



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
September 2019
(Statistics for August 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 August 2019 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 76% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 90% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In August, the CCRB opened 462 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 2,316 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 25% of its fully investigated cases (page 16).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 40% of the cases it closed in August (page 13) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 51% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency's truncation rate was 48% (page 13). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.
- 4) For August, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 35% of cases - compared to 8% 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 August the Police Commissioner finalized 2 decision(s) 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 21 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 2 trials were conducted against respondent officers in August.

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 August 2019, the CCRB initiated 462 new complaints.

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




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2018 - August 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 Bronx. The 75th Precinct had the highest number at 26 incidents.

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




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




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


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	5	67	12
5	2	68	4
6	1	69	12
7	3	70	7
10	3	71	7
13	3	72	4
14	10	73	17
17	1	75	26
18	9	76	6
19	4	77	10
20	2	78	2
22	1	79	7
23	4	81	4
24	4	83	10
25	12	84	13
26	3	88	2
28	4	90	11
30	3	94	4
32	5	100	2
33	1	101	2
34	6	102	3
40	13	103	9
41	3	104	3
42	7	106	4
43	16	107	3
44	12	109	7
45	10	110	4
46	15	111	1
47	9	112	3
48	3	113	6
49	8	114	13
50	3	115	3
52	7	120	9
60	6	121	6
61	5	122	4
62	2	123	1
63	2	Unknown	12
66	2		

*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 August 2018 to August 2019, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is up, Abuse of Authority complaints are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down. 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 down.

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




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

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

	August 2018		August 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	189	38%	195	42%	6	3%
Abuse of Authority (A)	359	73%	328	71%	-31	-9%
Discourtesy (D)	125	25%	81	18%	-44	-35%
Offensive Language (O)	30	6%	16	3%	-14	-47%
Total FADO Allegations	703		620		-83	-12%
Total Complaints	491		462		-29	-6%

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		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	1158	38%	1434	40%	276	24%
Abuse of Authority (A)	2307	75%	2792	77%	485	21%
Discourtesy (D)	867	28%	775	21%	-92	-11%
Offensive Language (O)	208	7%	196	5%	-12	-6%
Total FADO Allegations	4540		5197		657	14%
Total Complaints	3058		3614		556	18%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	August 2018		August 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	416	26%	434	29%	18	4%
Abuse of Authority (A)	948	59%	930	63%	-18	-2%
Discourtesy (D)	196	12%	105	7%	-91	-46%
Offensive Language (O)	44	3%	18	1%	-26	-59%
Total Allegations	1604		1487		-117	-7%
Total Complaints	491		462		-29	-6%

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

	YTD 2018		YTD 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	2440	24%	3096	23%	656	27%
Abuse of Authority (A)	6236	61%	9066	67%	2830	45%
Discourtesy (D)	1235	12%	1094	8%	-141	-11%
Offensive Language (O)	275	3%	249	2%	-26	-9%
Total Allegations	10186		13505		3319	33%
Total Complaints	3058		3614		556	18%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of August 2019, 76% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 90% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

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

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1623	76.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	287	13.5%
Cases 8-11 Months	167	7.9%
Cases 12-18 Months*	36	1.7%
Cases Over 18 Months**	10	0.5%
Total	2123	100%

*12-18 Months: 7 cases that were reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 4 cases that were reopened; 6 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1509	71.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	317	14.9%
Cases 8-11 Months	203	9.6%
Cases 12-18 Months*	72	3.4%
Cases Over 18 Months**	22	1.0%
Total	2123	100%

*12-18 Months: 9 cases that were reopened; 0 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 4 cases that were reopened; 8 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 - August 2019)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	July 2019		August 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	1270	58%	1336	58%	66	5%
Pending Board Review	716	33%	787	34%	71	10%
Mediation	191	9%	187	8%	-4	-2%
On DA Hold	9	0%	6	0%	-3	-33%
Total	2186		2316		130	6%

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	321	47.4%
30 <= Days < 60	236	34.9%
60 <= Days < 90	60	8.9%
90 <= Days	60	8.9%
Total	677	100%

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




Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In August 2019, the CCRB fully investigated 40% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 51% of the cases it closed.

Figure 20: Case Resolutions (January 2018 - August 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

A witness, from her window, observed an individual fleeing from officers. As the individual attempted to hop over a fence, an officer apprehended him by hooking both of his arms around the individual's throat, restricting his breathing. Documentation prepared by the officer stated that he used a "forcible takedown" against the individual and during his interview the officer stated that he pulled the individual off the fence by his waist and did not make any contact with the individual's neck as there was "no need" to use a chokehold against him. Other officers interviewed also denied seeing the subject officer, or any other officer, use a chokehold against the individual. The investigation obtained security camera and cell phone video footage of the incident. It showed the individual running from the officers, and attempting to jump over a fence. The camera captured the officer first pulling the individual by his belt, and then wrapping his left and right arms around the individual's neck. The officer and individual then fall towards the ground and out of the video frame. The investigation determined, based on the video, that the officer took the individual to the ground by placing his arms around individual's neck, and pulling him off the fence. The Patrol Guide prohibits the use of chokeholds. The Board substantiated the chokehold and restricted breathing allegations.

2. Unsubstantiated

An individual went by himself to the stationhouse to file a complaint against officers. He spoke only to the desk sergeant, who allegedly refused to take his complaint. The individual then asked the desk sergeant for documentation showing that he had attempted to make a complaint, but the desk sergeant told him that he did not have any forms and could not provide such documentation. During his interview, the sergeant stated that while the individual wanted the

officers in his complaint to be disciplined, the individual did not want to go through the process of filing a CCRB complaint. The sergeant believed he offered the individual complaint forms, and denied refusing to take the individual's CCRB complaint. He did not remember the individual asking for any type of documentation. As both the individual and officer provided conflicting statements and surveillance footage would not have captured the audio of their conversation, without additional statements or evidence, the investigation could not determine whether the sergeant refused to take the individual's CCRB complaint. The Board unsubstantiated the allegation.

3. Unfounded

An individual went to Restaurant X after learning that her daughter was involved in a physical altercation at the location. When she arrived at the location, an officer told the individual, "Everyone's gotta leave the fucking premises." The individual was not arrested or issued a summons. BWC and restaurant surveillance footage for the incident was retrieved. BWC footage captured the subject officer directing individuals to leave, but did not show the officer making the discourteous statement or using any profanity. During his interview, the officer also testified that he did not remember using any discourteous language towards the individual. Based on the BWC footage, the investigation determined that at no point during the incident did the officer speak discourteously to the individual. The Board unfounded the allegation.

4. Exonerated

An individual assaulted a male, and shortly thereafter, officers responded to the scene. Officers subsequently used physical force against the individual while placing him under arrest. Surveillance footage retrieved from the deli where the incident occurred showed that officers used minimal force to bring the individual to the ground after the individual struggled and attempted to free himself from their grips. Based on the video footage provided, the investigation found that the officers' use of force was reasonable and justified. The Board exonerated the allegation.


5. Officer Unidentified

On an unknown date, three plainclothes officers stopped, searched, and refused to provide an individual with their names and badge numbers. The individual captured a portion of this incident, and the officers' vehicle license plate number, using her cell phone. During her statement, the individual noted she was unsure if the incident date she provided was correct, but stated she would try and use her personal documentation to determine the exact date and time of the incident.

Police documentation for the assigned vehicle on the alleged incident date returned four potential subject officers, who were subsequently interviewed at the CCRB. During their interviews, three of the officers stated they had no recollection of the incident, while the fourth officer described an incident that did not clearly align with the incident detailed in the complaint. Though the investigation considered the possibility that the incident occurred on an alternative date, on the alleged date and time provided, NYPD documents established that the officers using the vehicle shown in the individual's video were making an arrest over two miles away from the alleged location of this incident. Additionally, the footage the individual provided did not clearly depict the officers involved and none of the officers interviewed recalled this incident or recognized anyone in the video. Absent a clear incident date or any other identifying information, the investigation was unable to identify the subject officers involved in this stop. The Board closed the allegation as officer unidentified.


Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 21: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (August 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)

	Aug 2018		Aug 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Full Investigations								
Substantiated	16	18%	34	25%	157	19%	250	24%
Exonerated	18	21%	31	23%	136	17%	235	22%
Unfounded	5	6%	12	9%	59	7%	84	8%
Unsubstantiated	44	51%	52	39%	395	48%	425	40%
MOS Unidentified	4	5%	6	4%	71	9%	66	6%
Total - Full Investigations	87		135		818		1060	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	12	100%	18	51%	155	51%	132	42%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	17	49%	149	49%	186	58%
Total - ADR Closures	12		35		304		318	
Resolved Case Total	99	30%	170	51%	1122	43%	1378	41%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	36	16%	26	16%	253	17%	406	20%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	119	52%	73	44%	827	55%	946	47%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	42	18%	22	13%	213	14%	321	16%
Alleged Victim unidentified	5	2%	8	5%	23	2%	44	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	26	11%	32	19%	179	12%	258	13%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	4	0%	7	0%
Administrative closure**	1	0%	4	2%	5	0%	16	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	229		165		1504		1998	
Total - Closed Cases	328		335		2626		3376	

* 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 10% for the month of August 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 19% of such allegations during August 2019, and 21% for the year.

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2018 vs 2019)

	Aug 2018		Aug 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Fully Investigated Allegations								
Substantiated	49	11%	66	10%	404	11%	570	12%
Unsubstantiated	181	41%	262	40%	1481	39%	1672	34%
Unfounded	24	5%	53	8%	320	8%	422	9%
Exonerated	127	28%	198	31%	1169	31%	1690	35%
MOS Unidentified	65	15%	68	11%	443	12%	500	10%
Total - Full Investigations	446		647		3817		4854	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	34	100%	51	40%	341	46%	339	38%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	77	60%	401	54%	563	62%
Total - ADR Closures	34		128		742		902	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	76	12%	44	10%	587	14%	1020	17%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	358	58%	225	49%	2328	57%	2946	50%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	82	13%	67	15%	481	12%	792	13%
Alleged Victim unidentified	12	2%	18	4%	56	1%	129	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	81	13%	100	22%	564	14%	967	16%
Miscellaneous	1	0%	0	0%	32	1%	57	1%
Administrative closure	4	1%	6	1%	18	0%	39	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	614		460		4066		5950	
Total - Closed Allegations	1094		1235		8625		11707	

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	9 8%	27 24%	50 44%	13 12%	14 12%	113 100%
Abuse of Authority	37 9%	190 45%	136 32%	32 8%	30 7%	425 100%
Discourtesy	18 19%	37 40%	12 13%	6 6%	20 22%	93 100%
Offensive Language	2 13%	8 50%	0 0%	2 13%	4 25%	16 100%
Total	66 10%	262 40%	198 31%	53 8%	68 11%	647 100%


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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	78 8%	305 30%	399 39%	145 14%	87 9%	1014 100%
Abuse of Authority	357 11%	1028 33%	1239 40%	185 6%	299 10%	3108 100%
Discourtesy	125 21%	267 44%	51 8%	71 12%	91 15%	605 100%
Offensive Language	10 8%	72 57%	1 1%	21 17%	23 18%	127 100%
Total	570 12%	1672 34%	1690 35%	422 9%	500 10%	4854 100%

Substantiation Rates

The August 2019 case substantiation rate was 25%.

Figure 27: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2018 - August 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 - Aug 2019) (% substantiated shown)



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

Figure 29: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2019 - Aug 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*
(Aug 2018, Aug 2019, YTD 2018, YTD 2019)

Disposition	August 2018		August 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	2	12%	5	15%	36	23%	40	16%
Command Discipline	5	31%	16	47%	58	37%	101	40%
Formalized Training	3	19%	9	26%	28	18%	57	23%
Instructions	6	38%	4	12%	35	22%	52	21%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	16		34		157		250	

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*
(Aug 2018, Aug 2019, YTD 2018, YTD 2019)**

Disposition	August 2018		August 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	3	13.6%	5	10.9%	56	24%	58	16.7%
Command Discipline	5	22.7%	20	43.5%	87	37.3%	138	39.7%
Formalized Training	7	31.8%	11	23.9%	44	18.9%	74	21.3%
Instructions	7	31.8%	10	21.7%	46	19.7%	78	22.4%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	22		46		233		348	

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 (August 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 (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle stop	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of summons	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory summons	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Question	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Offensive Language	Other	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	24	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	26	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	26	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Search of recording device	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Electronic device information deletion	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Action	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Chokehold	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Restricted Breathing	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Chokehold	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Restricted Breathing	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Offensive Language	Race	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	47	Bronx

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Question	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Chokehold	63	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory summons	78	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	101	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	111	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	111	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	120	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 (August 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	9	66	39	4	51	169
Abuse of Authority	28	134	25	9	41	237
Discourtesy	6	19	3	4	6	38
Offensive Language	1	6	0	1	2	10
Total	44	225	67	18	100	454

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (August 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	26	73	22	8	32	161

Figure 36: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	173	583	307	27	483	1573
Abuse of Authority	707	2055	417	87	422	3688
Discourtesy	117	255	54	12	56	494
Offensive Language	23	53	14	3	6	99
Total	1020	2946	792	129	967	5854

Figure 37: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	406	946	321	44	258	1975

*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

	Aug 2018	Aug 2019	YTD 2018	YTD 2019
PSA Complaints	17	8	126	108
Total Complaints	328	335	2626	3376
PSA Complaints as % of Total	5.2%	2.4%	4.8%	3.2%

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

	Aug 2018	Aug 2019	YTD 2018	YTD 2019
PSA 1	1	0	14	23
PSA 2	0	2	47	22
PSA 3	7	0	23	7
PSA 4	12	0	33	43
PSA 5	3	4	19	23
PSA 6	0	0	20	19
PSA 7	3	1	52	15
PSA 8	0	1	19	15
PSA 9	5	5	19	20
Total	31	13	246	187

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

	Aug 2018		Aug 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	10	31%	8	53%	97	29%	81	33%
Abuse of Authority (A)	20	63%	6	40%	179	54%	127	52%
Discourtesy (D)	2	6%	1	7%	40	12%	24	10%
Offensive Language (O)	0	0%	0	0%	16	5%	10	4%
Total	32	100%	15	100%	332	100%	242	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)

Full Investigations	Aug 2018		Aug 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	1	8%	0	0%	23	17%	13	15%
Exonerated	3	23%	2	29%	31	23%	27	32%
Unfounded	0	0%	2	29%	3	2%	6	7%
Unsubstantiated	9	69%	3	43%	78	58%	39	46%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	13		7		135		85	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	0	0%	4	18%	7	32%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	18	82%	15	68%
Total - ADR Closures	0		0		22		22	
Resolved Case Total	13	42%	7	54%	157	64%	107	57%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	3	17%	0	0%	14	16%	12	15%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	7	39%	1	17%	44	49%	40	50%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	2	11%	5	83%	9	10%	16	20%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	6	33%	0	0%	21	24%	11	14%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	18		6		89		80	
Total - Closed Cases	31		13		246		187	

* 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 August and this year.

Figure 42: Mediated Complaints Closed

	August 2019			YTD 2019		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	18	17	35	132	186	318

Figure 43: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	August 2019			YTD 2019		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	2	4	6	12	52	64
Abuse of Authority	44	65	109	286	434	720
Discourtesy	4	6	10	32	61	93
Offensive Language	1	2	3	9	16	25
Total	51	77	128	339	563	902

Figure 44: Mediated Complaints By Borough (August 2019)

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

Figure 45: Mediated Allegations By Borough (August 2019)

	Mediations
Bronx	15
Brooklyn	15
Manhattan	13
Queens	8
Staten Island	0

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

Precinct	Aug 2019	YTD 2019	Precinct	Aug 2019	YTD 2019
1	0	3	62	0	1
5	1	2	67	1	5
6	0	2	68	1	1
7	0	2	70	1	2
9	1	7	71	0	3
10	1	2	72	0	2
13	0	1	73	0	1
14	0	4	75	1	5
17	0	1	77	0	2
18	0	6	78	0	1
19	0	1	83	0	2
20	1	4	84	0	1
22	0	1	90	0	1
23	0	1	100	0	3
25	1	3	102	1	3
28	0	2	103	0	1
30	0	2	104	0	3
32	0	1	105	1	1
33	0	1	107	1	2
40	1	3	108	0	1
42	0	1	109	1	1
44	2	8	111	0	1
46	0	2	112	0	1
47	0	7	113	0	2
48	0	1	114	0	3
50	0	1	115	0	1
52	2	4	120	0	2
60	0	3	121	0	2
61	0	1	122	0	1

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

Precinct	Aug 2019	YTD 2019	Precinct	Aug 2019	YTD 2019
1	0	5	62	0	2
5	5	7	67	3	13
6	0	3	68	2	2
7	0	7	70	1	3
9	1	19	71	0	7
10	3	5	72	0	3
13	0	1	73	0	2
14	0	7	75	9	25
17	0	4	77	0	2
18	0	15	78	0	1
19	0	3	83	0	8
20	3	6	84	0	1
22	0	1	90	0	3
23	0	6	100	0	3
25	1	8	102	2	15
28	0	5	103	0	6
30	0	6	104	0	5
32	0	3	105	1	1
33	0	1	107	4	12
40	2	19	108	0	1
42	0	10	109	1	1
44	7	14	111	0	1
46	0	3	112	0	1
47	0	11	113	0	5
48	0	3	114	0	10
50	0	1	115	0	3
52	6	9	120	0	5
60	0	3	121	0	5
61	0	2	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	Aug 2019	YTD 2019
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	1	8
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. A imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. B imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Formalized Training imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Instructions imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Guilty	0	0
	Resolved by plea	1	8
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. B	0	0
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. A	0	0
	Plea set aside, Formalized Training	0	0
	Plea set aside, Instructions	0	0
	*Retained, with discipline	0	3
	Disciplinary Action Total	2	19
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	0	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	0	8
Total Closures	2	33	

*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*	August 2019	YTD 2019
Terminated	1	1
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	1	10
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	2
Formalized Training**	0	0
Instructions***	0	1
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	2	19
No Disciplinary Action†	0	7
Adjudicated Total	2	26
Discipline Rate	100%	73%
Not Adjudicated† Total	0	8
Total Closures	2	34

*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*	August 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	3	7
	Command Discipline A	7	35
	Formalized Training**	10	62
	Instructions***	6	46
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total	26	151
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	1	4
	SOL Expired	1	1
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	3	28
	No Finding ††††	0	8
	Total	5	41
	Discipline Rate	84%	79%
	DUP Rate	10%	15%

*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 (August 2019)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	18	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	18	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	18	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search (of person)	18	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	24	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	24	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	24	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	24	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Question	25	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle search	34	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle search	34	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	34	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search (of person)	34	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Interference with recording	43	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Retaliatory arrest	49	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	52	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	60	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	60	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Entry of Premises	61	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Interference with recording	61	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle search	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Entry of Premises	68	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Threat re: removal to hospital	68	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Action	73	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	77	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	77	Brooklyn	Formalized Training

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	79	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	79	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	79	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	79	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search of Premises	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	83	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	83	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	83	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	83	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	83	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	83	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	83	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	83	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	84	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	107	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	114	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	114	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	E	Gender	120	Outside NYC	No Discipline

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

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	60	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 8 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Chokehold	120	Staten Island	Terminated
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Other	120	Staten Island	Terminated

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

	August 2019		July 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1644	71.2%	1519	69.8%	125	8.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	353	15.3%	325	14.9%	28	8.6%
Cases 8 Months	56	2.4%	77	3.5%	-21	-27.3%
Cases 9 Months	72	3.1%	66	3.0%	6	9.1%
Cases 10 Months	52	2.3%	44	2.0%	8	18.2%
Cases 11 Months	32	1.4%	40	1.8%	-8	-20.0%
Cases 12 Months	30	1.3%	24	1.1%	6	25.0%
Cases 13 Months	20	0.9%	17	0.8%	3	17.6%
Cases 14 Months	11	0.5%	10	0.5%	1	10.0%
Cases 15 Months	5	0.2%	9	0.4%	-4	-44.4%
Cases 16 Months	9	0.4%	15	0.7%	-6	-40.0%
Cases 17 Months	1	0.0%	10	0.5%	-9	-90.0%
Cases 18 Months	2	0.1%	6	0.3%	-4	-66.7%
Cases Over 18 Months	23	1.0%	15	0.7%	8	53.3%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	2310	100.0%	2177	100.0%	133	6.1%

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

	August 2019		July 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1774	76.8%	1647	75.7%	127	7.7%
Cases 5-7 Months	313	13.5%	303	13.9%	10	3.3%
Cases 8 Months	55	2.4%	75	3.4%	-20	-26.7%
Cases 9 Months	63	2.7%	47	2.2%	16	34.0%
Cases 10 Months	34	1.5%	34	1.6%	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	25	1.1%	23	1.1%	2	8.7%
Cases 12 Months	13	0.6%	12	0.6%	1	8.3%
Cases 13 Months	10	0.4%	8	0.4%	2	25.0%
Cases 14 Months	5	0.2%	7	0.3%	-2	-28.6%
Cases 15 Months	5	0.2%	4	0.2%	1	25.0%
Cases 16 Months	1	0.0%	7	0.3%	-6	-85.7%
Cases 17 Months	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	10	0.4%	8	0.4%	2	25.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	2310	100.0%	2177	100.0%	133	6.1%

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

	August 2019		July 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	939	70.3%	906	71.3%	33	3.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	212	15.9%	188	14.8%	24	12.8%
Cases 8 Months	40	3.0%	47	3.7%	-7	-14.9%
Cases 9 Months	37	2.8%	35	2.8%	2	5.7%
Cases 10 Months	28	2.1%	25	2.0%	3	12.0%
Cases 11 Months	22	1.6%	21	1.7%	1	4.8%
Cases 12 Months	16	1.2%	14	1.1%	2	14.3%
Cases 13 Months	12	0.9%	6	0.5%	6	100.0%
Cases 14 Months	5	0.4%	4	0.3%	1	25.0%
Cases 15 Months	1	0.1%	5	0.4%	-4	-80.0%
Cases 16 Months	5	0.4%	2	0.2%	3	150.0%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	-1	NA
Cases 18 Months	1	0.1%	5	0.4%	-4	-80.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	18	1.3%	11	0.9%	7	63.6%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1336	100.0%	1270	100.0%	66	5.2%

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

	August 2019	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	2	33.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	1	16.7%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 10 Months	1	16.7%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	1	16.7%
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	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	1	16.7%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	6	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	5.9%	32	62.7%	8	15.7%	5	9.8%	3	5.9%	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%	5	45.5%	2	18.2%	3	27.3%	1	9.1%	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	11.1%	6	66.7%	2	22.2%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	1	3.6%	8	28.6%	11	39.3%	5	17.9%	2	7.1%	1	3.6%
Chokehold	9	20.5%	0	0%	17	38.6%	13	29.5%	5	11.4%	0	0%
Pepper spray	2	16.7%	5	41.7%	2	16.7%	1	8.3%	2	16.7%	0	0%
Physical force	39	5.4%	323	44.6%	212	29.3%	88	12.2%	60	8.3%	2	0.3%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	18	36%	20	40%	6	12%	5	10%	1	2%	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	4	8.7%	0	0%	23	50%	11	23.9%	7	15.2%	1	2.2%
Total	78	7.7%	399	39.2%	305	30%	145	14.2%	87	8.5%	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	4.2%	12	50%	6	25%	4	16.7%	1	4.2%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	19	5.7%	254	75.6%	54	16.1%	3	0.9%	6	1.8%	0	0%
Strip-searched	9	24.3%	4	10.8%	17	45.9%	4	10.8%	3	8.1%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	4	2.6%	82	53.6%	43	28.1%	0	0%	24	15.7%	0	0%
Vehicle search	12	8.7%	61	44.2%	46	33.3%	3	2.2%	16	11.6%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	0	0%	5	83.3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Threat of summons	5	14.7%	14	41.2%	10	29.4%	1	2.9%	4	11.8%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	18	6.1%	134	45.4%	102	34.6%	20	6.8%	21	7.1%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	1	6.2%	10	62.5%	5	31.2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	13	9.7%	34	25.4%	51	38.1%	20	14.9%	15	11.2%	1	0.7%
Threat to damage/seize property	5	11.4%	17	38.6%	17	38.6%	0	0%	5	11.4%	0	0%
Property damaged	8	11.3%	11	15.5%	23	32.4%	7	9.9%	21	29.6%	1	1.4%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	17	25.8%	2	3%	34	51.5%	2	3%	11	16.7%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	9	15%	0	0%	38	63.3%	9	15%	4	6.7%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	9	81.8%	0	0%	2	18.2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	7	87.5%	1	12.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	9	18.8%	1	2.1%	18	37.5%	14	29.2%	6	12.5%	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	23.3%	19	44.2%	11	25.6%	1	2.3%	2	4.7%	0	0%
Seizure of property	12	24%	25	50%	7	14%	2	4%	4	8%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	2	6.1%	1	3%	18	54.5%	5	15.2%	7	21.2%	0	0%
Frisk	38	20.1%	66	34.9%	54	28.6%	10	5.3%	21	11.1%	0	0%
Search (of person)	21	11.9%	58	33%	76	43.2%	3	1.7%	18	10.2%	0	0%
Stop	30	14.3%	94	44.8%	61	29%	9	4.3%	16	7.6%	0	0%
Question	10	13.7%	30	41.1%	20	27.4%	1	1.4%	12	16.4%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Interference with recording	9	16.1%	13	23.2%	17	30.4%	11	19.6%	6	10.7%	0	0%
Search of recording device	3	16.7%	0	0%	8	44.4%	2	11.1%	5	27.8%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	1	11.1%	0	0%	3	33.3%	1	11.1%	4	44.4%	0	0%

Forcible Removal to Hospital	9	5.1%	152	85.9%	10	5.6%	5	2.8%	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	9	5.4%	120	71.4%	26	15.5%	5	3%	8	4.8%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	3	25%	0	0%	4	33.3%	2	16.7%	3	25%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	8	53.3%	0	0%	2	13.3%	3	20%	2	13.3%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	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	11.1%	4	22.2%	7	38.9%	1	5.6%	4	22.2%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	1	33.3%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	10	6.6%	1	0.7%	100	65.8%	20	13.2%	21	13.8%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	12	7.8%	3	2%	103	67.3%	16	10.5%	19	12.4%	0	0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	18	37.5%	6	12.5%	20	41.7%	1	2.1%	3	6.2%	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	357	11.5%	1239	39.8%	1028	33.1%	185	5.9%	299	9.6%	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	113	21.3%	48	9.1%	220	41.5%	65	12.3%	83	15.7%	1	0.2%
Gesture	1	9.1%	0	0%	8	72.7%	0	0%	2	18.2%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Action	11	16.7%	3	4.5%	39	59.1%	6	9.1%	6	9.1%	1	1.5%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	125	20.6%	51	8.4%	267	44%	71	11.7%	91	15%	2	0.3%

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	2	5%	0	0%	23	57.5%	10	25%	5	12.5%	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%	7	46.7%	2	13.3%	6	40%	0	0%
Physical disability	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	3	15%	1	5%	12	60%	1	5%	3	15%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0%	0	0%	4	57.1%	0	0%	3	42.9%	0	0%
Gender	3	20%	0	0%	7	46.7%	3	20%	2	13.3%	0	0%
Total	9	7.8%	1	0.9%	68	58.6%	18	15.5%	20	17.2%	0	0%

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

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	0	0%
Trial commenced	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	9	9%
Charges filed, awaiting service	28	28%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	40	40%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	2	2%
Calendared for court appearance	13	13%
Trial scheduled	5	5%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	2	2%
Total	99	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 (August 2019)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	0	0%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	10	42%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	7	29%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	0	0%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	7	29%
Total	24	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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	2	18	23	240
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	8	38	57	381
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	14	77	106	735
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	6	54	49	456
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	9	53	63	526
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	1	28	31	394
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	1	12	28	231
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	1	8	22	190
Special Operations Division Total	0	3	1	35
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	1	4
Total	42	291	381	3192
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	1	6	51
Transit Bureau Total	3	15	13	158
Housing Bureau Total	0	15	13	204
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	8	7	120
Detective Bureau Total	0	6	15	130
Other Bureaus Total	1	8	15	105
Total	4	53	69	768
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	1	2	36
Undetermined	0	3	4	56
Total	46	348	456	4052

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
001 Precinct	0	2	3	21
005 Precinct	0	4	3	19
006 Precinct	0	1	1	29
007 Precinct	0	1	1	20
009 Precinct	1	1	5	24
010 Precinct	0	0	0	12
013 Precinct	0	0	1	19
Midtown South Precinct	0	0	1	31
017 Precinct	0	0	3	9
Midtown North Precinct	0	5	3	35
Precincts Total	1	14	21	219
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	1	4	2	16
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	2
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	2	18	23	240

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
019 Precinct	0	2	2	21
020 Precinct	0	1	4	19
023 Precinct	0	2	0	28
024 Precinct	1	1	7	25
025 Precinct	2	3	8	44
026 Precinct	0	0	0	14
Central Park Precinct	0	2	2	7
028 Precinct	2	5	11	38
030 Precinct	0	2	0	20
032 Precinct	0	2	7	45
033 Precinct	1	7	6	38
034 Precinct	2	9	10	67
Precincts Total	8	36	57	366
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	0	12
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	8	38	57	381

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
040 Precinct	1	4	9	53
041 Precinct	0	3	1	46
042 Precinct	1	6	12	63
043 Precinct	1	8	6	50
044 Precinct	7	20	24	110
045 Precinct	0	0	1	20
046 Precinct	2	12	14	100
047 Precinct	1	5	10	73
048 Precinct	0	5	6	56
049 Precinct	1	3	5	54
050 Precinct	0	3	0	17
052 Precinct	0	6	12	68
Precincts Total	14	75	100	710
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	1	0	7
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	1	0	11
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	6	7
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	14	77	106	735

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
060 Precinct	0	4	1	32
061 Precinct	0	0	7	34
062 Precinct	0	2	2	19
063 Precinct	1	7	5	35
066 Precinct	0	0	1	10
067 Precinct	0	2	11	81
068 Precinct	0	5	6	20
069 Precinct	2	8	5	36
070 Precinct	0	7	0	50
071 Precinct	0	8	0	57
072 Precinct	0	0	2	32
076 Precinct	0	1	0	14
078 Precinct	1	3	4	21
Precincts Total	4	47	44	441
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	1	0	2
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	1	1
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	2	6	4	12
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	6	54	49	456

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
073 Precinct	0	4	9	68
075 Precinct	0	7	11	97
077 Precinct	2	4	11	67
079 Precinct	3	16	13	71
081 Precinct	1	1	5	42
083 Precinct	0	7	4	57
084 Precinct	0	2	0	29
088 Precinct	1	4	3	28
090 Precinct	2	7	6	52
094 Precinct	0	0	0	10
Precincts Total	9	52	62	521
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	0	0	2
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	1	3
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	9	53	63	526

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
100 Precinct	0	0	1	29
101 Precinct	1	5	8	56
102 Precinct	0	7	1	45
103 Precinct	0	4	2	65
105 Precinct	0	6	11	70
106 Precinct	0	2	0	27
107 Precinct	0	1	2	19
113 Precinct	0	3	6	77
Precincts Total	1	28	31	388
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	1	28	31	394

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
104 Precinct	0	2	6	49
108 Precinct	0	2	7	21
109 Precinct	0	2	2	26
110 Precinct	0	1	1	17
111 Precinct	1	3	2	19
112 Precinct	0	0	2	13
114 Precinct	0	2	8	57
115 Precinct	0	0	0	24
Precincts Total	1	12	28	226
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	1	12	28	231

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
120 Precinct	1	2	9	81
122 Precinct	0	0	0	31
123 Precinct	0	3	4	33
121 Precinct	0	2	0	27
Precincts Total	1	7	13	172
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	1	3	10
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	2	3
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	2	3
Staten Island Housing Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Court Section	0	0	2	2
Staten Island Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	1	8	22	190

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	1	1	29
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	0	2	0	5
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	0	3	1	35

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Chiefs Office	0	0	1	4
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	1	4

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	1
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	3	27
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	1	7
Highway Unit #2	0	0	1	4
Highway Unit #3	0	1	1	8
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	1
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Division Total	0	1	6	51

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 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	2	22
TB DT02	0	0	0	14
TB DT03	2	4	4	16
TB DT04	1	1	1	17
TB DT11	0	0	2	5
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	0	6
TB DT33	0	0	2	11
TB DT34	0	0	0	4
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	1	7
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	0	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	1	19
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	3	15	13	158

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 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	0	3	0	24
PSA 2	0	1	2	20
PSA 3	0	1	0	7
PSA 4	0	5	0	44
PSA 5	0	0	4	23
PSA 6	0	2	0	19
PSA 7	0	1	1	15
PSA 8	0	0	1	15
PSA 9	0	1	5	22
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	0	15	13	204
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	0	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	0	15	13	204

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Queens Narcotics	0	1	1	18
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	3	0	14
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	8
Bronx Narcotics	0	1	2	18
Staten Island Narcotics	0	2	0	10
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	1	30
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	0	0	6
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	3	7
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	1
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	1	0	8
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	8	7	120

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

Figure 640: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	2
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	2
Special Investigations Division	0	0	0	4
Special Victims Division	0	0	2	4
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	1
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	0	1	8
Detective Borough Bronx	0	1	3	26
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	3	4	31
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	1	0	20
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	5	29
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	0	6	15	130

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	3
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	1	7	15	98
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	8	15	105

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 Aug 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Aug 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	0	5
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	0	2
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	0	0	1	1
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	1	19
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	2	36

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