



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

MAYA D. WILEY, ESQ.
CHAIR

MINA Q. MALIK, ESQ.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Executive Director's Monthly Report
October 2016
(Statistics for September 2016)

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Glossary	3
Complaints Received	4
CCRB Cases Received By Borough and Precinct	5
Allegations Received	7
CCRB Docket	10
Closed Cases	12
Resolving Cases	12
Dispositions / Case Abstracts	13
Dispositions - Full Investigations	15
Dispositions - All CCRB Cases	16
Dispositions - Allegations	17
Substantiation Rates	19
Substantiation Rates and Video	19
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints	20
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Allegations	22
Truncations	27
Mediation Unit	28
Administrative Prosecution Unit	30
NYPD Discipline	31
Appendix	36

Executive Summary

The Civilian Complaint Review Board (“CCRB”) is an independent municipal Agency that investigates complaints of NYPD misconduct. Every month, the CCRB prepares an Executive Director report for its public meeting. In general, investigations are being conducted more efficiently than at any period in the Agency’s history. The raw number of substantiations and percentage of cases being substantiated are at historic levels. Video evidence is playing a crucial role in the outcome of cases. Data for September 2016 included the following highlights:

- 1) The CCRB continues to close its cases more efficiently. Of the cases that remain in the CCRB active docket, 95% have been open for four months or less, and 99% have been open for seven months or less (page 10). In September, the CCRB opened 323 new cases (page 4), and currently has a docket of 1,079 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 26% of its fully investigated cases (page 19).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 43% of the cases it closed in September (page 12) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 59% of the cases it closed in September (page 12). The Agency's truncation rate is 40% (page 12). This is primarily driven by complainant/victim/witness uncooperative.
- 4) For September, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 31% of cases - compared to 24% of substantiated cases in which video was not available (page 19).
- 5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6).
- 6) In September the PC finalized penalty decisions against 7 officers: 5 were guilty verdicts won by the APU (page 28). The APU has conducted trials against 99 respondent officers year to date, and trials against 9 respondent officers in September. The CCRB's Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct.

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 welcome feedback on how to make our 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 appointed by the mayor. 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 a 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: If a case is not fully investigated due to the victim’s lack of interest or availability, the case is closed and is considered “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 September 2016, the CCRB initiated 323 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2015 - September 2016)




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2015 - September 2016)





Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (2010 - YTD 2016)



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. A leading 14 incidents took place in the 67th Precinct.

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (September 2016)




Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2016)




Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (September 2016)


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	5	67	14
5	1	68	1
6	3	69	4
7	2	70	10
9	3	71	6
10	4	73	10
14	4	75	8
17	3	77	9
18	5	78	3
19	4	79	8
20	2	81	5
23	5	83	10
24	2	84	3
25	7	88	1
26	1	90	4
28	3	94	1
30	6	100	2
32	4	101	1
33	4	102	2
40	5	103	10
41	4	104	3
42	6	105	4
43	7	106	4
44	4	107	1
45	3	108	3
46	6	109	2
47	12	110	7
48	3	111	2
49	4	113	6
50	3	114	3
52	6	115	2
60	4	120	11
61	8	121	5
62	3	122	2
63	3	123	1
66	2	Unknown	4

*These figures track where an incident occurred, not necessarily the Command of the officer. For example, a complaint filed against officers assigned to a Narcotics unit working in East New York would be counted as occurring in the 75th Precinct.

Allegations Received

As described in the previous section, the CCRB has jurisdiction over four categories of NYPD misconduct. In comparing September 2015 to September 2016, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down. Figures for the year to date comparison show that in 2016 complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are up, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (September 2015 vs. September 2016)




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

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

	September 2015		September 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	174	43%	124	38%	-50	-29%
Abuse of Authority (A)	270	67%	214	66%	-56	-21%
Discourtesy (D)	137	34%	108	33%	-29	-21%
Offensive Language (O)	46	11%	26	8%	-20	-43%
Total FADO Allegations	627		472		-155	-25%
Total Complaints	404		323		-81	-20%

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 2015 vs. YTD 2016)



*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 2015		YTD 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	1575	48%	1439	42%	-136	-9%
Abuse of Authority (A)	2018	61%	2376	70%	358	18%
Discourtesy (D)	1127	34%	1089	32%	-38	-3%
Offensive Language (O)	268	8%	257	8%	-11	-4%
Total FADO Allegations	4988		5161		173	3%
Total Complaints	3292		3397		105	3%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	September 2015		September 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	%of Total Allegations	Count	%of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	320	27%	198	23%	-122	-38%
Abuse of Authority (A)	624	53%	485	57%	-139	-22%
Discourtesy (D)	192	16%	138	16%	-54	-28%
Offensive Language (O)	52	4%	29	3%	-23	-44%
Total Allegations	1188		850		-338	-28%
Total Complaints	404		323		-81	-20%

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

	YTD 2015		YTD 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	%of Total Allegations	Count	%of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	2764	30%	2908	26%	144	5%
Abuse of Authority (A)	4732	51%	6265	57%	1533	32%
Discourtesy (D)	1467	16%	1578	14%	111	8%
Offensive Language (O)	306	3%	324	3%	18	6%
Total Allegations	9269		11075		1806	19%
Total Complaints	3292		3397		105	3%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of September 2016, 95% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 99% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (September 2016)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1013	95.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	43	4.0%
Cases 8-11 Months	4	0.4%
Cases 12-18 Months*	1	0.1%
Cases Over 18 Months**	2	0.2%
Total	1063	100%

* 12-18 Months: 1 case that was reopened.

** Over 18 Months: 1 case that was reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (September 2016)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	952	89.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	80	7.5%
Cases 8-11 Months	18	1.7%
Cases 12-18 Months	11	1.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	2	0.2%
Total	1063	100%

An active case is specifically one in which the facts are still being investigated.

Figure 15: Number of Active Investigations (January 2015 - September 2016)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change


	August 2016		September 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	619	57%	591	55%	-28	-5%
Pending Board Review	319	30%	363	34%	44	14%
Mediation	124	11%	109	10%	-15	-12%
On DA Hold	18	2%	16	1%	-2	-11%
Total	1080		1079		-1	0%

Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In September 2016, the CCRB fully investigated 43% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 59% of the cases it closed.

Figure 18: Case Resolutions (January 2015 - September 2016) (%)



Dispositions

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

- If the allegations of misconduct are found to be improper, based on the preponderance of the evidence, the allegation is **substantiated**.
- If there is not enough evidence to determine whether or not 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. Finally, a case that cannot be fully investigated due to victim/complainant unavailability or lack of cooperation is **truncated**.

Case Abstracts

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

1. Substantiated

An officer approached a man who was parked in a handicapped parking spot outside a fast food restaurant. The officer stood directly outside the driver's side door and asked for the man's license and registration. The man refused. After an argument, the officer opened the car door and attempted to forcibly remove the man from his vehicle. A struggle ensued and the officer called for backup. Two backup officers arrived and the man was then quickly removed from his vehicle and handcuffed. After the man was handcuffed, one of the backup officers used discourteous language, asking the man, "Have you lost your fucking mind?" Because the discourteous language was personal in nature and occurred after the man was subdued, the Board "Substantiated" the discourtesy allegation.

2. Unsubstantiated

Two officers responded to a harassment call and entered an apartment. The son of the occupant stated that he opened the door to speak with the officers and that one of the officers entered the apartment without his consent. The occupant of the apartment testified that she was in her bedroom when she heard the knock on her front door and came out to the front area to see what was going on. One of the officers testified that he received consent before entering the apartment. He said that when he saw the occupant come out to the front area, he asked for her permission to enter and she gave it. The other officer involved in the case said he could not remember the details of the incident and could not remember whether or not the apartment was ever entered. In the absence of additional evidence, the investigation was unable to determine whether the officers entered the woman's apartment without consent. Therefore, the Board voted the abuse of authority allegation as "Unsubstantiated."

3. Unfounded

A man and woman arrived at a stationhouse to file a complaint against a different man for threatening their daughter following a physical altercation between the two men. The man and woman said the officer told them their complaint was “bullshit”, with the man further stating the officer threatened to “lock [the man and woman] up” for complaining about the incident. In a video provided by the woman that depicts the interaction, at no time did the officer use the word “bullshit” or threaten to arrest the man and woman. Since the video evidence established the officer did not speak discourteously, the Board voted the allegations “Unfounded”.

4. Exonerated

Detectives forcibly entered and searched a home in the morning hours. The detectives testified that they attempted to gain entry into the apartment peacefully by knocking several minutes, announcing they were police and saying they had a warrant, before breaking down the door. The two men and woman residing in the apartment stated they all awoke to the sound of a breaking door, and while not refuting that the detectives took these before mentioned steps, instead stated they were sleeping and did not hear the detectives. Since the detectives had an open arrest warrant and arrived at the apartment during a time when they could reasonably expect to find the man in question, the investigation credited that forcing the door open fell within the guidelines of Criminal Procedure Law. Therefore, the Board “Exonerated” the entry and search allegations.

5. Officer Unidentified

Officers in plainclothes conducted a vehicle stop and allegedly pointed a gun at a man. The man stated during the vehicle stop that officers accused him and his wife of dealing drugs and of kidnapping their son who was sitting in the back seat. The officers left when the husband and wife explained that they had not committed any crimes. Numerous police documents were requested, in addition to canvassing for video footage, in an attempt to identify the officers. The investigation determined that this incident went wholly undocumented, and the information provided by the man was insufficient to determine the officers’ identities. Since the investigation was unable to identify the subject officers after obtaining all available evidence, the Board decided to close the case as “Officer Unidentified”.

Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 19: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (September 2016)





Figure 20: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2016)



Dispositions - All CCRB Cases

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

Figure 21: Disposition of Cases (2015 vs 2016)

	Sep 2015		Sep 2016		YTD 2015		YTD 2016	
Full Investigations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	72	28%	36	26%	386	23%	293	24%
Exonerated	35	14%	23	16%	211	13%	195	16%
Unfounded	23	9%	15	11%	113	7%	115	10%
Unsubstantiated	109	42%	60	43%	858	51%	523	44%
MOS Unidentified	18	7%	7	5%	119	7%	70	6%
Total - Full Investigations	257		141		1687		1196	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	16	53%	15	30%	135	51%	151	47%
Mediation Attempted	14	47%	35	70%	130	49%	173	53%
Total - ADR Closures	30		50		265		324	
Resolved Case Total	287	58%	191	59%	1952	50%	1520	45%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	32	15%	24	18%	248	13%	338	18%
Complainant/Victim/Witness uncooperative	130	62%	91	68%	1198	62%	1120	61%
Complainant/Victim/Witness unavailable	28	13%	14	10%	316	16%	297	16%
Victim unidentified	4	2%	2	1%	19	1%	31	2%
Miscellaneous	1	0%	0	0%	12	1%	3	0%
Administrative closure*	16	8%	3	2%	129	7%	44	2%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	211		134		1922		1833	
Total - Closed Cases	498		325		3874		3353	

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

Dispositions - 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 17% for the month of September 2016, and the allegation substantiation rate is 14% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is Abuse of Authority – substantiating 24% of such allegations during September 2016, and 20% for the year.

Figure 22: Disposition of Allegations (2015 vs 2016)

	Sep 2015		Sep 2016		YTD 2015		YTD 2016	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Fully Investigated Allegations								
Substantiated	177	17%	108	17%	939	13%	759	14%
Unsubstantiated	405	38%	257	41%	3121	44%	2061	39%
Unfounded	109	10%	52	8%	596	8%	509	10%
Exonerated	267	25%	158	25%	1532	22%	1452	27%
MOS Unidentified	107	10%	51	8%	933	13%	501	9%
Total - Full Investigations	1065		626		7121		5282	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	32	49%	29	24%	256	50%	345	45%
Mediation Attempted	33	51%	94	76%	260	50%	416	55%
Total - ADR Closures	65		123		516		761	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	58	11%	41	11%	546	13%	641	15%
Complainant/Victim/Witness uncooperative	386	72%	253	70%	2942	68%	2946	67%
Complainant/Victim/Witness unavailable	53	10%	42	12%	553	13%	645	15%
Victim unidentified	6	1%	13	4%	47	1%	71	2%
Miscellaneous	12	2%	0	0%	65	1%	20	0%
Administrative closure	21	4%	10	3%	186	4%	73	2%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	536		359		4339		4396	
Total - Closed Allegations	1773		1178		12706		10888	

Figure 23: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (September 2016)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	9 5%	62 37%	53 32%	26 16%	16 10%	166 100%
Abuse of Authority	85 24%	126 35%	105 29%	19 5%	23 6%	358 100%
Discourtesy	10 12%	58 69%	0 0%	6 7%	10 12%	84 100%
Offensive Language	4 22%	11 61%	0 0%	1 6%	2 11%	18 100%
Total	108 17%	257 41%	158 25%	52 8%	51 8%	626 100%


Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (YTD 2016)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	69 5%	442 33%	468 35%	230 17%	135 10%	1344 100%
Abuse of Authority	610 20%	1051 35%	964 32%	152 5%	250 8%	3027 100%
Discourtesy	71 9%	480 62%	20 3%	100 13%	102 13%	773 100%
Offensive Language	9 7%	87 64%	0 0%	27 20%	14 10%	137 100%
Total	759 14%	2060 39%	1452 27%	509 10%	501 9%	5281 100%

Substantiation Rates

The September 2016 case substantiation rate was 26%.

Figure 25: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2015 - September 2016)



Substantiation Rates and Video

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

Figure 26: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations without Video (Jan 2016 - Sep 2016) (% substantiated shown)





Figure 27: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2016 - Sep 2016) (% substantiated shown)



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 or not to substantiate the allegation and make a disciplinary recommendation.


- “Charges and Specifications” are recommended for the most serious allegations of misconduct. Charges launch an administrative trial in the NYPD Trial Room. An officer may lose vacation days, be suspended, or terminated if he 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 more problematic than poor training, but does not rise to the level of 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, while cases where the Board recommends charges are prosecuted by the CCRB’s Administrative Prosecution Unit.

Figure 28: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints*
(Sep 2015, Sep 2016, YTD 2015, YTD 2016)

Disposition	September 2015		September 2016		YTD 2015		YTD 2016	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	18	25%	5	14%	96	25%	38	13%
Command Discipline	30	42%	10	28%	162	42%	135	46%
Formalized Training	23	32%	16	44%	114	30%	107	37%
Instructions	1	1%	5	14%	12	3%	13	4%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	72		36		384		293	

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

Figure 29: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints* (2016)



* 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 Substantiated Allegations

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

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

Figure 30: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Allegations*
(Sep 2015, Sep 2016, YTD 2015, YTD 2016)

Disposition	September 2015		September 2016		YTD 2015		YTD 2016	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	28	26.4%	10	16.9%	175	30.1%	71	16.1%
Command Discipline	48	45.3%	17	28.8%	257	44.2%	208	47.1%
Formalized Training	29	27.4%	25	42.4%	136	23.4%	148	33.5%
Instructions	1	0.9%	7	11.9%	13	2.2%	15	3.4%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	106		59		581		442	

* The counts in this table reflect the number of distinct MOS.

Figure 31: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (September 2016)

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Gun Pointed	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	10	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	10	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	10	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	10	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	10	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Chokehold	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	14	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	26	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	26	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	26	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	26	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Question	26	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Question	26	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Other	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle stop	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	43	Bronx

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Pepper spray	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Question	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Question	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Race	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Gender	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to show search warrant	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Offensive Language	Race	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	67	Brooklyn
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	Refusal to provide name/shield number	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Other	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Threat to damage/seize property	88	Brooklyn

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	105	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	105	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	106	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	106	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	106	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	106	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	106	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	106	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	106	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	108	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Question	108	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	108	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Action	108	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Offensive Language	Gender	121	Staten Island

Truncations

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

Figure 32: Truncated Allegations (September 2016)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Force	8	74	11	2	95
Abuse of Authority	23	134	27	9	193
Discourtesy	8	36	3	2	49
Offensive Language	2	8	1	0	11
Total	41	252	42	13	348

Figure 33: Truncated CCRB Complaints (September 2016)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	24	91	14	2	131

Figure 34: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2016)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Force	160	878	258	17	1313
Abuse of Authority	354	1575	289	45	2263
Discourtesy	102	409	69	7	587
Offensive Language	25	83	29	2	139
Total	641	2945	645	71	4302

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2016)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	338	1120	297	31	1786

Mediation Unit

Whenever mediation between a complainant/victim and subject officer is suitable, it is offered by CCRB investigators. If the complainant/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 September and this year.

Figure 36: Mediated Complaints Closed

	September 2016			YTD 2016		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	15	35	50	151	173	324

Figure 37: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	September 2016			YTD 2016		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	0	11	11	23	32	55
Abuse of Authority	19	68	87	234	293	527
Discourtesy	10	14	24	76	76	152
Offensive Language	0	1	1	12	15	27
Total	29	94	123	345	416	761

Figure 38: Mediated Complaints By Borough (September 2016)

	Mediations
Bronx	3
Brooklyn	3
Manhattan	4
Queens	4
Staten Island	1

Figure 39: Mediated Allegations By Borough (September 2016)

	Mediations
Bronx	7
Brooklyn	5
Manhattan	7
Queens	8
Staten Island	2

**Figure 40: Mediated Complaints By Precinct
(Sep 2016 - YTD 2016)**

Precinct	Sep 2016	YTD 2016	Precinct	Sep 2016	YTD 2016
1	0	3	62	0	2
5	1	4	67	0	6
6	0	4	68	2	4
7	1	2	69	0	2
9	0	3	70	0	4
10	1	5	71	0	4
13	0	2	73	0	4
14	0	4	75	0	4
17	0	3	78	0	3
18	0	1	79	0	1
19	0	2	81	0	1
23	0	3	83	0	2
25	0	2	88	0	2
26	0	2	90	0	1
28	0	3	94	1	1
30	0	2	100	0	1
32	1	3	101	0	1
33	0	2	102	0	2
34	0	3	103	0	1
40	1	5	105	0	3
41	0	1	106	0	1
42	0	1	107	1	2
43	0	1	108	1	3
45	0	1	109	0	1
46	0	4	110	0	1
47	0	2	111	0	1
48	0	1	112	0	1
49	0	1	113	1	3
50	0	1	115	1	2
52	2	5	120	0	1
60	0	3	121	1	1
61	0	3	122	0	3

**Figure 41: Mediated Allegations By Precinct
(Sep 2016 - YTD 2016)**

Precinct	Sep 2016	YTD 2016	Precinct	Sep 2016	YTD 2016
1	0	4	62	0	4
5	1	5	67	0	11
6	0	6	68	2	5
7	3	4	69	0	2
9	0	3	70	0	8
10	1	23	71	0	6
13	0	6	73	0	12
14	0	7	75	0	11
17	0	3	78	0	10
18	0	8	79	0	1
19	0	2	81	0	2
23	0	4	83	0	5
25	0	12	88	0	3
26	0	9	90	0	3
28	0	17	94	3	3
30	0	3	100	0	1
32	2	5	101	0	8
33	0	4	102	0	5
34	0	6	103	0	1
40	1	8	105	0	6
41	0	13	106	0	2
42	0	1	107	1	3
43	0	1	108	2	7
45	0	1	109	0	3
46	0	13	110	0	2
47	0	4	111	0	4
48	0	1	112	0	1
49	0	2	113	2	5
50	0	1	115	3	5
52	6	13	120	0	2
60	0	6	121	2	2
61	0	3	122	0	4

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 42: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Sep 2016	YTD 2016
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	5	60
	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	1
	Resolved by plea	0	39
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. B	0	0
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. A	0	3
	Plea set aside, Formalized Training	0	13
	Plea set aside, Instructions	0	0
	*Retained, with discipline	0	1
	Disciplinary Action Total		5
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	1	49
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	3
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	1
	**Retained, without discipline	0	2
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total		1
Not Adjudicated	Charges not filed	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	1
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	3	13
	Retired	1	1
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total		4
	Total Closures	10	187

*Retained cases are those where 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 DUP.

*** In some case, the Department conducts their 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 allegation 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 43: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	September 2016	YTD 2016
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	4
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	1	9
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	4	72
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	3
Formalized Training**	0	14
Instructions***	0	6
Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	8
Disciplinary Action† Total	5	117
No Disciplinary Action†	1	55
Adjudicated Total	6	172
Discipline Rate	83%	68%
Not Adjudicated† Total	4	15
Total Closures	10	187

*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 42 on the previous page.

Figure 44: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	Disposition Type*	September 2016	YTD 2016
Disciplinary Action	Terminated	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	0
	Command Discipline B	1	8
	Command Discipline A	19	99
	Formalized Training**	25	151
	Instructions***	2	56
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total	47	314
No Disciplinary Action	Not Guilty	0	2
	Filed ††	1	4
	SOL Expired	0	5
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	0	17
	Total	1	28
	Discipline Rate	98%	92%
	DUP Rate	0%	5%

*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.

† This verdict relates to a trial conducted by DAO on a case decided by the Board prior to the activation of the APU.

†† "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.

Figure 45: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (September 2016)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	F	Pepper spray	5	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	F	Physical force	5	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	F	Physical force	5	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	5	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	5	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	5	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Other	5	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	5	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	6	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Other	10	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	20	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Other	20	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	20	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	25	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	25	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	32	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	32	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	40	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	40	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	40	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	40	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Retaliatory summons	40	Bronx	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	40	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Question	40	Bronx	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	43	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search (of person)	43	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	43	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	47	Bronx	Formalized Training

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Question	49	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	63	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	63	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Other	63	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	67	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	67	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	68	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Question	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle stop	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle stop	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle stop	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle stop	79	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	79	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Question	79	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	101	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	103	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	103	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	103	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	103	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	113	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	113	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	113	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	113	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	113	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	121	Staten Island	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Other	121	Staten Island	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	122	Staten Island	Command Discipline A

Figure 46: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (September 2016)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Chokehold	25	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 15 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	25	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	46	Bronx	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Pepper spray	46	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 7 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Retaliatory arrest	46	Bronx	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Retaliatory arrest	46	Bronx	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	81	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 8 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	81	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 8 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	81	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 8 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	D	Action	81	Brooklyn	No Penalty

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

	September 2016		August 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	952	89.6%	941	88.6%	11	1.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	80	7.5%	84	7.9%	-4	-4.8%
Cases 8 Months	9	0.8%	8	0.8%	1	12.5%
Cases 9 Months	4	0.4%	5	0.5%	-1	-20.0%
Cases 10 Months	4	0.4%	2	0.2%	2	100.0%
Cases 11 Months	1	0.1%	6	0.6%	-5	-83.3%
Cases 12 Months	3	0.3%	2	0.2%	1	50.0%
Cases 13 Months	3	0.3%	1	0.1%	2	200.0%
Cases 14 Months	1	0.1%	4	0.4%	-3	-75.0%
Cases 15 Months	3	0.3%	2	0.2%	1	50.0%
Cases 16 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	-1	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	-1	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	2	0.2%	4	0.4%	-2	-50.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1063	100.0%	1062	100.0%	1	0.1%

Figure 48: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On CCRB Received Date

	September 2016		August 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1013	95.3%	1001	94.3%	12	1.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	43	4.0%	53	5.0%	-10	-18.9%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	-1	NA
Cases 9 Months	2	0.2%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%
Cases 10 Months	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	-1	NA
Cases 12 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	-1	NA
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	2	0.2%	3	0.3%	-1	-33.3%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1063	100.0%	1062	100.0%	1	0.1%

Figure 49: CCRB Investigations Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	September 2016		August 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	547	92.6%	571	92.2%	-24	-4.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	27	4.6%	30	4.8%	-3	-10.0%
Cases 8 Months	4	0.7%	3	0.5%	1	33.3%
Cases 9 Months	1	0.2%	2	0.3%	-1	-50.0%
Cases 10 Months	2	0.3%	1	0.2%	1	100.0%
Cases 11 Months	1	0.2%	3	0.5%	-2	-66.7%
Cases 12 Months	2	0.3%	2	0.3%	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	2	0.3%	1	0.2%	1	100.0%
Cases 14 Months	1	0.2%	3	0.5%	-2	-66.7%
Cases 15 Months	1	0.2%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	2	0.3%	2	0.3%	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	591	100.0%	619	100.0%	-28	-4.5%

Figure 50: CCRB DA Hold Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	September 2016	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	4	25.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	1	6.3%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	1	6.3%
Cases 10 Months	1	6.3%
Cases 11 Months	1	6.3%
Cases 12 Months	1	6.3%
Cases 13 Months	1	6.3%
Cases 14 Months	2	12.5%
Cases 15 Months	1	6.3%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	3	18.8%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	16	100.0%

Figure 51: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2016)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	7	7.9%	45	50.6%	23	25.8%	4	4.5%	10	11.2%	0	0%
Gun fired	0	0%	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	4	12.1%	13	39.4%	3	9.1%	12	36.4%	1	3%	0	0%
Gun as club	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Radio as club	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Flashlight as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Police shield	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle	0	0%	1	14.3%	3	42.9%	3	42.9%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	4	50%	3	37.5%	1	12.5%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	3	9.7%	3	9.7%	14	45.2%	9	29%	2	6.5%	0	0%
Chokehold	3	4.4%	0	0%	34	50%	19	27.9%	12	17.6%	0	0%
Pepper spray	4	12.5%	16	50%	5	15.6%	4	12.5%	3	9.4%	0	0%
Physical force	37	4.1%	361	39.7%	290	31.9%	136	15%	82	9%	3	0.3%
Handcuffs too tight	1	5%	0	0%	11	55%	7	35%	1	5%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	4	11.1%	24	66.7%	3	8.3%	5	13.9%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	3	3.1%	1	1%	45	46.4%	26	26.8%	22	22.7%	0	0%
Total	69	5.1%	468	34.7%	442	32.8%	230	17.1%	135	10%	3	0.2%

Figure 52: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2016)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	0	0%	16	48.5%	12	36.4%	2	6.1%	3	9.1%	0	0%
Strip-searched	18	31.6%	7	12.3%	21	36.8%	4	7%	7	12.3%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	14	7.3%	113	59.2%	53	27.7%	1	0.5%	10	5.2%	0	0%
Vehicle search	32	19%	52	31%	71	42.3%	3	1.8%	10	6%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	61	14.5%	262	62.4%	81	19.3%	5	1.2%	11	2.6%	0	0%
Threat of summons	1	3.7%	12	44.4%	10	37%	2	7.4%	2	7.4%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	15	5.6%	121	44.8%	97	35.9%	9	3.3%	28	10.4%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	1	5.6%	7	38.9%	7	38.9%	1	5.6%	2	11.1%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	12	7.3%	22	13.4%	91	55.5%	20	12.2%	19	11.6%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	3	7.1%	11	26.2%	22	52.4%	2	4.8%	4	9.5%	0	0%
Property damaged	10	13.2%	18	23.7%	26	34.2%	5	6.6%	17	22.4%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	6	15.8%	0	0%	28	73.7%	1	2.6%	3	7.9%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	39	12.1%	1	0.3%	197	61.2%	59	18.3%	26	8.1%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	15	83.3%	2	11.1%	1	5.6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	17	21.5%	0	0%	43	54.4%	15	19%	4	5.1%	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	50	40.3%	28	22.6%	34	27.4%	8	6.5%	4	3.2%	0	0%
Seizure of property	2	10%	8	40%	6	30%	2	10%	2	10%	0	0%
Failure to show search warrant	7	24.1%	1	3.4%	18	62.1%	3	10.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Frisk	92	41.1%	45	20.1%	57	25.4%	1	0.4%	28	12.5%	1	0.4%
Search (of person)	64	26.3%	45	18.5%	100	41.2%	5	2.1%	29	11.9%	0	0%
Stop	123	32.7%	166	44.1%	52	13.8%	2	0.5%	33	8.8%	0	0%
Question	18	28.1%	25	39.1%	15	23.4%	1	1.6%	5	7.8%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%
Interference with recording	5	55.6%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	0	0%	1	11.1%	0	0%
Search of recording device	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Total	610	20.1%	964	31.8%	1051	34.7%	152	5%	250	8.3%	1	0%
--------------	-----	-------	-----	-------	------	-------	-----	----	-----	------	---	----

Figure 53: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2016)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	58	8.6%	18	2.7%	421	62.2%	82	12.1%	95	14%	3	0.4%
Gesture	0	0%	0	0%	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Action	12	13.2%	2	2.2%	54	59.3%	17	18.7%	6	6.6%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	71	9.1%	20	2.6%	480	61.9%	100	12.9%	102	13.1%	3	0.4%

Figure 54: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2016)

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	2	3.9%	0	0%	34	66.7%	8	15.7%	7	13.7%	0	0%
Ethnicity	0	0%	0	0%	11	61.1%	6	33.3%	1	5.6%	0	0%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender	4	11.8%	0	0%	21	61.8%	6	17.6%	3	8.8%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	1	5.3%	0	0%	12	63.2%	6	31.6%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical disability	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	1	10%	0	0%	5	50%	1	10%	3	30%	0	0%
Total	9	6.6%	0	0%	87	63.5%	27	19.7%	14	10.2%	0	0%

Figure 55: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (September 2016)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Awaiting filing of charges	6	5%
Charges filed, awaiting service	29	25%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	21	18%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	10	9%
Calendered for court appearance	11	9%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	5	4%
Trial scheduled	24	21%
Trial commenced	2	2%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	8	7%
Total	116	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 56: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (September 2016)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	6	5%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	60	51%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	24	21%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	10	9%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	17	15%
Total	117	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 57: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	3	27	25	262
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	4	33	38	339
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	13	96	72	625
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	5	46	41	379
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	1	58	63	459
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	3	35	30	280
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	1	11	9	139
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	4	12	22	135
Special Operations Division Total	0	2	5	48

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	3
Total	34	320	305	2669
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	3	2	44
Transit Bureau Total	1	10	10	155
Housing Bureau Total	8	25	34	238
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	10	39	37	255
Detective Bureau Total	4	20	11	137
Other Bureaus Total	1	15	14	111
Total	24	112	108	940
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	1	4	5	28
Undetermined	0	6	7	40
Total	59	442	425	3677

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

Figure 58A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
001 Precinct	0	4	1	28
005 Precinct	0	0	3	14
006 Precinct	1	9	3	40
007 Precinct	0	1	2	12
009 Precinct	0	0	1	11
010 Precinct	1	7	6	32
013 Precinct	0	0	0	22
Midtown South Precinct	1	3	1	28
017 Precinct	0	0	2	17
Midtown North Precinct	0	1	5	39
Precincts Total	3	25	24	243
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	1	1	3
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	0	0	13
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	0	3
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	3	27	25	262

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

Figure 58B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
019 Precinct	0	0	3	34
020 Precinct	0	0	3	21
023 Precinct	0	4	1	34
024 Precinct	0	0	2	15
025 Precinct	0	4	1	45
026 Precinct	0	0	4	7
Central Park Precinct	0	2	1	6
028 Precinct	1	3	6	35
030 Precinct	1	4	6	26
032 Precinct	2	8	8	34
033 Precinct	0	7	1	34
034 Precinct	0	1	2	36
Precincts Total	4	33	38	327
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	0	0	12
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	4	33	38	339

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

Figure 58C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
040 Precinct	2	19	3	57
041 Precinct	0	1	7	44
042 Precinct	0	6	7	65
043 Precinct	0	2	4	35
044 Precinct	0	4	6	41
045 Precinct	0	0	0	16
046 Precinct	9	23	17	75
047 Precinct	0	4	5	68
048 Precinct	2	10	7	48
049 Precinct	0	3	1	37
050 Precinct	0	5	1	29
052 Precinct	0	1	14	50
Precincts Total	13	78	72	565
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	1	0	7
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	16	0	46
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	0	7
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	13	96	72	625

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

Figure 58D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
060 Precinct	1	7	2	27
061 Precinct	0	0	5	25
062 Precinct	0	5	3	37
063 Precinct	0	2	1	16
066 Precinct	0	1	1	15
067 Precinct	3	14	8	56
068 Precinct	0	1	2	16
069 Precinct	1	6	10	39
070 Precinct	0	2	2	28
071 Precinct	0	4	4	60
072 Precinct	0	2	1	12
076 Precinct	0	1	0	12
078 Precinct	0	1	1	20
Precincts Total	5	46	40	363
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	0	0	2
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	8
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	1	6
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	5	46	41	379

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

Figure 58E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
073 Precinct	0	10	7	67
075 Precinct	0	15	16	124
077 Precinct	0	2	8	33
079 Precinct	0	6	3	51
081 Precinct	0	6	3	38
083 Precinct	0	1	5	29
084 Precinct	1	4	6	20
088 Precinct	0	1	8	24
090 Precinct	0	1	3	16
094 Precinct	0	1	4	13
Precincts Total	1	47	63	415
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	5	0	29
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	6	0	15
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	1	58	63	459

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

Figure 58F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
100 Precinct	0	1	3	18
101 Precinct	0	5	0	34
102 Precinct	0	4	5	32
103 Precinct	0	4	6	61
105 Precinct	1	12	4	48
106 Precinct	2	3	5	29
107 Precinct	0	1	1	10
113 Precinct	0	3	6	43
Precincts Total	3	33	30	275
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	2	0	3
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	3	35	30	280

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

Figure 58G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Sustantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
104 Precinct	0	1	1	18
108 Precinct	1	1	2	21
109 Precinct	0	1	0	20
110 Precinct	0	0	0	17
111 Precinct	0	0	0	8
112 Precinct	0	0	0	7
114 Precinct	0	6	2	25
115 Precinct	0	1	4	19
Precincts Total	1	10	9	135
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	1	0	4
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	1	11	9	139

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

Figure 58H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
120 Precinct	0	2	12	50
122 Precinct	0	0	1	18
123 Precinct	0	0	1	13
121 Precinct	4	8	8	46
Precincts Total	4	10	22	127
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	1	0	3
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	1	0	5
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
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	4	12	22	135

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

Figure 58I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	0	4	30
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	0
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	0	0	1
Mounted Unit	0	0	1	1
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	2	0	16
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	0	2	5	48

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

Figure 58J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Chiefs Office	0	0	0	3
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	3

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

Figure 58K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	7
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	3
Bus Unit	0	0	1	4
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	2
Highway Unit #1	0	1	0	11
Highway Unit #2	0	0	0	6
Highway Unit #3	0	1	0	8
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	1	2
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	1	0	1
Traffic Control Division Total	0	3	2	44

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

Figure 58L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	1	0	6
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	1
Transit Bureau Patrol Operations	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	0	0	0	7
TB DT02	0	0	0	11
TB DT03	0	2	0	12
TB DT04	0	0	0	18
TB DT11	0	1	0	7
TB DT12	0	2	1	12
TB DT20	0	2	0	6
TB DT23	0	0	0	3
TB DT30	0	0	4	10
TB DT32	0	0	0	13
TB DT33	0	0	0	10
TB DT34	0	0	0	8
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	0	2
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	1	2	9
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Division Canine Unit	1	1	1	1
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	3
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	0	2	15
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	1	10	10	155

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

Figure 58M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	0	4	5	29
PSA 2	0	1	3	30
PSA 3	0	1	3	17
PSA 4	2	5	7	39
PSA 5	1	2	2	15
PSA 6	1	3	1	24
PSA 7	0	1	2	34
PSA 8	2	4	6	19
PSA 9	0	0	1	14
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Bronx/Queens	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Investigations	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Elevator Vandalism Unit	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Operations and Misc. Commands	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	8	25	34	238
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	2	6
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	2	4	2	9
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	2
Housing Bureau Total	8	25	34	238

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

Figure 58N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Queens Narcotics	1	11	2	49
Manhattan North Narcotics	4	7	12	42
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	2	20
Bronx Narcotics	4	6	9	39
Staten Island Narcotics	0	3	0	13
Brooklyn North Narcotics	1	6	8	37
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	4	4	44
Narcotics Headquarters	0	1	0	5
Auto Crime Division	0	1	0	2
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	3
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	1
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	10	39	37	255

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

Figure 580: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	1	1
Special Victims Division	0	0	0	2
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	1
Gang Division	3	10	6	48
Detective Borough Bronx	0	5	1	15
Detective Borough Manhattan	1	3	3	17
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	1	0	30
Detective Borough Queens	0	1	0	22
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	0	0
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	1
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	4	20	11	137

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

Figure 58P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Substantiate d MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	5
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	1	15	13	103
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	1
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	0
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	1	2
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Other Bureaus Total	1	15	14	111

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

Figure 58Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Sustantiated MOS Sep 2016	Sustantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Sep 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - Legal Bureau	0	0	0	0
DC Training	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy Training	0	0	0	2
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	1	3
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	0	1	0	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	0
School Safety Queens/Brooklyn	0	0	0	1
Office of Equal Employment	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Operations	0	0	0	1
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	1	2	4	13
Chief of Department	0	1	0	6
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	1
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	1	4	5	28

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