	27	13.7%	0	0%
Stop	35	13.5%	115	44.2%	73	28.1%	6	2.3%	31	11.9%	0	0%
Question	6	10.3%	16	27.6%	24	41.4%	4	6.9%	8	13.8%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	5	71.4%	0	0%	2	28.6%	0	0%
Interference with recording	13	22%	9	15.3%	19	32.2%	8	13.6%	10	16.9%	0	0%
Search of recording device	0	0%	1	9.1%	8	72.7%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%

Forcible Removal to Hospital	9	7%	105	81.4%	12	9.3%	2	1.6%	1	0.8%	0	0%
Threat re: removal to hospital	3	21.4%	3	21.4%	7	50%	1	7.1%	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%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Search of Premises	12	11%	73	67%	18	16.5%	0	0%	6	5.5%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	1	11.1%	0	0%	4	44.4%	3	33.3%	1	11.1%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	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	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Refusal to provide shield number	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	360	11.8%	1124	36.8%	1115	36.5%	165	5.4%	288	9.4%	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	60	10.8%	18	3.2%	333	60.1%	59	10.6%	84	15.2%	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	5	7%	4	5.6%	40	56.3%	8	11.3%	14	19.7%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	65	10.3%	22	3.5%	377	59.7%	69	10.9%	98	15.5%	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	1	2.1%	0	0%	34	72.3%	10	21.3%	2	4.3%	0	0%
Ethnicity	0	0%	0	0%	2	10.5%	9	47.4%	8	42.1%	0	0%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	7	87.5%	0	0%	1	12.5%	0	0%
Physical disability	1	33.3%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%
Other	2	11.1%	0	0%	8	44.4%	5	27.8%	3	16.7%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gender	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	5	5.1%	0	0%	52	53.1%	25	25.5%	16	16.3%	0	0%

Figure 59: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (October 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	12	14%
Charges filed, awaiting service	35	41%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	22	26%
Calendared for court appearance	10	12%
Trial scheduled	4	5%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	2	2%
Total	85	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 (October 2018)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	1	6%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	12	67%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	3	17%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	0	0%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	2	11%
Total	18	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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	1	9	35	234
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	6	48	72	391
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	14	52	110	683
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	6	34	78	494
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	5	37	98	499
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	3	15	47	350
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	6	13	38	192
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	18	24	169
Special Operations Division Total	1	1	8	40
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	1	0	4
Total	42	228	510	3056
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	1	4	7	55
Transit Bureau Total	1	7	12	131
Housing Bureau Total	2	25	40	315
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	2	9	16	128
Detective Bureau Total	0	5	25	131
Other Bureaus Total	3	13	12	104
Total	9	63	112	864
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	1	6	39
Undetermined	2	4	9	36
Total	53	296	637	3995

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
001 Precinct	0	1	8	25
005 Precinct	0	1	2	21
006 Precinct	0	3	3	30
007 Precinct	0	0	0	16
009 Precinct	0	1	5	29
010 Precinct	0	1	0	11
013 Precinct	0	0	1	10
Midtown South Precinct	0	0	10	28
017 Precinct	0	0	0	7
Midtown North Precinct	1	2	4	39
Precincts Total	1	9	33	216
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	0	0	10
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	0	2	8
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	1	9	35	234

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
019 Precinct	0	3	3	29
020 Precinct	2	2	8	28
023 Precinct	0	3	3	33
024 Precinct	0	0	3	20
025 Precinct	1	4	14	47
026 Precinct	0	1	0	9
Central Park Precinct	0	1	0	4
028 Precinct	0	7	7	39
030 Precinct	0	3	2	23
032 Precinct	1	4	9	36
033 Precinct	0	1	11	50
034 Precinct	0	16	10	67
Precincts Total	4	45	70	385
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	2	3	2	4
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	2
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	6	48	72	391

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
040 Precinct	0	7	8	52
041 Precinct	2	6	12	57
042 Precinct	0	0	9	39
043 Precinct	0	1	10	36
044 Precinct	0	3	12	98
045 Precinct	4	8	9	34
046 Precinct	0	2	4	58
047 Precinct	5	10	13	72
048 Precinct	1	7	6	70
049 Precinct	0	1	6	36
050 Precinct	0	1	3	30
052 Precinct	1	5	13	92
Precincts Total	13	51	105	674
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	0	2	3
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	1	1	3	4
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	2
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	14	52	110	683

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
060 Precinct	0	1	5	35
061 Precinct	2	2	8	34
062 Precinct	0	1	11	31
063 Precinct	0	5	6	34
066 Precinct	0	0	1	15
067 Precinct	1	4	6	80
068 Precinct	0	4	4	21
069 Precinct	1	8	8	66
070 Precinct	0	0	4	43
071 Precinct	2	4	13	52
072 Precinct	0	1	5	35
076 Precinct	0	0	0	18
078 Precinct	0	0	3	15
Precincts Total	6	30	74	479
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	4	2	9
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	2	6
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	6	34	78	494

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
073 Precinct	0	3	6	54
075 Precinct	1	4	13	94
077 Precinct	1	6	16	77
079 Precinct	1	6	12	73
081 Precinct	0	6	9	56
083 Precinct	0	3	14	38
084 Precinct	2	4	13	44
088 Precinct	0	2	3	17
090 Precinct	0	0	9	21
094 Precinct	0	1	2	15
Precincts Total	5	35	97	489
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	1	7
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	5	37	98	499

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
100 Precinct	0	0	4	25
101 Precinct	0	1	11	71
102 Precinct	1	4	5	32
103 Precinct	0	0	6	50
105 Precinct	1	2	9	38
106 Precinct	0	2	1	28
107 Precinct	0	1	2	29
113 Precinct	1	5	9	73
Precincts Total	3	15	47	346
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	3	15	47	350

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
104 Precinct	1	1	7	20
108 Precinct	0	1	3	12
109 Precinct	0	0	0	22
110 Precinct	2	2	4	20
111 Precinct	0	0	4	15
112 Precinct	2	2	4	13
114 Precinct	1	6	9	60
115 Precinct	0	0	3	21
Precincts Total	6	12	34	183
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	1	0	5
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	4	4
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	6	13	38	192

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
120 Precinct	0	7	13	71
122 Precinct	0	4	4	45
123 Precinct	0	2	0	17
121 Precinct	0	0	6	21
Precincts Total	0	13	23	154
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	0	1	2
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	5	0	10
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	0	18	24	169

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	0	6	26
Harbor Unit	1	1	1	5
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	0	0	1
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	1
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	0	1	7
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	1	1	8	40

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Chiefs Office	0	1	0	4
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	1	0	4

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	1	1	8
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	1
Bus Unit	0	0	0	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	4
Highway Unit #1	1	1	4	15
Highway Unit #2	0	0	1	9
Highway Unit #3	0	1	1	10
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	5
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Division Total	1	4	7	55

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 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	4
TB DT02	0	2	0	19
TB DT03	0	0	0	21
TB DT04	0	0	1	13
TB DT11	0	0	0	5
TB DT12	1	1	2	8
TB DT20	0	0	0	4
TB DT23	0	0	0	3
TB DT30	0	0	1	6
TB DT32	0	0	2	8
TB DT33	0	0	0	8
TB DT34	0	0	0	4
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	2	1	11
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	3
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	1	1
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	1	3
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	4
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	1	3	6
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	1	7	12	131

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 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	1	1	17
PSA 2	0	1	16	65
PSA 3	0	1	3	24
PSA 4	0	0	2	42
PSA 5	1	3	2	28
PSA 6	0	1	2	22
PSA 7	0	12	5	58
PSA 8	1	5	4	24
PSA 9	0	0	5	27
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	2	25	40	315
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	1	0	8
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	2	25	40	315

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Queens Narcotics	0	2	6	31
Manhattan North Narcotics	2	2	4	6
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	14
Bronx Narcotics	0	3	3	22
Staten Island Narcotics	0	0	0	14
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	2	23
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	2	0	14
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	1	2
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	2	9	16	128

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	4
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	2	10
Special Victims Division	0	2	0	9
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	1	6	23
Detective Borough Bronx	0	0	0	16
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	0	6	22
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	1	7	28
Detective Borough Queens	0	1	4	18
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	0	5	25	131

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	2	4
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	3	13	10	94
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	1
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	1
Other Bureaus Total	3	13	12	104

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 Oct 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Oct 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division	0	0	1	1
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	1	3
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	1	2
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	0	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	3	24
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	1
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	6	39

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