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

BILL DE BLASIO
MAYOR

FREDERICK DAVIE
CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report

August 2019

(Statistics for July 2019)

Contents

Executive Summary 2

Glossary 3

Complaints Received 4

- CCRB Cases Received By Borough and Precinct 5

Allegations Received 7

CCRB Docket 10

Body Worn Camera Footage Requests 12

Closed Cases 13

- Resolving Cases 13
- Dispositions / Case Abstracts 14
- Dispositions - Full Investigations 16
- Dispositions - All CCRB Cases 17
- Dispositions - Allegations 18
- Substantiation Rates 20
- Substantiation Rates and Video 21
- Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints 22
- Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Allegations 24
- 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 July 2019 included the following highlights:

1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 75% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 89% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In July, the CCRB opened 492 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 2,190 cases (page 11).

2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 26% of its fully investigated cases (page 16).

3) The CCRB fully investigated 42% of the cases it closed in July (page 13) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 56% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency's truncation rate was 44% (page 13). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.

4) For July, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 32% of cases - compared to 16% of cases in which video was not available (page 20-21).

5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6, 25-26).

6) In July the Police Commissioner finalized 1 decision 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 16 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 4 trials were conducted against respondent officers in July.

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 July 2019, the CCRB initiated 492 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2018 - July 2019)



Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2018 - July 2019)



Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (YTD 2010 - YTD 2019)



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 75th Precinct had the highest number at 17 incidents.

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (July 2019)



Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2019)



Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (July 2019)

NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	11
5	1
6	5
7	6
9	5
10	1
13	2
14	11
17	3
18	3
19	6
20	3
23	7
24	6
25	7
26	2
28	6
30	2
32	6
33	2
34	13
40	8
41	7
42	10
43	9
44	13
45	3
46	11
47	4
48	9
49	8
50	2
52	9
60	14
61	13
62	5
63	4
66	1

NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
67	11
68	7
69	11
70	6
71	11
72	5
73	13
75	17
76	5
77	11
78	4
79	7
81	5
83	7
84	6
90	10
94	5
100	3
101	9
102	4
103	7
104	5
105	9
106	5
107	6
108	3
109	4
110	5
111	1
112	1
113	8
114	1
115	5
120	9
121	8
122	5
123	3
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 July 2018 to July 2019, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is up, Abuse of Authority complaints are up, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are up. Figures for the year-to-date comparison show that in 2019, complaints containing an allegation of Force are up, Abuse of Authority are up, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are unchanged.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (July 2018 vs. July 2019)



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

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

	July 2018		July 2019			
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints	Change	% Change
Force (F)	153	39%	214	43%	61	40%
Abuse of Authority (A)	292	74%	351	71%	59	20%
Discourtesy (D)	103	26%	97	20%	-6	-6%
Offensive Language (O)	24	6%	25	5%	1	4%
Total FADO Allegations	572		687		115	20%
Total Complaints	392		492		100	26%

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 2018 vs. YTD 2019)



*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 2018		YTD 2019			
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints	Change	% Change
Force (F)	970	38%	1242	39%	272	28%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1948	76%	2463	78%	515	26%
Discourtesy (D)	742	29%	689	22%	-53	-7%
Offensive Language (O)	178	7%	178	6%	0	0%
Total FADO Allegations	3838		4572		734	19%
Total Complaints	2567		3158		591	23%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	July 2018		July 2019			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	336	27%	412	28%	76	23%
Abuse of Authority (A)	762	61%	911	62%	149	20%
Discourtesy (D)	130	10%	124	8%	-6	-5%
Offensive Language (O)	28	2%	31	2%	3	11%
Total Allegations	1256		1478		222	18%
Total Complaints	392		492		100	26%

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

	YTD 2018		YTD 2019			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	2033	24%	2645	22%	612	30%
Abuse of Authority (A)	5323	62%	7997	68%	2674	50%
Discourtesy (D)	1043	12%	966	8%	-77	-7%
Offensive Language (O)	233	3%	224	2%	-9	-4%
Total Allegations	8632		11832		3200	37%
Total Complaints	2567		3158		591	23%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of July 2019, 75% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 89% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (July 2019)

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1501	75.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	277	13.9%
Cases 8-11 Months	167	8.4%
Cases 12-18 Months*	39	2.0%
Cases Over 18 Months**	8	0.4%
Total	**1992**	**100%**

*12-18 Months: 10 cases that were reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.
**Over18 Months: 4 cases that were reopened; 4 cases that were on DA Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (July 2019)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1384	69.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	295	14.8%
Cases 8-11 Months	218	10.9%
Cases 12-18 Months*	80	4.0%
Cases Over 18 Months**	15	0.8%
Total	**1992**	**100%**

*12-18 Months: 13 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 2018 - July 2019)



Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis



Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	June 2019		July 2019			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Investigations	1235	61%	1276	58%	41	3%
Pending Board Review	592	29%	716	33%	124	21%
Mediation	178	9%	191	9%	13	7%
On DA Hold	6	0%	7	0%	1	17%
Total	2011		2190		179	9%

Body Worn Camera Footage Requests

Since the widespread roll out of body worn cameras in 2018, the collection of footage from these cameras has become an integral part of CCRB investigations.

The timeliness of the response to BWC footage requests has a direct impact on the length of time it takes to complete an investigation. The longer it takes to fulfill BWC requests, the longer CCRB investigations remain on the open docket.

Figure 18: Pending Requests for BWC Footage

Days Pending	BWC Requests	% of Total
00 <= Days < 30	402	64.0%
30 <= Days < 60	132	21.0%
60 <= Days < 90	52	8.3%
90 <= Days	42	6.7%
Total	**628**	**100%**

Figure 19: Percentage of Open Investigations Docket with Pending BWC Requests (January 2018 - July 2019)



Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In July 2019, the CCRB fully investigated 42% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 56% of the cases it closed.

Figure 20: Case Resolutions (January 2018 - July 2019) (%)



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

The complainant, his brother, and six individuals were standing in front of the complainant's residence when four officers in a police van approached them for double-parking their vehicle in front of the building. As the officers spoke to the individuals, a crowd of civilians gathered. An officer then threatened to arrest the crowd for blocking pedestrian traffic. BWC footage returned from the incident showed a group of approximately seven individuals standing in a line on the curb. An officer is heard over the loudspeaker saying, "If you don't move from in front of the building, you're obstructing pedestrian traffic … That's my first and final warning … If not, you'll come back to the precinct with us." While the officer makes this statement, two individuals walk by. The passersby do not have to move around the crowd.

During his CCRB interview, the subject officer stated that when the officers exited their vehicle to speak with the complainant, a crowd formed. Members of the crowd recorded the officers and stepped off the sidewalk into the street. The officer instructed the members of the crowd to remain on the sidewalk, and while some individuals complied with his command, others did not. The officer then told the crowd that they could be arrested for obstruction of governmental administration (OGA) for failure to comply with the police. The investigation determined that the officer could not arrest the individuals on the sidewalk for OGA as BWC footage showed that at the time of the threat, the individuals were in no way impeding pedestrian traffic or otherwise causing an inconvenience. The Board substantiated the threat to arrest allegation.

2. Unsubstantiated

Officers responded to a 911 call for a dispute involving cross complainants—a mother and son.

While speaking to the son, an officer allegedly told him to, "Hold the fuck on," and "Shut the fuck up." BWC was not activated until partway through the incident and thus did not capture the discourteous statements made by the officers. During their CCRB interviews, both officers denied using profanity towards the individual. While the mother involved in the complaint also told the CCRB she did not hear the officers use profanity, the investigation did not credit her account as that of an independent third-party due to her familial relationship with the complainant and role in the dispute that led to the police interaction. Given the conflicting statements, lack of independent third-party testimony, or video footage or documentary evidence capturing the allegation, the investigation was unable to determine by a preponderance of evidence whether the officer spoke discourteously to the individual. The Board unsubstantiated the allegation.

3. Unfounded
An individual was stopped and issued three summonses for failing to yield to a pedestrian/vehicle, making an improper turn, and operating a motor vehicle while using a portable electronic device. As the individual received the summonses, the officer allegedly said, "Here you go, black boy." BWC footage returned for the subject officer captured the entire incident. It did not show the officer referring to the individual as a "black boy," or saying anything to the individual as he handed him the summons. Based on the BWC footage, the investigation determined that at no point during the incident did the officer speak offensively to the individual. The Board unfounded the allegation.

4. Exonerated
An individual and his friend were stopped for a broken taillight. An officer approached the driver side, and while speaking to the individual, informed him that the vehicle smelled like marijuana. The individual was subsequently frisked, searched, and issued a summons for unlawful possession of marijuana. BWC footage captured the duration of the stop. It showed officers commenting on the odor of marijuana and informing the individual that the smell of marijuana in the vehicle gave the officers probable cause to remove the individual and search the vehicle. In response, the individual replied, "No problem," exited his vehicle, and consented to the search of his person. Given that the officer informed the individual that the smell of marijuana gave the officer probable cause to remove him from the vehicle, and frisked and searched the individual pursuant to that odor, the officer's actions were consistent with and adherent to the courts and NYS law. As such, the investigation determined by a preponderance of evidence that the officer was justified in stopping, frisking, and searching individual. As a result, the Board exonerated the allegation.

5. Officer Unidentified
An individual called a precinct's Detective Squad to obtain information about a police report he had filed. An unidentified officer answered the phone and provided the individual with the requested information. At the conclusion of the call, the individual asked the officer for his name. The officer did not provide his name, and instead disengaged the call. NYPD documents identified at least 13 officers present at the stationhouse at the time of the individual's phone call. The individual, however, was unable to provide any additional information that might narrow down the pool of possible subject officers. As such, the investigation was unable to identify the officer who allegedly refused to provide his name to the individual over the phone. The Board closed the allegation as officer unidentified.

Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 21: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (July 2019)



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

Figure 22: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2019)



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 23: Disposition of Cases (2018 vs 2019)

	Jul 2018		Jul 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
Full Investigations	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Substantiated	29	21%	34	26%	141	19%	216	23%
Exonerated	22	16%	27	20%	118	16%	204	22%
Unfounded	7	5%	9	7%	54	7%	72	8%
Unsubstantiated	64	46%	58	44%	351	48%	373	40%
MOS Unidentified	17	12%	5	4%	67	9%	60	6%
Total - Full Investigations	139		133		731		925	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	23	58%	24	57%	143	49%	114	40%
Mediation Attempted	17	42%	18	43%	149	51%	169	60%
Total - ADR Closures	40		42		292		283	
Resolved Case Total	179	50%	175	56%	1023	44%	1208	40%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	32	18%	29	21%	217	17%	380	21%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	105	60%	65	47%	709	56%	873	48%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	18	10%	19	14%	171	13%	300	16%
Alleged Victim unidentified	5	3%	4	3%	18	1%	36	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	16	9%	20	14%	153	12%	227	12%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	1	1%	4	0%	7	0%
Administrative closure**	0	0%	1	1%	4	0%	12	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	176		139		1276		1835	
Total - Closed Cases	355		314		2299		3043	

* 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 12% for the month of July 2019, and the allegation substantiation rate is 12% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is Discourtesy – substantiating 29% of such allegations during July 2019, and 21% for the year.

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2018 vs 2019)

	Jul 2018		Jul 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	75	12%	82	12%	355	11%	504	12%
Unsubstantiated	233	37%	236	35%	1300	39%	1410	34%
Unfounded	52	8%	64	10%	296	9%	369	9%
Exonerated	178	29%	230	34%	1042	31%	1492	35%
MOS Unidentified	86	14%	60	9%	378	11%	432	10%
Total - Full Investigations	624		672		3371		4207	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	42	44%	72	56%	307	43%	288	37%
Mediation Attempted	53	56%	57	44%	401	57%	486	63%
Total - ADR Closures	95		129		708		774	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	75	16%	76	17%	511	15%	976	18%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	285	59%	217	48%	1972	57%	2721	49%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	52	11%	55	12%	401	12%	729	13%
Alleged Victim unidentified	14	3%	8	2%	44	1%	111	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	54	11%	85	19%	483	14%	871	16%
Miscellaneous	1	0%	9	2%	31	1%	57	1%
Administrative closure	0	0%	6	1%	14	0%	33	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	481		456		3456		5498	
Total - Closed Allegations	1200		1257		7535		10480	

Figure 25: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (July 2019)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	9	37	52	14	13	125
	7%	30%	42%	11%	10%	100%
Abuse of Authority	42	146	168	35	28	419
	10%	35%	40%	8%	7%	100%
Discourtesy	30	36	10	12	17	105
	29%	34%	10%	11%	16%	100%
Offensive Language	1	17	0	3	2	23
	4%	74%	0%	13%	9%	100%
	82	236	230	64	60	672
Total	12%	35%	34%	10%	9%	100%

Figure 26: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (YTD 2019)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	69	278	349	132	73	901
	8%	31%	39%	15%	8%	100%
Abuse of Authority	320	838	1103	153	269	2683
	12%	31%	41%	6%	10%	100%
Discourtesy	107	230	39	65	71	512
	21%	45%	8%	13%	14%	100%
Offensive Language	8	64	1	19	19	111
	7%	58%	1%	17%	17%	100%
	504	1410	1492	369	432	4207
Total	12%	34%	35%	9%	10%	100%

Substantiation Rates

The July 2019 case substantiation rate was 26%.

Figure 27: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2018 - July 2019)



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 28: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations without Video (Jan 2019 - Jul 2019) (% substantiated shown)



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

Figure 29: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2019 - Jul 2019) (% 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 30: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints* (Jul 2018, Jul 2019, YTD 2018, YTD 2019)

	July 2018		July 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
Disposition	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	5	17%	4	12%	34	24%	35	16%
Command Discipline	8	28%	15	44%	53	38%	85	39%
Formalized Training	10	34%	8	24%	25	18%	48	22%
Instructions	6	21%	7	21%	29	21%	48	22%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	29		34		141		216	

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 31: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints* (2019)



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 32: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations* (Jul 2018, Jul 2019, YTD 2018, YTD 2019)

	July 2018		July 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
Disposition	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	7	17.1%	5	10.2%	53	25.1%	53	17.5%
Command Discipline	12	29.3%	21	42.9%	82	38.9%	118	39.1%
Formalized Training	15	36.6%	11	22.4%	37	17.5%	63	20.9%
Instructions	7	17.1%	12	24.5%	39	18.5%	68	22.5%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	41		49		211		302	

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 33: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (July 2019)

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Force	Pepper spray	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Force	Physical force	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Action	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Physical force	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	20	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	20	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat re: removal to hospital	20	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Question	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Action	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Other	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	63	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	66	Brooklyn

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of summons	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Offensive Language	Gender	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Gun Pointed	103	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Gun Pointed	103	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	114	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	114	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Search of recording device	115	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	120	Staten Island
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat to damage/seize property	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	121	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 34: Truncated Allegations (July 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	15	57	19	2	53	146
Abuse of Authority	54	132	32	5	28	251
Discourtesy	7	25	4	0	4	40
Offensive Language	0	3	0	1	0	4
Total	76	217	55	8	85	441

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (July 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	29	65	19	4	20	137

Figure 36: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	164	517	268	23	436	1408
Abuse of Authority	679	1921	396	78	381	3455
Discourtesy	111	236	51	8	50	456
Offensive Language	22	47	14	2	4	89
Total	976	2721	729	111	871	5408

Figure 37: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	380	873	300	36	227	1816

*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 38: PSA Complaints Closed as % of Total Complaints Closed

	Jul 2018	Jul 2019	YTD 2018	YTD 2019
PSA Complaints	22	10	109	100
Total Complaints	355	314	2299	3043
PSA Complaints as % of Total	6.2%	3.2%	4.7%	3.3%

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 39: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

	Jul 2018	Jul 2019	YTD 2018	YTD 2019
PSA 1	0	2	13	23
PSA 2	13	0	47	20
PSA 3	6	0	16	7
PSA 4	3	2	21	43
PSA 5	1	3	16	19
PSA 6	2	2	20	19
PSA 7	13	5	49	14
PSA 8	7	2	19	14
PSA 9	1	3	14	15
Total	46	19	215	174

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

	Jul 2018		Jul 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	24	34%	12	46%	87	29%	73	32%
Abuse of Authority (A)	31	44%	9	35%	159	53%	121	53%
Discourtesy (D)	8	11%	4	15%	38	13%	23	10%
Offensive Language (O)	7	10%	1	4%	16	5%	10	4%
Total	70	99%	26	100%	300	100%	227	99%

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 41: Disposition of PSA Officers (2018 vs 2019)

	Jul 2018		Jul 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
Full Investigations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	8	27%	2	29%	22	18%	13	17%
Exonerated	7	23%	2	29%	28	23%	25	32%
Unfounded	2	7%	0	0%	3	2%	4	5%
Unsubstantiated	13	43%	3	43%	69	57%	36	46%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	30		7		122		78	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	1	100%	2	67%	4	18%	7	32%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	1	33%	18	82%	15	68%
Total - ADR Closures	1		3		22		22	
Resolved Case Total	31	67%	10	53%	144	67%	100	57%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	0	0%	2	22%	11	15%	12	16%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	12	80%	4	44%	37	52%	39	53%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	1	7%	1	11%	7	10%	11	15%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	2	13%	2	22%	15	21%	11	15%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	15		9		71		74	
Total - Closed Cases	46		19		215		174	

* 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 July and this year.

Figure 42: Mediated Complaints Closed

	July 2019			YTD 2019		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	24	18	42	114	169	283

Figure 43: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	July 2019			YTD 2019		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	2	4	6	10	48	58
Abuse of Authority	63	46	109	242	369	611
Discourtesy	6	5	11	28	55	83
Offensive Language	1	2	3	8	14	22
Total	72	57	129	288	486	774

Figure 44: Mediated Complaints By Borough (July 2019)

	Mediations
Bronx	3
Brooklyn	5
Manhattan	14
Queens	2
Staten Island	0

Figure 45: Mediated Allegations By Borough (July 2019)

	Mediations
Bronx	18
Brooklyn	10
Manhattan	31
Queens	13
Staten Island	0

Figure 46: Mediated Complaints By Precinct (Jul 2019 - YTD 2019)

Precinct	Jul 2019	YTD 2019
1	1	3
5	0	1
6	0	2
7	0	2
9	2	6
10	1	1
13	0	1
14	2	4
17	0	1
18	3	6
19	0	1
20	2	3
22	0	1
23	1	1
25	0	2
28	0	2
30	2	2
32	0	1
33	0	1
40	2	2
42	0	1
44	1	6
46	0	2
47	0	7
48	0	1
50	0	1
52	0	2

Precinct	Jul 2019	YTD 2019
60	0	3
61	0	1
62	0	1
67	1	4
70	0	1
71	1	3
72	0	2
73	0	1
75	0	4
77	1	2
78	0	1
83	1	2
84	1	1
90	0	1
100	0	3
102	1	2
103	0	1
104	0	3
107	0	1
108	0	1
111	0	1
112	0	1
113	1	2
114	0	3
115	0	1
120	0	2
121	0	2
122	0	1

Figure 47: Mediated Allegations By Precinct (Jul 2019 - YTD 2019)

Precinct	Jul 2019	YTD 2019
1	1	5
5	0	2
6	0	3
7	0	7
9	5	18
10	2	2
13	0	1
14	2	7
17	0	4
18	7	15
19	0	3
20	2	3
22	0	1
23	6	6
25	0	7
28	0	5
30	6	6
32	0	3
33	0	1
40	17	17
42	0	10
44	1	7
46	0	3
47	0	11
48	0	3
50	0	1
52	0	3

Precinct	Jul 2019	YTD 2019
60	0	3
61	0	2
62	0	2
67	1	10
70	0	2
71	1	7
72	0	3
73	0	2
75	0	16
77	1	2
78	0	1
83	6	8
84	1	1
90	0	3
100	0	3
102	11	13
103	0	6
104	0	5
107	0	8
108	0	1
111	0	1
112	0	1
113	2	5
114	0	10
115	0	3
120	0	5
121	0	5
122	0	6

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 48: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Jul 2019	YTD 2019
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	0	6
	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	1	3
	Disciplinary Action Total	**1**	**14**
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	0	6
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	0
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	0	0
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total	**0**	**6**
Not Adjudicated	Charges not filed	1	1
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	2
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	0	5
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total	**1**	**8**
	Total Closures	**2**	**28**

*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 49: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	July 2019	YTD 2019
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	1
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	3
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	6
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	1	2
Formalized Training**	0	0
Instructions***	0	1
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	**1**	**14**
No Disciplinary Action†	1	7
Adjudicated Total	**2**	**21**
Discipline Rate	**50%**	**67%**
Not Adjudicated† Total	1	8
Total Closures	**3**	**29**

*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 50: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	**Disposition Type***	July 2019	YTD 2019
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	1
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	0
	Command Discipline B	1	4
	Command Discipline A	4	28
	Formalized Training**	6	52
	Instructions***	3	40
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total	**14**	**125**
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	1	3
	SOL Expired	0	0
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	5	25
	No Finding ††††	3	8
	Total	**9**	**36**
	Discipline Rate	**61%**	**78%**
	DUP Rate	**22%**	**16%**

*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 51: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (July 2019)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Physical force	6	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	6	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	6	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	10	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	18	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	18	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	18	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	23	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Seizure of property	28	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search of Premises	28	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of arrest	32	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Threat of arrest	32	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	32	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Retaliatory summons	32	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	32	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	40	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Seizure of property	41	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	45	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle search	60	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle search	60	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	60	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	69	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	69	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	F	Other	71	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	71	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	71	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	71	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	71	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	88	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Chokehold	90	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Demeanor/tone	90	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of arrest	101	Queens	No Discipline

Figure 52: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (July 2019)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Strip-searched	107	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Strip-searched	107	Queens	Command Discipline A

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

	July 2019		June 2019			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	1525	69.9%	1332	66.4%	193	14.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	326	14.9%	334	16.7%	-8	-2.4%
Cases 8 Months	80	3.7%	86	4.3%	-6	-7.0%
Cases 9 Months	66	3.0%	53	2.6%	13	24.5%
Cases 10 Months	43	2.0%	54	2.7%	-11	-20.4%
Cases 11 Months	41	1.9%	33	1.6%	8	24.2%
Cases 12 Months	24	1.1%	25	1.2%	-1	-4.0%
Cases 13 Months	17	0.8%	18	0.9%	-1	-5.6%
Cases 14 Months	10	0.5%	17	0.8%	-7	-41.2%
Cases 15 Months	9	0.4%	18	0.9%	-9	-50.0%
Cases 16 Months	15	0.7%	15	0.7%	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	10	0.5%	2	0.1%	8	400.0%
Cases 18 Months	2	0.1%	1	0.0%	1	100.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	15	0.7%	17	0.8%	-2	-11.8%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**2183**	**100.0%**	**2005**	**100.0%**	**178**	**8.9%**

Figure 54: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On CCRB Received Date

	July 2019		June 2019			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	1654	75.8%	1472	73.4%	182	12.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	303	13.9%	311	15.5%	-8	-2.6%
Cases 8 Months	76	3.5%	71	3.5%	5	7.0%
Cases 9 Months	46	2.1%	41	2.0%	5	12.2%
Cases 10 Months	34	1.6%	35	1.7%	-1	-2.9%
Cases 11 Months	23	1.1%	20	1.0%	3	15.0%
Cases 12 Months	12	0.5%	14	0.7%	-2	-14.3%
Cases 13 Months	8	0.4%	16	0.8%	-8	-50.0%
Cases 14 Months	7	0.3%	8	0.4%	-1	-12.5%
Cases 15 Months	4	0.2%	7	0.3%	-3	-42.9%
Cases 16 Months	7	0.3%	2	0.1%	5	250.0%
Cases 17 Months	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	-2	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	8	0.4%	6	0.3%	2	33.3%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**2183**	**100.0%**	**2005**	**100.0%**	**178**	**8.9%**

Figure 55: CCRB Investigations Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	July 2019		June 2019			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	912	71.5%	859	69.6%	53	6.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	189	14.8%	217	17.6%	-28	-12.9%
Cases 8 Months	50	3.9%	41	3.3%	9	22.0%
Cases 9 Months	35	2.7%	28	2.3%	7	25.0%
Cases 10 Months	24	1.9%	23	1.9%	1	4.3%
Cases 11 Months	22	1.7%	17	1.4%	5	29.4%
Cases 12 Months	14	1.1%	10	0.8%	4	40.0%
Cases 13 Months	6	0.5%	6	0.5%	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	4	0.3%	6	0.5%	-2	-33.3%
Cases 15 Months	5	0.4%	6	0.5%	-1	-16.7%
Cases 16 Months	2	0.2%	8	0.6%	-6	-75.0%
Cases 17 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	11	0.9%	12	1.0%	-1	-8.3%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**1276**	**100.0%**	**1235**	**100.0%**	**41**	**3.3%**

Figure 56: CCRB DA Hold Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	July 2019	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	2	28.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	1	14.3%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	1	14.3%
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	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	1	14.3%
Cases Over 18 Months	2	28.6%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	**7**	**100.0%**

Figure 57: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2019)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	3	6.7%	28	62.2%	7	15.6%	5	11.1%	2	4.4%	0	0%
Gun fired	2	25%	4	50%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	0	0%	4	40%	2	20%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Radio as club	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%
Flashlight as club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Police shield	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	1	12.5%	6	75%	1	12.5%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	1	4.3%	8	34.8%	9	39.1%	3	13%	1	4.3%	1	4.3%
Chokehold	6	15%	0	0%	17	42.5%	12	30%	5	12.5%	0	0%
Pepper spray	2	16.7%	5	41.7%	2	16.7%	1	8.3%	2	16.7%	0	0%
Physical force	35	5.5%	279	43.7%	191	29.9%	81	12.7%	50	7.8%	2	0.3%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	18	39.1%	19	41.3%	6	13%	3	6.5%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	0	0%	2	16.7%	6	50%	2	16.7%	2	16.7%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	2	4.9%	0	0%	21	51.2%	10	24.4%	7	17.1%	1	2.4%
Total	69	7.6%	349	38.6%	278	30.7%	132	14.6%	73	8.1%	4	0.4%

Figure 58: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2019)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	1	4.5%	11	50%	5	22.7%	4	18.2%	1	4.5%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	18	5.9%	230	75.9%	48	15.8%	2	0.7%	5	1.7%	0	0%
Strip-searched	9	29%	4	12.9%	12	38.7%	3	9.7%	3	9.7%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	3	2.3%	78	60.5%	27	20.9%	0	0%	21	16.3%	0	0%
Vehicle search	11	9%	52	42.6%	41	33.6%	2	1.6%	16	13.1%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	0	0%	5	83.3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Threat of summons	4	16.7%	9	37.5%	7	29.2%	1	4.2%	3	12.5%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	16	6%	120	45.3%	91	34.3%	17	6.4%	21	7.9%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	1	6.7%	9	60%	5	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	13	11%	29	24.6%	45	38.1%	15	12.7%	15	12.7%	1	0.8%
Threat to damage/seize property	5	13.2%	13	34.2%	16	42.1%	0	0%	4	10.5%	0	0%
Property damaged	7	10.3%	10	14.7%	23	33.8%	7	10.3%	20	29.4%	1	1.5%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	14	25%	2	3.6%	29	51.8%	2	3.6%	9	16.1%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	9	15.5%	0	0%	37	63.8%	9	15.5%	3	5.2%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	8	80%	0	0%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	9	22%	1	2.4%	13	31.7%	12	29.3%	6	14.6%	0	0%
Improper dissemination of medical info	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	10	24.4%	19	46.3%	9	22%	1	2.4%	2	4.9%	0	0%
Seizure of property	8	21.1%	18	47.4%	7	18.4%	2	5.3%	3	7.9%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	2	6.5%	1	3.2%	18	58.1%	5	16.1%	5	16.1%	0	0%
Frisk	35	21.1%	60	36.1%	40	24.1%	10	6%	21	12.7%	0	0%
Search (of person)	19	12.7%	49	32.7%	63	42%	3	2%	16	10.7%	0	0%
Stop	28	15.5%	83	45.9%	47	26%	9	5%	14	7.7%	0	0%
Question	8	11.8%	28	41.2%	20	29.4%	1	1.5%	11	16.2%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Interference with recording	8	18.2%	11	25%	12	27.3%	8	18.2%	5	11.4%	0	0%
Search of recording device	2	13.3%	0	0%	6	40%	2	13.3%	5	33.3%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0%	0	0%	3	37.5%	1	12.5%	4	50%	0	0%

Forcible Removal to Hospital	9	5.6%	137	85.6%	8	5%	5	3.1%	1	0.6%	0	0%
Threat re: removal to hospital	1	7.1%	4	28.6%	7	50%	0	0%	2	14.3%	0	0%
Threat re: immigration status	1	100%	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%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Search of Premises	8	5.2%	108	70.6%	24	15.7%	5	3.3%	8	5.2%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	3	27.3%	0	0%	4	36.4%	2	18.2%	2	18.2%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%
Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	8	66.7%	0	0%	2	16.7%	0	0%	2	16.7%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	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	2	12.5%	3	18.8%	7	43.8%	0	0%	4	25%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	9	7.7%	1	0.9%	75	64.1%	14	12%	18	15.4%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	11	9.8%	3	2.7%	73	65.2%	11	9.8%	14	12.5%	0	0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	13	52%	4	16%	7	28%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	320	11.9%	1103	41.1%	838	31.2%	153	5.7%	269	10%	2	0.1%

Figure 59: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2019)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	96	21.3%	36	8%	191	42.4%	60	13.3%	67	14.9%	1	0.2%
Gesture	1	12.5%	0	0%	5	62.5%	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Action	10	18.2%	3	5.5%	34	61.8%	5	9.1%	2	3.6%	1	1.8%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	107	20.8%	39	7.6%	230	44.7%	65	12.6%	71	13.8%	2	0.4%

Figure 60: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2019)

Offensive Language Allegation	**Substantiated**		**Exonerated**		**Unsubstantiated**		**Unfounded**		**Officer Unidentified**		**Miscellaneous**	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	1	2.9%	0	0%	20	58.8%	10	29.4%	3	8.8%	0	0%
Ethnicity	1	8.3%	0	0%	9	75%	2	16.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	4	36.4%	2	18.2%	5	45.5%	0	0%
Physical disability	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	2	11.8%	1	5.9%	11	64.7%	1	5.9%	2	11.8%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0%	0	0%	4	57.1%	0	0%	3	42.9%	0	0%
Gender	3	23.1%	0	0%	7	53.8%	1	7.7%	2	15.4%	0	0%
Total	7	7%	1	1%	60	60%	16	16%	16	16%	0	0%

Figure 61: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (July 2019)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	0	0%
Trial commenced	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	8	8%
Charges filed, awaiting service	30	30%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	41	41%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	3	3%
Calendared for court appearance	8	8%
Trial scheduled	7	7%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	3	3%
Total	**100**	**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 62: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (July 2019)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	4	14%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	14	50%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	7	25%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	0	0%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	3	11%
Total	**28**	**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 63: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	3	16	37	217
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	3	30	36	324
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	12	63	71	629
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	7	48	51	407
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	10	44	76	463
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	2	27	43	367
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	11	22	203
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	3	7	12	168
Special Operations Division Total	2	3	7	34
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	1	3
Total	**42**	**249**	**356**	**2815**
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	1	1	5	45
Transit Bureau Total	1	12	14	145
Housing Bureau Total	3	15	24	191
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	8	10	113
Detective Bureau Total	1	6	16	118
Other Bureaus Total	1	7	14	90
Total	**7**	**49**	**83**	**702**
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	1	4	34
Undetermined	0	3	4	52
Total	**49**	**302**	**447**	**3603**

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

Figure 64A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
001 Precinct	2	2	2	18
005 Precinct	0	4	1	16
006 Precinct	1	1	12	28
007 Precinct	0	1	0	19
009 Precinct	0	0	3	19
010 Precinct	0	0	3	12
013 Precinct	0	0	2	18
Midtown South Precinct	0	0	4	30
017 Precinct	0	0	0	6
Midtown North Precinct	0	5	4	32
Precincts Total	**3**	**13**	**31**	**198**
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	0	2	3
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	3	2	14
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	2	2
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	**3**	**16**	**37**	**217**

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

Figure 64B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
019 Precinct	0	2	0	19
020 Precinct	1	1	2	15
023 Precinct	1	2	7	28
024 Precinct	0	0	3	18
025 Precinct	0	1	4	36
026 Precinct	0	0	0	14
Central Park Precinct	0	2	0	5
028 Precinct	0	3	5	27
030 Precinct	1	2	7	20
032 Precinct	0	2	6	38
033 Precinct	0	6	0	32
034 Precinct	0	7	0	57
Precincts Total	**3**	**28**	**34**	**309**
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	2	2	12
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	**3**	**30**	**36**	**324**

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

Figure 64C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
040 Precinct	0	3	5	44
041 Precinct	1	3	10	45
042 Precinct	0	5	1	51
043 Precinct	0	7	2	44
044 Precinct	5	13	16	86
045 Precinct	0	0	0	19
046 Precinct	2	10	13	86
047 Precinct	2	4	8	63
048 Precinct	0	5	0	50
049 Precinct	0	2	2	49
050 Precinct	0	3	1	17
052 Precinct	2	6	6	56
Precincts Total	**12**	**61**	**64**	**610**
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	1	4	7
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	1	3	11
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	**12**	**63**	**71**	**629**

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

Figure 64D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
060 Precinct	0	4	2	31
061 Precinct	0	0	6	27
062 Precinct	0	2	0	17
063 Precinct	1	6	3	30
066 Precinct	0	0	0	9
067 Precinct	0	2	11	70
068 Precinct	0	5	0	14
069 Precinct	4	6	8	31
070 Precinct	0	7	5	50
071 Precinct	0	8	6	57
072 Precinct	0	0	6	30
076 Precinct	0	1	2	14
078 Precinct	0	2	0	17
Precincts Total	**5**	**43**	**49**	**397**
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	1	1	1	2
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	1	4	1	8
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	**7**	**48**	**51**	**407**

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

Figure 64E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
073 Precinct	0	4	4	59
075 Precinct	2	7	13	86
077 Precinct	0	2	6	56
079 Precinct	4	13	8	58
081 Precinct	0	0	2	37
083 Precinct	1	7	23	53
084 Precinct	0	2	7	29
088 Precinct	0	3	4	25
090 Precinct	3	5	7	46
094 Precinct	0	0	1	10
Precincts Total	**10**	**43**	**75**	**459**
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	0	1	2
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	0	2
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	**10**	**44**	**76**	**463**

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

Figure 64F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
100 Precinct	0	0	1	28
101 Precinct	0	4	3	48
102 Precinct	0	7	13	48
103 Precinct	2	4	10	63
105 Precinct	0	6	1	59
106 Precinct	0	2	3	27
107 Precinct	0	1	2	17
113 Precinct	0	3	10	71
Precincts Total	**2**	**27**	**43**	**361**
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	0	5
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	**2**	**27**	**43**	**367**

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

Figure 64G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
104 Precinct	0	2	5	43
108 Precinct	0	2	2	14
109 Precinct	0	2	1	24
110 Precinct	0	1	4	16
111 Precinct	0	2	0	17
112 Precinct	0	0	5	11
114 Precinct	0	2	5	49
115 Precinct	0	0	0	24
Precincts Total	**0**	**11**	**22**	**198**
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	0	0	2
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	**0**	**11**	**22**	**203**

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

Figure 64H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
120 Precinct	1	1	8	72
122 Precinct	0	0	1	31
123 Precinct	0	3	1	29
121 Precinct	2	2	2	27
Precincts Total	**3**	**6**	**12**	**159**
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	1	0	7
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
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	**3**	**7**	**12**	**168**

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

Figure 64I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	1	4	28
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	1
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	0	0	0
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	0
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	2	2	3	5
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	**2**	**3**	**7**	**34**

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

Figure 64J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Chiefs Office	0	0	1	3
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**

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

Figure 64K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	1
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	2	24
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	2
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	0	0	0
Highway Unit #1	0	0	0	6
Highway Unit #2	0	0	0	3
Highway Unit #3	1	1	3	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	**1**	**1**	**5**	**45**

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

Figure 64L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
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	5	3	20
TB DT02	0	0	0	14
TB DT03	1	2	1	12
TB DT04	0	0	4	16
TB DT11	0	0	0	3
TB DT12	0	2	0	12
TB DT20	0	1	0	4
TB DT23	0	0	0	3
TB DT30	0	2	0	13
TB DT32	0	0	2	6
TB DT33	0	0	0	9
TB DT34	0	0	0	4
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	0	6
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	0	1	1
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	1
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	2
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	0	3	18
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	**1**	**12**	**14**	**145**

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

Figure 64M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	1	3	3	24
PSA 2	0	1	0	18
PSA 3	0	1	0	7
PSA 4	0	5	2	44
PSA 5	0	0	3	19
PSA 6	0	2	2	19
PSA 7	1	1	5	14
PSA 8	0	0	2	14
PSA 9	1	1	3	17
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	2
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	**3**	**15**	**24**	**191**
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	4	10
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	1	0	2
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	1
Housing Bureau Total	**3**	**15**	**24**	**191**

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

Figure 64N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Queens Narcotics	0	1	2	17
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	3	1	14
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	8
Bronx Narcotics	0	1	0	16
Staten Island Narcotics	0	2	2	10
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	4	29
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	0	0	6
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	4
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	1	1
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	1	0	8
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	**0**	**8**	**10**	**113**

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

Figure 64O: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	2	2
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	2
Special Investigations Division	0	0	1	4
Special Victims Division	0	0	0	2
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	1
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	0	0	10
Detective Borough Bronx	1	1	4	23
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	3	1	27
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	1	6	20
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	2	24
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	1	0	3
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	**1**	**6**	**16**	**118**

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

Figure 64P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	3
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	1	6	14	83
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	1
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	1	0	2
Other Bureaus Total	**1**	**7**	**14**	**90**

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

Figure 64Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Jul 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jul 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
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	1	5
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	0	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	3
School Safety Queens/Brooklyn	0	0	0	1
Office of Equal Employment	0	0	0	1
Deputy Commissioner Operations	0	0	0	0
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	1	3	18
Chief of Department	0	0	0	1
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	2
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	1
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	**0**	**1**	**4**	**34**

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