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

BILL DE BLASIO
MAYOR

FREDERICK DAVIE
CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report

June 2019

(Statistics for May 2019)

Contents

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 May 2019 included the following highlights:

1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 70% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 87% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In May, the CCRB opened 505 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 1,979 cases (page 11).

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

3) The CCRB fully investigated 32% of the cases it closed in May (page 12) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 53% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency's truncation rate was 47% (page 12). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.

4) For May, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 42% of cases - compared to 7% 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 May the Police Commissioner did not finalize any decisions against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases (page 32). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 10 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 1 trial was conducted against respondent officers in May.

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 May 2019, the CCRB initiated 505 new complaints.

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



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



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



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Of the five boroughs, the largest number of misconduct complaints stemmed from incidents occurring in Brooklyn, followed by Manhattan. The 75th Precinct had the highest number at 23 incidents.

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



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



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

NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	6
5	8
7	3
9	5
10	5
13	6
14	9
17	3
18	10
19	4
20	3
23	8
24	6
25	11
26	4
28	7
30	5
32	9
33	3
34	8
40	14
41	8
42	11
43	10
44	10
45	4
46	8
47	9
48	9
49	4
50	3
52	12
60	7
61	10
62	7
63	6
66	1

NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
67	10
68	3
70	7
71	6
72	1
73	22
75	23
76	4
77	12
78	3
79	13
81	5
83	11
84	4
88	4
90	5
94	4
100	3
101	4
102	3
103	9
104	3
105	6
106	3
107	1
108	3
109	3
110	7
112	4
113	16
114	12
115	3
120	10
121	11
122	2
123	2
Unknown	7

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



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

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

	May 2018		May 2019			
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints	Change	% Change
Force (F)	157	36%	223	44%	66	42%
Abuse of Authority (A)	339	78%	361	71%	22	6%
Discourtesy (D)	119	27%	104	21%	-15	-13%
Offensive Language (O)	33	8%	23	5%	-10	-30%
Total FADO Allegations	648		711		63	10%
Total Complaints	434		505		71	16%

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

Figure 9: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (YTD 2018 vs. YTD 2019)



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

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

	YTD 2018		YTD 2019			
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints	Change	% Change
Force (F)	684	38%	866	39%	182	27%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1384	76%	1725	78%	341	25%
Discourtesy (D)	541	30%	460	21%	-81	-15%
Offensive Language (O)	134	7%	109	5%	-25	-19%
Total FADO Allegations	2743		3160		417	15%
Total Complaints	1818		2200		382	21%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	May 2018		May 2019			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	336	21%	409	26%	73	22%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1007	64%	999	64%	-8	-1%
Discourtesy (D)	177	11%	132	8%	-45	-25%
Offensive Language (O)	47	3%	28	2%	-19	-40%
Total Allegations	1567		1568		1	0%
Total Complaints	434		505		71	16%

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

	YTD 2018		YTD 2019			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	1432	23%	1822	22%	390	27%
Abuse of Authority (A)	3888	62%	5751	69%	1863	48%
Discourtesy (D)	772	12%	634	8%	-138	-18%
Offensive Language (O)	180	3%	141	2%	-39	-22%
Total Allegations	6272		8348		2076	33%
Total Complaints	1818		2200		382	21%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of May 2019, 70% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 87% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

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

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1253	69.9%
Cases 5-7 Months	315	17.6%
Cases 8-11 Months	158	8.8%
Cases 12-18 Months*	60	3.3%
Cases Over 18 Months**	7	0.4%
Total	**1793**	**100%**

*12-18 Months: 16 cases that were reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold.
**Over18 Months: 2 cases that were reopened; 5 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1128	62.9%
Cases 5-7 Months	319	17.8%
Cases 8-11 Months	214	11.9%
Cases 12-18 Months*	110	6.1%
Cases Over 18 Months**	22	1.2%
Total	**1793**	**100%**

*12-18 Months: 19 cases that were reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold.
**Over18 Months: 2 cases that were reopened; 7 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 - May 2019)



Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis



Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	April 2019		May 2019			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Investigations	1092	57%	1187	60%	95	9%
Pending Board Review	576	30%	606	31%	30	5%
Mediation	224	12%	179	9%	-45	-20%
On DA Hold	10	1%	7	0%	-3	-30%
Total	1902		1979		77	4%

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	333	51.9%
30 <= Days < 60	204	31.8%
60 <= Days < 90	75	11.7%
90 <= Days	30	4.7%
Total	**642**	**100%**

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



Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In May 2019, the CCRB fully investigated 32% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 53% of the cases it closed.

Figure 20: Case Resolutions (January 2018 - May 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

Officers warned and admonished several individuals for drinking and smoking marijuana. The individuals dispersed, but shortly thereafter, were stopped by the same officers for jaywalking. Two of the individuals were transported to the stationhouse after officers determined they had open warrants. At the stationhouse, the individuals were strip-searched in the holding cells. The strip-search was recorded by the desk sergeant in the Command Log, who cited the reason for the strip-search as "furtive movements." BWC footage captured the initial interaction at the stationhouse and showed the officers frisking and searching the individuals in front of the main desk. There was no mention of the furtive movements the men were allegedly making. Shortly thereafter, BWC captured the sergeant saying, "I want to strip search." During his CCRB statement, the sergeant justified the strip-searches by saying the individuals had shifted their bodies during their frisks – even though none of the officers who frisked the men requested the strip-search, cited any suspicion of the individuals concealing evidence, or independently knew why the strip-searches were ordered. Furthermore, the sergeant failed to properly conduct the strip-searches, as they were undisputedly conducted in open holding cells with cameras in or around them, denying the individuals the privacy supposedly to be granted to civilians during a strip-search. The Board substantiated the allegations.

2. Unsubstantiated

An individual was driving his car when he became stuck in traffic. Shortly thereafter, he was approached by officers, who asked him to move his car because he was blocking traffic. The individual explained that he could not move his vehicle because of traffic. Officers then removed the individual from his vehicle, and searched his car. In their statements, the officers

stated they had reasonable suspicion to believe there was a weapon inside of the vehicle, as well as permission from the individual to search the car. Given the conflicting statements and lack of video or documentary evidence capturing the allegation, the investigation was unable to determine by a preponderance of evidence whether the officer abused his authority by searching the vehicle. The Board unsubstantiated the allegation.

3. Unfounded
An individual was stopped by officers for failure to signal. An officer asked the individual for his license and registration. When the individual asked the officer if he was serious, the officer allegedly replied, "Yeah, nigga, give me your license." The investigation obtained body worn camera footage from the incident, which captured the conversation between individual and officer. Based on the body worn camera footage, the investigation determined that officer did not use offensive language. The Board unfounded the allegation.

4. Exonerated
An individual alleged that she was wrongfully removed to the hospital by police officers. On the day of the incident, the individual's brother called a mental health hotline to report that his sister, who suffered from paranoid schizophrenia, was not taking her medication. Two individuals from the hotline unit responded to the incident, and called 911, reporting that the individual was not responsive to them and had a history of depression. Officers and EMS responded and removed the individual to the hospital. BWC footage of this incident showed that EMS was already on scene when officers attempted to remove the individual from her bedroom. An EMT was heard informing the paramedic the individual's family was concerned because she had not been out of bed for "quite some time," and that when the officers told her she needed to get up, she resisted and tried to bite them. The EMT also mentioned a history of schizophrenia. The paramedic instructed the EMT and the officers to bring the individual downstairs for transport. The investigation found that based on the evidence, the individual was mentally ill, presented an imminent danger to herself, and needed to be removed to the hospital for evaluation. Moreover, based on the statement provided by the individual's brother, police documents, and BWC footage, the investigation concluded that the medical professionals on scene decided to remove the individual to the hospital and that the responding officers assisted in facilitating the removal. As a result, the Board exonerated the allegation.

5. Officer Unidentified
An individual alleged that she was approached by two officers who grabbed her, placed her in an ambulance, and took her to the hospital. No video evidence was obtained for this case. When the individual was interviewed at the hospital, she refused to sign HIPAA compliant waivers for the investigation. Consequently, the investigation was unable to obtain the hospital and FDNY medical documents that likely would have revealed the incident time, location, reasons for which individual was removed to the hospital, and the reasons for which she was held for weeks thereafter. Because the individual was unable to provide a detailed account of this incident, the investigation was unable to pinpoint the time and place of occurrence. Searches to determine additional information yielded negative results. In declining to sign HIPAA compliant medical records request forms, the individual severely limited the investigation's capacity to investigate this case and the investigation could not determine which officers removed the individual to the hospital. The Board closed the allegation as officer unidentified.

Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 21: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (May 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)

	May 2018		May 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
Full Investigations	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Substantiated	17	19%	36	26%	101	19%	134	22%
Exonerated	17	19%	36	26%	87	16%	133	22%
Unfounded	5	6%	9	6%	44	8%	51	8%
Unsubstantiated	39	44%	49	35%	263	49%	241	40%
MOS Unidentified	10	11%	11	8%	46	9%	48	8%
Total - Full Investigations	88		141		541		607	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	22	43%	20	23%	107	48%	75	36%
Mediation Attempted	29	57%	68	77%	117	52%	136	64%
Total - ADR Closures	51		88		224		211	
Resolved Case Total	139	55%	229	53%	765	47%	818	36%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	5	4%	53	26%	135	16%	314	21%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	71	61%	79	38%	475	56%	699	47%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	25	22%	36	17%	116	14%	249	17%
Alleged Victim unidentified	1	1%	2	1%	9	1%	28	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	14	12%	35	17%	110	13%	177	12%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%	5	0%
Administrative closure**	0	0%	0	0%	4	0%	5	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	116		206		851		1477	
Total - Closed Cases	255		435		1616		2295	

* Closed - Pending Litigation is a truncation category added in August 2017. It indicates that the complaint was truncated due to the complainant/alleged victim's attorney.
**Administrative closure is a special category that deals with NYPD's Internal Affairs Bureau-referred cases or spin off cases with no complainant/alleged victim, and in which CCRB attempts to locate or identify a complainant/alleged victim has yielded no results.

Dispositions - FADO Allegations

"Allegations" are different than "cases." A case or complaint is based on an incident and may contain one or more allegations of police misconduct. The allegation substantiation rate is 12% for the month of May 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 26% of such allegations during May 2019, and 18% for the year.

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2018 vs 2019)

	May 2018		May 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	36	9%	68	12%	262	11%	335	12%
Unsubstantiated	139	35%	199	35%	973	39%	891	33%
Unfounded	34	9%	31	6%	223	9%	234	9%
Exonerated	145	36%	189	34%	772	31%	952	35%
MOS Unidentified	45	11%	74	13%	263	11%	322	12%
Total - Full Investigations	399		561		2493		2734	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	49	39%	60	21%	231	43%	168	30%
Mediation Attempted	77	61%	227	79%	309	57%	389	70%
Total - ADR Closures	126		287		540		557	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	17	5%	125	21%	327	14%	815	19%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	223	59%	259	44%	1312	57%	2210	50%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	67	18%	77	13%	258	11%	590	13%
Alleged Victim unidentified	5	1%	10	2%	25	1%	92	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	60	16%	120	20%	358	15%	655	15%
Miscellaneous	5	1%	2	0%	21	1%	35	1%
Administrative closure	0	0%	0	0%	14	1%	8	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	377		593		2315		4405	
Total - Closed Allegations	902		1442		5348		7697	

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	7	37	31	7	9	91
	8%	41%	34%	8%	10%	100%
Abuse of Authority	41	128	149	16	46	380
	11%	34%	39%	4%	12%	100%
Discourtesy	19	27	9	6	12	73
	26%	37%	12%	8%	16%	100%
Offensive Language	1	7	0	2	7	17
	6%	41%	0%	12%	41%	100%
	68	199	189	31	74	561
Total	12%	35%	34%	6%	13%	100%

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	49	174	216	87	47	573
	9%	30%	38%	15%	8%	100%
Abuse of Authority	226	534	714	86	217	1777
	13%	30%	40%	5%	12%	100%
Discourtesy	55	145	21	46	43	310
	18%	47%	7%	15%	14%	100%
Offensive Language	5	38	1	15	15	74
	7%	51%	1%	20%	20%	100%
	335	891	952	234	322	2734
Total	12%	33%	35%	9%	12%	100%

Substantiation Rates

The May 2019 case substantiation rate was 26%.

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



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

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

	May 2018		May 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
Disposition	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	4	24%	3	8%	28	28%	23	17%
Command Discipline	7	41%	9	25%	43	43%	56	42%
Formalized Training	0	0%	15	42%	11	11%	30	22%
Instructions	6	35%	9	25%	19	19%	25	19%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	17		36		101		134	

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* (May 2018, May 2019, YTD 2018, YTD 2019)

	May 2018		May 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
Disposition	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	6	25%	3	6.8%	45	28.8%	33	17.6%
Command Discipline	9	37.5%	10	22.7%	66	42.3%	78	41.7%
Formalized Training	0	0%	16	36.4%	17	10.9%	40	21.4%
Instructions	9	37.5%	15	34.1%	28	17.9%	36	19.3%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	24		44		156		187	

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 (May 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 (Charges)	Force	Chokehold	5	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	5	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	7	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	7	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	9	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	9	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	20	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of summons	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Force	Physical force	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	63	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	68	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	68	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Action	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Action	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Question	75	Brooklyn

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of summons	78	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Action	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	101	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	101	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	103	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	103	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	105	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	106	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	106	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	106	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	106	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	106	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Race	106	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Threat to damage/seize property	108	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	108	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	109	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	109	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	1000	Manhattan

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 (May 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	19	50	33	2	50	154
Abuse of Authority	88	186	40	7	60	381
Discourtesy	15	21	4	1	8	49
Offensive Language	3	2	0	0	2	7
Total	125	259	77	10	120	591

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (May 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	53	79	36	2	35	205

Figure 36: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	136	402	227	20	314	1099
Abuse of Authority	566	1573	311	63	298	2811
Discourtesy	91	195	40	8	39	373
Offensive Language	22	40	12	1	4	79
Total	815	2210	590	92	655	4362

Figure 37: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	314	699	249	28	177	1467

*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

	May 2018	May 2019	YTD 2018	YTD 2019
PSA Complaints	15	18	76	78
Total Complaints	255	435	1616	2295
PSA Complaints as % of Total	5.9%	4.1%	4.7%	3.4%

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

	May 2018	May 2019	YTD 2018	YTD 2019
PSA 1	0	9	10	20
PSA 2	13	3	32	19
PSA 3	0	0	8	6
PSA 4	0	3	18	33
PSA 5	4	3	9	14
PSA 6	3	2	17	14
PSA 7	5	3	36	9
PSA 8	1	3	9	12
PSA 9	2	4	12	10
Total	28	30	151	137

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

	May 2018		May 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	8	21%	12	29%	56	27%	55	31%
Abuse of Authority (A)	25	64%	26	62%	117	57%	98	56%
Discourtesy (D)	4	10%	3	7%	24	12%	15	9%
Offensive Language (O)	2	5%	1	2%	9	4%	8	5%
Total	39	100%	42	100%	206	100%	176	101%

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)

	May 2018		May 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
Full Investigations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	1	9%	2	20%	13	15%	8	14%
Exonerated	0	0%	0	0%	19	22%	18	32%
Unfounded	1	9%	0	0%	1	1%	4	7%
Unsubstantiated	9	82%	8	80%	53	62%	26	46%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	11		10		86		56	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	3	23%	3	18%	4	25%
Mediation Attempted	9	100%	10	77%	14	82%	12	75%
Total - ADR Closures	9		13		17		16	
Resolved Case Total	20	71%	23	77%	103	68%	72	53%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	0	0%	0	0%	10	21%	10	15%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	5	62%	6	86%	23	48%	35	54%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	3	38%	1	14%	4	8%	10	15%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	0	0%	0	0%	11	23%	9	14%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	8		7		48		65	
Total - Closed Cases	28		30		151		137	

* 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 May and this year.

Figure 42: Mediated Complaints Closed

	May 2019			YTD 2019		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	20	68	88	75	136	211

Figure 43: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	May 2019			YTD 2019		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	0	21	21	4	37	41
Abuse of Authority	51	183	234	137	297	434
Discourtesy	6	19	25	20	45	65
Offensive Language	3	4	7	7	10	17
Total	60	227	287	168	389	557

Figure 44: Mediated Complaints By Borough (May 2019)

	Mediations
Bronx	1
Brooklyn	3
Manhattan	10
Queens	3
Staten Island	3

Figure 45: Mediated Allegations By Borough (May 2019)

	Mediations
Bronx	1
Brooklyn	13
Manhattan	26
Queens	9
Staten Island	11

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

Precinct	May 2019	YTD 2019	Precinct	May 2019	YTD 2019
1	1	1	62	0	1
5	0	1	67	1	2
6	0	1	70	0	1
7	1	2	71	1	2
9	1	2	72	0	2
13	1	1	73	0	1
14	1	2	75	1	4
18	1	3	78	0	1
19	1	1	83	0	1
20	0	1	90	0	1
22	0	1	100	0	3
25	2	2	102	1	1
28	0	2	103	1	1
32	0	1	104	1	2
33	1	1	108	0	1
44	0	4	111	0	1
46	0	2	113	0	1
47	1	7	114	0	1
50	0	1	115	0	1
52	0	2	120	0	2
60	0	3	121	2	2
61	0	1	122	1	1

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

Precinct	May 2019	YTD 2019	Precinct	May 2019	YTD 2019
1	2	2	62	0	2
5	0	2	67	4	7
6	0	1	70	0	2
7	6	7	71	4	6
9	2	5	72	0	3
13	1	1	73	0	2
14	3	5	75	5	16
18	1	8	78	0	1
19	3	3	83	0	2
20	0	1	90	0	3
22	0	1	100	0	3
25	7	7	102	2	2
28	0	5	103	6	6
32	0	3	104	1	4
33	1	1	108	0	1
44	0	4	111	0	1
46	0	3	113	0	3
47	1	11	114	0	6
50	0	1	115	0	3
52	0	3	120	0	5
60	0	3	121	5	5
61	0	2	122	6	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	May 2019	YTD 2019
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	0	2
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. A imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. B imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Formalized Training imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Instructions imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Guilty	0	0
	Resolved by plea	0	1
	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	1
	Disciplinary Action Total	**0**	**4**
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	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	1	3
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total	**1**	**3**
	Total Closures	**1**	**13**

*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*	May 2019	YTD 2019
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	2
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	0
Formalized Training**	0	0
Instructions***	0	1
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	**0**	**4**
No Disciplinary Action†	0	6
Adjudicated Total	**0**	**10**
Discipline Rate	**0%**	**40%**
Not Adjudicated† Total	1	3
Total Closures	**1**	**13**

*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***	May 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	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	0
	Command Discipline B	0	1
	Command Discipline A	1	19
	Formalized Training**	8	43
	Instructions***	3	30
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total	**12**	**93**
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	0	0
	SOL Expired	0	0
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	4	20
	No Finding ††††	1	5
	Total	**5**	**25**
	Discipline Rate	**71%**	**79%**
	DUP Rate	**24%**	**17%**

*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 (May 2019)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	5	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	5	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	18	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	20	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	20	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Question	50	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Question	50	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Photography/Videography	50	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	67	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	69	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	69	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle search	71	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle search	79	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle search	79	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	79	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	81	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	105	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	121	Staten Island	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	121	Staten Island	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	121	Staten Island	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search of Premises	121	Staten Island	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search of Premises	121	Staten Island	Formalized Training

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

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline

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

	May 2019		April 2019			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	1265	64.1%	1129	59.7%	136	12.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	347	17.6%	403	21.3%	-56	-13.9%
Cases 8 Months	72	3.7%	104	5.5%	-32	-30.8%
Cases 9 Months	76	3.9%	63	3.3%	13	20.6%
Cases 10 Months	45	2.3%	48	2.5%	-3	-6.3%
Cases 11 Months	33	1.7%	39	2.1%	-6	-15.4%
Cases 12 Months	32	1.6%	20	1.1%	12	60.0%
Cases 13 Months	20	1.0%	24	1.3%	-4	-16.7%
Cases 14 Months	22	1.1%	23	1.2%	-1	-4.3%
Cases 15 Months	23	1.2%	13	0.7%	10	76.9%
Cases 16 Months	10	0.5%	3	0.2%	7	233.3%
Cases 17 Months	4	0.2%	4	0.2%	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	-1	-50.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	22	1.1%	17	0.9%	5	29.4%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**1972**	**100.0%**	**1892**	**100.0%**	**80**	**4.2%**

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

	May 2019		April 2019			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	1406	71.3%	1268	67.0%	138	10.9%
Cases 5-7 Months	335	17.0%	388	20.5%	-53	-13.7%
Cases 8 Months	60	3.0%	81	4.3%	-21	-25.9%
Cases 9 Months	52	2.6%	43	2.3%	9	20.9%
Cases 10 Months	27	1.4%	35	1.8%	-8	-22.9%
Cases 11 Months	25	1.3%	35	1.8%	-10	-28.6%
Cases 12 Months	29	1.5%	14	0.7%	15	107.1%
Cases 13 Months	11	0.6%	9	0.5%	2	22.2%
Cases 14 Months	8	0.4%	10	0.5%	-2	-20.0%
Cases 15 Months	7	0.4%	4	0.2%	3	75.0%
Cases 16 Months	3	0.2%	0	0.0%	3	NA
Cases 17 Months	2	0.1%	2	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	7	0.4%	3	0.2%	4	133.3%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**1972**	**100.0%**	**1892**	**100.0%**	**80**	**4.2%**

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

	May 2019		April 2019			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	846	71.3%	753	69.0%	93	12.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	189	15.9%	192	17.6%	-3	-1.6%
Cases 8 Months	35	2.9%	42	3.8%	-7	-16.7%
Cases 9 Months	31	2.6%	24	2.2%	7	29.2%
Cases 10 Months	16	1.3%	22	2.0%	-6	-27.3%
Cases 11 Months	14	1.2%	9	0.8%	5	55.6%
Cases 12 Months	6	0.5%	12	1.1%	-6	-50.0%
Cases 13 Months	11	0.9%	11	1.0%	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	11	0.9%	11	1.0%	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	12	1.0%	4	0.4%	8	200.0%
Cases 16 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 17 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 18 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	13	1.1%	12	1.1%	1	8.3%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**1187**	**100.0%**	**1092**	**100.0%**	**95**	**8.7%**

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

	May 2019	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	2	28.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	1	14.3%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	2	28.6%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	2	28.6%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	**7**	**100.0%**

Figure 57: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2019)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	1	3.1%	17	53.1%	7	21.9%	5	15.6%	2	6.2%	0	0%
Gun fired	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	0	0%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	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%	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	1	5%	7	35%	8	40%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%
Chokehold	5	17.9%	0	0%	10	35.7%	9	32.1%	4	14.3%	0	0%
Pepper spray	0	0%	4	80%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Physical force	24	6.1%	164	41.9%	117	29.9%	53	13.6%	32	8.2%	1	0.3%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	16	45.7%	14	40%	3	8.6%	2	5.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	0	0%	2	22.2%	5	55.6%	2	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	2	8.3%	0	0%	11	45.8%	6	25%	4	16.7%	1	4.2%
Total	49	8.5%	216	37.5%	174	30.2%	87	15.1%	47	8.2%	3	0.5%

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	5.9%	9	52.9%	4	23.5%	2	11.8%	1	5.9%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	13	6.6%	143	73%	34	17.3%	2	1%	4	2%	0	0%
Strip-searched	6	26.1%	2	8.7%	10	43.5%	2	8.7%	3	13%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	3	3.2%	51	53.7%	22	23.2%	0	0%	19	20%	0	0%
Vehicle search	9	10.5%	35	40.7%	29	33.7%	0	0%	13	15.1%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	0	0%	5	83.3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Threat of summons	3	18.8%	5	31.2%	4	25%	1	6.2%	3	18.8%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	9	5.8%	66	42.6%	62	40%	6	3.9%	12	7.7%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	0	0%	8	88.9%	1	11.1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	9	12.3%	16	21.9%	27	37%	10	13.7%	10	13.7%	1	1.4%
Threat to damage/seize property	4	14.8%	7	25.9%	12	44.4%	0	0%	4	14.8%	0	0%
Property damaged	5	9.8%	4	7.8%	19	37.3%	6	11.8%	16	31.4%	1	2%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	9	25.7%	0	0%	18	51.4%	2	5.7%	6	17.1%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	9	15.8%	0	0%	36	63.2%	9	15.8%	3	5.3%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	7	77.8%	0	0%	2	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	9	31%	1	3.4%	6	20.7%	8	27.6%	5	17.2%	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	7	29.2%	10	41.7%	4	16.7%	1	4.2%	2	8.3%	0	0%
Seizure of property	5	17.9%	14	50%	5	17.9%	1	3.6%	3	10.7%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	0	0%	1	4.8%	15	71.4%	1	4.8%	4	19%	0	0%
Frisk	26	22.6%	45	39.1%	21	18.3%	4	3.5%	19	16.5%	0	0%
Search (of person)	18	19.4%	35	37.6%	26	28%	2	2.2%	12	12.9%	0	0%
Stop	24	19.2%	60	48%	23	18.4%	5	4%	13	10.4%	0	0%
Question	7	14.6%	21	43.8%	12	25%	0	0%	8	16.7%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Interference with recording	4	14.8%	7	25.9%	8	29.6%	3	11.1%	5	18.5%	0	0%
Search of recording device	1	8.3%	0	0%	5	41.7%	2	16.7%	4	33.3%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0%	0	0%	3	42.9%	0	0%	4	57.1%	0	0%

Forcible Removal to Hospital	8	8.2%	82	84.5%	6	6.2%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%
Threat re: removal to hospital	0	0%	2	22.2%	5	55.6%	0	0%	2	22.2%	0	0%
Threat re: immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Disseminated immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Questioned immigration status	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Search of Premises	6	5.4%	79	70.5%	18	16.1%	4	3.6%	5	4.5%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	2	28.6%	0	0%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Arrest)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Frisk)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Strip-Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Vehicle Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Photo/Video)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Summons)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Photography/Videography	2	22.2%	2	22.2%	2	22.2%	0	0%	3	33.3%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	3	4.3%	0	0%	44	62.9%	10	14.3%	13	18.6%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	6	8.8%	3	4.4%	43	63.2%	4	5.9%	12	17.6%	0	0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	4	80%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Total	226	12.7%	714	40.1%	534	30%	86	4.8%	217	12.2%	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	47	17.3%	20	7.4%	122	44.9%	42	15.4%	40	14.7%	1	0.4%
Gesture	1	25%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Action	7	19.4%	1	2.8%	21	58.3%	4	11.1%	2	5.6%	1	2.8%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	55	17.6%	21	6.7%	145	46.5%	46	14.7%	43	13.8%	2	0.6%

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

Offensive Language Allegation	**Substantiated**		**Exonerated**		**Unsubstantiated**		**Unfounded**		**Officer Unidentified**		**Miscellaneous**	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	1	3.8%	0	0%	15	57.7%	8	30.8%	2	7.7%	0	0%
Ethnicity	1	16.7%	0	0%	4	66.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	4	44.4%	0	0%
Physical disability	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	5	55.6%	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	0	0%
Gender	1	14.3%	0	0%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0%
Total	4	6.2%	1	1.5%	36	55.4%	12	18.5%	12	18.5%	0	0%

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

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	0	0%
Trial commenced	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	8	8%
Charges filed, awaiting service	26	27%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	43	44%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	7	7%
Calendared for court appearance	3	3%
Trial scheduled	7	7%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	3	3%
Total	**97**	**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 (May 2019)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	1	5%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	13	59%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	6	27%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	0	0%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	2	9%
Total	**22**	**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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	3	7	39	142
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	2	21	44	245
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	7	39	75	456
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	8	25	51	280
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	10	32	77	334
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	6	16	61	276
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	2	9	16	138
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	4	26	129
Special Operations Division Total	0	1	0	17
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	2	2
Total	**38**	**154**	**391**	**2019**
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	9	37
Transit Bureau Total	1	6	17	100
Housing Bureau Total	2	9	30	145
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	7	18	87
Detective Bureau Total	1	3	16	89
Other Bureaus Total	2	5	10	65
Total	**6**	**30**	**100**	**523**
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	1	4	23
Undetermined	0	2	6	42
Total	**44**	**187**	**501**	**2607**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
001 Precinct	0	0	3	11
005 Precinct	1	2	4	12
006 Precinct	0	0	0	12
007 Precinct	1	1	5	17
009 Precinct	0	0	4	11
010 Precinct	0	0	0	8
013 Precinct	0	0	4	13
Midtown South Precinct	0	0	9	24
017 Precinct	0	0	2	6
Midtown North Precinct	1	2	5	16
Precincts Total	**3**	**5**	**36**	**130**
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	2	3	11
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	**3**	**7**	**39**	**142**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
019 Precinct	0	2	3	12
020 Precinct	0	0	5	13
023 Precinct	0	0	1	14
024 Precinct	0	0	2	9
025 Precinct	0	1	10	34
026 Precinct	0	0	0	12
Central Park Precinct	1	1	2	4
028 Precinct	0	3	1	22
030 Precinct	0	1	4	11
032 Precinct	0	1	9	25
033 Precinct	1	3	5	27
034 Precinct	0	7	2	51
Precincts Total	**2**	**19**	**44**	**234**
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	8
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	**2**	**21**	**44**	**245**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
040 Precinct	1	2	8	36
041 Precinct	0	1	3	20
042 Precinct	3	5	7	44
043 Precinct	0	7	4	40
044 Precinct	2	5	12	52
045 Precinct	0	0	2	16
046 Precinct	0	7	8	61
047 Precinct	0	2	6	47
048 Precinct	0	5	10	44
049 Precinct	0	1	1	37
050 Precinct	0	3	0	14
052 Precinct	0	0	11	38
Precincts Total	**6**	**38**	**72**	**449**
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	0	1	1
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	1	1	2	5
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	**7**	**39**	**75**	**456**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
060 Precinct	2	3	3	20
061 Precinct	0	0	1	11
062 Precinct	0	2	1	16
063 Precinct	1	4	7	22
066 Precinct	0	0	0	9
067 Precinct	0	2	4	48
068 Precinct	2	2	3	10
069 Precinct	0	2	0	19
070 Precinct	0	2	6	34
071 Precinct	3	5	15	44
072 Precinct	0	0	3	21
076 Precinct	0	0	1	9
078 Precinct	0	2	5	12
Precincts Total	**8**	**24**	**49**	**275**
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	2	5
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	**8**	**25**	**51**	**280**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
073 Precinct	1	4	15	50
075 Precinct	5	5	24	68
077 Precinct	0	2	8	42
079 Precinct	2	8	10	40
081 Precinct	0	0	4	32
083 Precinct	1	6	5	29
084 Precinct	0	2	5	20
088 Precinct	0	3	1	17
090 Precinct	0	1	1	25
094 Precinct	0	0	1	8
Precincts Total	**9**	**31**	**74**	**331**
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	0	1	1
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	1	1	2	2
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	**10**	**32**	**77**	**334**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
100 Precinct	0	0	2	26
101 Precinct	2	4	12	38
102 Precinct	1	2	5	24
103 Precinct	2	2	18	48
105 Precinct	1	5	8	49
106 Precinct	0	1	2	20
107 Precinct	0	1	3	14
113 Precinct	0	1	8	51
Precincts Total	**6**	**16**	**58**	**270**
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	2	5
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	1	1
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	**6**	**16**	**61**	**276**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
104 Precinct	0	2	5	29
108 Precinct	1	1	1	9
109 Precinct	1	2	5	18
110 Precinct	0	1	0	11
111 Precinct	0	2	3	15
112 Precinct	0	0	1	4
114 Precinct	0	1	0	30
115 Precinct	0	0	1	19
Precincts Total	**2**	**9**	**16**	**135**
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	**2**	**9**	**16**	**138**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
120 Precinct	0	0	8	51
122 Precinct	0	0	8	30
123 Precinct	0	3	4	22
121 Precinct	0	0	3	17
Precincts Total	**0**	**3**	**23**	**120**
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	1	3	7
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Staten Island Housing Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Court Section	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	**0**	**4**	**26**	**129**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	1	0	14
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	0	0	2
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	**0**	**1**	**0**	**17**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Chiefs Office	0	0	2	2
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	4	20
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	1	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	6
Highway Unit #2	0	0	0	3
Highway Unit #3	0	0	3	4
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**	**0**	**9**	**37**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 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	1	0	11
TB DT02	0	0	4	10
TB DT03	0	1	3	9
TB DT04	0	0	2	9
TB DT11	0	0	1	3
TB DT12	0	1	4	9
TB DT20	0	1	0	1
TB DT23	0	0	0	3
TB DT30	1	2	3	13
TB DT32	0	0	0	4
TB DT33	0	0	0	5
TB DT34	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	0	5
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	0
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	0
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	0	14
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	**1**	**6**	**17**	**100**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	1	1	9	20
PSA 2	0	1	3	17
PSA 3	0	0	0	6
PSA 4	1	4	3	34
PSA 5	0	0	3	14
PSA 6	0	2	2	14
PSA 7	0	0	3	9
PSA 8	0	0	3	12
PSA 9	0	0	4	12
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	1
Housing Bureau Bronx/Queens	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Investigations	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Elevator Vandalism Unit	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Operations and Misc. Commands	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	**2**	**9**	**30**	**145**
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	0	3
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	1	0	2
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	1
Housing Bureau Total	**2**	**9**	**30**	**145**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Queens Narcotics	0	1	2	14
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	3	4	13
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	3	8
Bronx Narcotics	0	1	0	14
Staten Island Narcotics	0	2	0	8
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	4	19
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	0	2	6
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	0
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	3	5
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	**0**	**7**	**18**	**87**

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

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

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	2
Special Investigations Division	0	0	0	2
Special Victims Division	0	0	0	2
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	1	1
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	0	4	10
Detective Borough Bronx	0	0	1	17
Detective Borough Manhattan	1	3	6	25
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	0	0	11
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	3	18
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	1	1
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	**1**	**3**	**16**	**89**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	2
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	2	5	10	60
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	0	0	1
Other Bureaus Total	**2**	**5**	**10**	**65**

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 May 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS May 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	3
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	1	2
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	0	0	0	0
Police Commissioner Office	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Division	0	0	0	0
Chief of Community Affairs	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Juvenile Section	0	0	0	0
School Safety Bronx/Manhattan	0	0	0	2
School Safety Queens/Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
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	11
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	1	2
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	1	1
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	**0**	**1**	**4**	**23**

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