



BILL DE BLASIO
MAYOR

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



FREDERICK DAVIE
CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report
November 2020
(Statistics for October 2020)

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary | 2 |
| Glossary | 3 |
| Complaints Received | 4 |
| CCRB Cases Received By Borough and Precinct | 5 |
| Allegations Received | 7 |
| CCRB Docket | 10 |
| Body Worn Camera Footage Requests | 12 |
| Closed Cases | 13 |
| Resolving Cases | 13 |
| Dispositions / Case Abstracts | 14 |
| Dispositions - Full Investigations | 16 |
| Dispositions - All CCRB Cases | 17 |
| Dispositions - Allegations | 18 |
| Substantiation Rates | 21 |
| Substantiation Rates and Video | 22 |
| Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints | 23 |
| Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Allegations | 25 |
| Truncations | 27 |
| Complaints by PSA | 28 |
| Mediation Unit | 30 |
| Administrative Prosecution Unit | 32 |
| NYPD Discipline | 33 |
| Appendix | 39 |

Executive Summary

The Civilian Complaint Review Board (“CCRB”) is an independent municipal Agency that investigates complaints of NYPD misconduct. Every month, the CCRB prepares an Executive Director report for its public meeting. Data for October 2020 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 52% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 74% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In October, the CCRB opened 266 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 2,809 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 26% of its fully investigated cases (page 16).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 36% of the cases it closed in October (page 13) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 36% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency's truncation rate was 57% (page 13). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.
- 4) For October, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 27% of cases - compared to 22% of cases in which video was not available (page 21-22).
- 5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6, 26).
- 6) In October 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 12 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 2 trials were conducted against respondent officers in October.

Finally, the Monthly Report contains a Table of Contents, Glossary, and Appendix, all meant to assist readers in navigating this report. The CCRB is committed to producing monthly reports that are valuable to the public, and welcomes feedback on how to make its data more accessible.

Glossary

In this glossary we have included a list of terms that regularly appear in our reports.

Allegation: An allegation is a specific act of misconduct. The same “complaint” can have multiple allegations – excessive force and discourteous language, for example. Each allegation is reviewed separately during an investigation.

APU: The Administrative Prosecution Unit is the division of the CCRB that has prosecuted “charges” cases since April 2013, after the signing of a 2012 Memorandum of Understanding between the CCRB and NYPD.

Board Panel: The “Board” of the CCRB has 13 members. Of the 13 members, five are chosen by the Mayor, five are chosen by the City Council, and three are chosen by the Police Commissioner. Following a completed investigation by the CCRB staff, three Board members, sitting as a Board Panel, will make a finding on whether misconduct occurred and will make a recommendation on what level of penalty should follow.

Case/Complaint: For the purposes of CCRB data, a “case” or “complaint” is defined as any incident within the Agency’s jurisdiction, brought to resolution by the CCRB. Cases/Complaints thus include truncations, fully investigated or ongoing cases, mediations, and completed investigations pending Board Panel review.

Disposition: The Board’s finding as to the outcome of a case (i.e. if misconduct occurred).

FADO: Under the City Charter, the CCRB has jurisdiction to investigate the following categories of police misconduct: Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy, and Offensive Language, collectively known as “FADO”.

Intake: CCRB’s intake team initially handles complaints from the public. Intake takes complaints that come via live phone calls, voicemails, an online complaint form, or in-person.

Investigation: CCRB investigators gather evidence and interview witnesses to prepare reports on misconduct allegations. An investigation ends when a closing report is prepared detailing the evidence and legal analysis, and the case is given to the Board for disposition.

Mediation: A complainant may mediate his or her case with the subject officer, in lieu of an investigation, with the CCRB providing a neutral, third-party mediator.

Truncation: When a complaint is withdrawn or there is no complainant/alleged victim available for an interview, the investigation is “truncated.”

Complaints Received

The CCRB’s Intake team processes misconduct complaints from the public and referrals from the NYPD. Under the New York City Charter, the CCRB’s jurisdiction is limited to allegations of misconduct related to Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy and Offensive Language. All other complaints are referred to the appropriate agency. Figure 1 refers to all complaints that the CCRB receives and Figures 2 and 3 refer to new cases that remain with the Agency. In October 2020, the CCRB initiated 266 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2019 - October 2020)




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2019 - October 2020)





Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (YTD 2010 - YTD 2020)



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Of the five boroughs, the largest number of misconduct complaints stemmed from incidents occurring in Brooklyn, followed by Bronx. The 75th Precinct had the highest number at 10 incidents.

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (October 2020)




Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2020)




Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (October 2020)


| NYPD Precinct of Occurrence* | Number of Complaints | NYPD Precinct of Occurrence* | Number of Complaints |
|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 0 | 1 | 67 | 8 |
| 6 | 2 | 68 | 1 |
| 7 | 2 | 69 | 5 |
| 10 | 1 | 70 | 4 |
| 13 | 4 | 71 | 4 |
| 14 | 1 | 72 | 2 |
| 17 | 4 | 73 | 8 |
| 18 | 4 | 75 | 10 |
| 19 | 3 | 76 | 2 |
| 20 | 2 | 77 | 6 |
| 23 | 3 | 78 | 4 |
| 24 | 3 | 79 | 5 |
| 25 | 3 | 81 | 6 |
| 26 | 1 | 83 | 3 |
| 28 | 5 | 84 | 2 |
| 30 | 1 | 90 | 8 |
| 32 | 2 | 101 | 1 |
| 33 | 1 | 102 | 6 |
| 34 | 2 | 103 | 8 |
| 40 | 9 | 105 | 3 |
| 41 | 4 | 106 | 1 |
| 42 | 3 | 107 | 3 |
| 43 | 3 | 109 | 3 |
| 44 | 8 | 110 | 2 |
| 45 | 5 | 111 | 2 |
| 46 | 3 | 112 | 1 |
| 47 | 5 | 113 | 8 |
| 48 | 4 | 114 | 4 |
| 49 | 3 | 115 | 5 |
| 52 | 3 | 120 | 2 |
| 60 | 3 | 121 | 9 |
| 61 | 6 | 122 | 1 |
| 62 | 2 | 123 | 2 |
| 63 | 2 | Unknown | 18 |
| 66 | 1 | | |

*These figures track where an incident occurred, not necessarily the Command of the officer. Please review Figures 62A-62Q for Command Level data for cases closed in 2017.

Allegations Received

As described in the previous section, the CCRB has jurisdiction over four categories of NYPD misconduct. In comparing October 2019 to October 2020, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is down, Abuse of Authority complaints are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down. Figures for the year-to-date comparison show that in 2020, complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are up.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (October 2019 vs. October 2020)




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

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

| | October 2019 | | October 2020 | | Change | % Change |
|------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|
| | Count | % of Total Complaints | Count | % of Total Complaints | | |
| Force (F) | 149 | 40% | 90 | 34% | -59 | -40% |
| Abuse of Authority (A) | 290 | 78% | 198 | 74% | -92 | -32% |
| Discourtesy (D) | 83 | 22% | 53 | 20% | -30 | -36% |
| Offensive Language (O) | 22 | 6% | 12 | 5% | -10 | -45% |
| Total FADO Allegations | 544 | | 353 | | -191 | -35% |
| Total Complaints | 372 | | 266 | | -106 | -28% |

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 2019 vs. YTD 2020)



*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 2019 | | YTD 2020 | | Change | % Change |
|------------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|--------|----------|
| | Count | % of Total Complaints | Count | % of Total Complaints | | |
| Force (F) | 1701 | 39% | 1390 | 42% | -311 | -18% |
| Abuse of Authority (A) | 3371 | 78% | 2450 | 74% | -921 | -27% |
| Discourtesy (D) | 1032 | 24% | 882 | 26% | -150 | -15% |
| Offensive Language (O) | 254 | 6% | 258 | 8% | 4 | 2% |
| Total FADO Allegations | 6358 | | 4980 | | -1378 | -22% |
| Total Complaints | 4334 | | 3332 | | -1002 | -23% |

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

| | October 2019 | | October 2020 | | Change | % Change |
|------------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------|----------|
| | Count | % of Total Allegations | Count | % of Total Allegations | | |
| Force (F) | 347 | 26% | 178 | 22% | -169 | -49% |
| Abuse of Authority (A) | 808 | 61% | 549 | 67% | -259 | -32% |
| Discourtesy (D) | 126 | 10% | 69 | 8% | -57 | -45% |
| Offensive Language (O) | 34 | 3% | 20 | 2% | -14 | -41% |
| Total Allegations | 1315 | | 816 | | -499 | -38% |
| Total Complaints | 372 | | 266 | | -106 | -28% |

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

| | YTD 2019 | | YTD 2020 | | Change | % Change |
|------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|------------------------|--------|----------|
| | Count | % of Total Allegations | Count | % of Total Allegations | | |
| Force (F) | 3818 | 23% | 3635 | 27% | -183 | -5% |
| Abuse of Authority (A) | 10562 | 65% | 8043 | 60% | -2519 | -24% |
| Discourtesy (D) | 1541 | 9% | 1349 | 10% | -192 | -12% |
| Offensive Language (O) | 333 | 2% | 344 | 3% | 11 | 3% |
| Total Allegations | 16254 | | 13371 | | -2883 | -18% |
| Total Complaints | 4334 | | 3332 | | -1002 | -23% |

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of October 2020, 52% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 74% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (October 2020)

| Case Age Group | Count | % of Total |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Cases 0-4 Months | 1228 | 52.1% |
| Cases 5-7 Months | 527 | 22.4% |
| Cases 8-11 Months | 355 | 15.1% |
| Cases 12-18 Months* | 226 | 9.6% |
| Cases Over 18 Months** | 20 | 0.8% |
| Total | 2356 | 100% |

*12-18 Months: 14 cases that were reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 10 cases that were reopened; 3 cases that were on DA Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (October 2020)

| | Count | % of Total |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Cases 0-4 Months | 999 | 42.4% |
| Cases 5-7 Months | 634 | 26.9% |
| Cases 8-11 Months | 385 | 16.3% |
| Cases 12-18 Months* | 293 | 12.4% |
| Cases Over 18 Months** | 45 | 1.9% |
| Total | 2356 | 100% |

*12-18 Months: 16 cases that were reopened; 3 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 10 cases that were reopened; 3 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 2019 - October 2020)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

| | September 2020 | | October 2020 | | Change | % Change |
|----------------------|----------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total | | |
| Investigations | 1806 | 67% | 1883 | 67% | 77 | 4% |
| Pending Board Review | 461 | 17% | 473 | 17% | 12 | 3% |
| Mediation | 423 | 16% | 446 | 16% | 23 | 5% |
| On DA Hold | 10 | 0% | 7 | 0% | -3 | -30% |
| Total | 2700 | | 2809 | | 109 | 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 | 64 | 64.0% |
| 30 <= Days < 60 | 2 | 2.0% |
| 60 <= Days < 90 | 3 | 3.0% |
| 90 <= Days | 31 | 31.0% |
| Total | 100 | 100% |

Figure 19: Percentage of Open Investigations Docket with Pending BWC Requests (January 2019 - October 2020)




Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In October 2020, the CCRB fully investigated 36% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 36% of the cases it closed.

Figure 20: Case Resolutions (January 2019 - October 2020) (%)



Dispositions

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

- If the alleged misconduct is found to have occurred, based on the preponderance of the evidence, the allegation is **substantiated**.
- If there is not enough evidence to determine whether or not the alleged misconduct occurred, the allegation is **unsubstantiated**.
- If the preponderance of the evidence suggests that the event or alleged act did not occur, the allegation is **unfounded**.
- If the event did occur, but was not improper by a preponderance of evidence, the allegation is **exonerated**.
- If the CCRB was unable to identify any of the officers accused of misconduct, the case is closed as **officer unidentified**.

Additionally, a case might be **mediated**, with the subject officer and complainant discussing the incident in the presence of a neutral third-party moderator, or closed as **mediation attempted**, the designation for a case in which both the officer and the civilian agree to mediate, but the civilian fails to appear twice for the scheduled mediation session or fails to respond to attempts to schedule a mediation session. Finally, a case that cannot be fully investigated due to complainant/alleged victim unavailability or lack of cooperation is **truncated**.

Case Abstracts

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

1. Substantiated

The complainant/victim was walking with his brother when he witnessed Officer 1, Officer 2, Officer 3, and Officer 4 of PSA 7 stopping an individual. Although a few seconds of this interaction is captured on Officer 1's BWC, no other officers used their BWC or prepared any paperwork regarding the stop, and therefore the stopped individual could not be identified and the related allegations were closed as victim unidentified. However, when the complainant/victim approached the officers to record the stop of the individual on his cell phone and criticize the officers' actions, it was alleged that Officer 1 and Officer 2 threatened to remove him to the hospital. As the officers began to walk towards their vehicle, the complainant/victim continued to record their actions, causing Officer 1 to order him to put his phone down while slapping his hand and Officer 2 to threaten him with arrest. When the complainant/victim refused to put his phone down, Officer 1 and Officer 2 handcuffed him and brought him to the stationhouse, where they issued him a summons for disorderly conduct. Allegations of interference with recording device, threat of arrest, and improper summons were substantiated as the complainant/victim posed no safety risk, did not interfere with any police investigation, and violated no laws as he was merely standing on the sidewalk criticizing officers. Additionally, it was determined that Officer 2 provided a false official statement to the CCRB, which was referred to the NYPD for further investigation as this statement was made prior to the CCRB's jurisdiction over untruthful statements came into effect.

2. Unsubstantiated

While driving with his wife and children, the complainant/victim almost got into an accident with another vehicle and exited his vehicle to yell at the other motorist. Upon returning to the vehicle, Officer 1 of the 121st PCT allegedly pointed his gun at the complainant/victim and used discourteous language while telling him to get out of the vehicle. Due to divergent statements, it could not be determined whether Officer 1 had used discourteous language. While it was undisputed that Officer 1 pointed his gun at the complainant/victim, due to conflicting statements as to the conversation between

the complainant/victim and the other motorist, it could not be determined whether Officer 1 had a fear for his safety that would justify pointing his gun. Officer 1 was also cited for improper use of body-worn camera footage, as he only turned it on after he was already handcuffing the complainant/victim, who was arrested for menacing and harassing the other motorist, who happened to be the officer's wife.

3. Unfounded

The complainant/victim went to an apartment to move her belongings out due to an order of protection against her. The individual who had the order of protection called 911 and officers responded, including Officer 1 of the 122nd PCT. The complainant/victim alleged that Officer 1 threatened to arrest her. However, body-worn camera footage showed that while the officers asked her not to leave until they figured out what was happening, they never threatened her with arrest. Therefore, the allegation was unfounded.

4. Exonerated


The complainant/victim had not taken his medication for paranoid schizophrenia and, based on this and his behavior, his health care proxy called 911 to have him removed to the hospital. When officers arrived, he made threats of physical violence and refused to go to the hospital. The officers placed him in handcuffs and into an ambulance for delivery to the hospital. As the complainant/victim's health care proxy determined that he needed medical attention, and as his behavior created a risk of danger to himself and/or others, the officers acted properly in forcibly removing him to the hospital and the allegation was exonerated.

5. Officer Unidentified

The complainant/victim was looking for a parking spot in a parking lot when he almost collided with another vehicle. When he engaged the other motorist in conversation, the motorist briefly showed him a shield and told him to de-escalate the situation or he would be arrested. When the complainant/victim asked to see the badge again, the officer refused and instead took a photograph of the complainant/victim while threatening him with arrest. The complainant/victim told the officer that he should not have been made an officer, and the officer allegedly used discourteous language and told him they should not have let him into the country before driving off. A partial license plate number for the officer's vehicle was provided, but did not match any vehicle registered to the NYPD or to an officer. Surveillance footage was obtained, but it did not provide any further identifying characteristics for the officer. Additionally, no NYPD documents were generated for the incident. As such, the identity of the officer could not be determined and the allegations were closed as officer unidentified.


Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 21: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (October 2020)



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

Figure 22: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2020)



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 (2019 vs 2020)

| | Oct 2019 | | Oct 2020 | | YTD 2019 | | YTD 2020 | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| Full Investigations | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total |
| Substantiated | 42 | 25% | 15 | 26% | 313 | 24% | 257 | 29% |
| Exonerated | 42 | 25% | 11 | 19% | 294 | 23% | 188 | 21% |
| Unfounded | 16 | 10% | 13 | 22% | 107 | 8% | 84 | 10% |
| Unsubstantiated | 56 | 33% | 12 | 21% | 511 | 39% | 260 | 30% |
| MOS Unidentified | 12 | 7% | 7 | 12% | 81 | 6% | 88 | 10% |
| Total - Full Investigations | 168 | | 58 | | 1306 | | 877 | |
| Mediation Closures | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total |
| Mediated | 13 | 100% | 0 | NaN% | 155 | 42% | 29 | 100% |
| Mediation Attempted | 0 | 0% | 0 | NaN% | 210 | 58% | 0 | 0% |
| Total - ADR Closures | 13 | | 0 | | 365 | | 29 | |
| Resolved Case Total | 181 | 55% | 58 | 36% | 1671 | 42% | 906 | 33% |
| Truncations / Other Closures | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total |
| Complaint withdrawn | 32 | 21% | 18 | 17% | 479 | 20% | 347 | 19% |
| Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative | 50 | 33% | 29 | 28% | 1093 | 47% | 787 | 42% |
| Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable | 23 | 15% | 12 | 12% | 383 | 16% | 324 | 17% |
| Alleged Victim unidentified | 3 | 2% | 2 | 2% | 53 | 2% | 29 | 2% |
| Closed - Pending Litigation* | 42 | 28% | 32 | 31% | 309 | 13% | 288 | 15% |
| Miscellaneous | 0 | 0% | 2 | 2% | 8 | 0% | 8 | 0% |
| Administrative closure** | 1 | 1% | 9 | 9% | 22 | 1% | 79 | 4% |
| Total - Other Case Dispositions | 151 | | 104 | | 2347 | | 1862 | |
| Total - Closed Cases | 332 | | 162 | | 4018 | | 2768 | |

* 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 16% for the month of October 2020, and the allegation substantiation rate is 15% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is Discourtesy – substantiating 20% of such allegations during October 2020, and 20% for the year.

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2019 vs 2020)

| | Oct 2019 | | Oct 2020 | | YTD 2019 | | YTD 2020 | |
|--|-------------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total |
| Fully Investigated Allegations | | | | | | | | |
| Substantiated | 95 | 13% | 41 | 16% | 706 | 12% | 654 | 15% |
| Unsubstantiated | 204 | 28% | 60 | 23% | 1995 | 33% | 1326 | 30% |
| Unfounded | 69 | 9% | 39 | 15% | 519 | 9% | 475 | 11% |
| Exonerated | 276 | 38% | 92 | 35% | 2112 | 35% | 1512 | 34% |
| MOS Unidentified | 92 | 12% | 29 | 11% | 630 | 11% | 521 | 12% |
| Total - Full Investigations | 736 | | 261 | | 5962 | | 4488 | |
| Mediation Closures | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total |
| Mediated | 35 | 100% | 0 | NaN% | 416 | 40% | 76 | 100% |
| Mediation Attempted | 0 | 0% | 0 | NaN% | 627 | 60% | 0 | 0% |
| Total - ADR Closures | 35 | | 0 | | 1043 | | 76 | |
| Truncations / Other Closures | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total |
| Complaint withdrawn | 57 | 13% | 34 | 11% | 1183 | 17% | 926 | 17% |
| Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative | 183 | 42% | 66 | 21% | 3422 | 50% | 2349 | 44% |
| Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable | 47 | 11% | 22 | 7% | 939 | 14% | 804 | 15% |
| Alleged Victim unidentified | 12 | 3% | 8 | 3% | 153 | 2% | 71 | 1% |
| Closed - Pending Litigation | 135 | 31% | 142 | 46% | 1065 | 15% | 1005 | 19% |
| Miscellaneous | 2 | 0% | 9 | 3% | 69 | 1% | 83 | 2% |
| Administrative closure | 1 | 0% | 26 | 8% | 47 | 1% | 100 | 2% |
| Total - Other Case Dispositions | 437 | | 307 | | 6878 | | 5338 | |
| Total - Closed Allegations | 1208 | | 568 | | 13883 | | 9902 | |

Figure 25: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (October 2020)

| | Substantiated | Unsubstantiated | Exonerated | Unfounded | Officers Unidentified | Total |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Force | 4 7% | 11 20% | 28 51% | 10 18% | 2 4% | 55 100% |
| Abuse of Authority | 34 19% | 39 22% | 63 35% | 21 12% | 21 12% | 178 100% |
| Discourtesy | 3 20% | 2 13% | 1 7% | 6 40% | 3 20% | 15 100% |
| Offensive Language | 0 0% | 8 62% | 0 0% | 2 15% | 3 23% | 13 100% |
| Total | 41 16% | 60 23% | 92 35% | 39 15% | 29 11% | 261 100% |

Figure 26: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (YTD 2020)

| | Substantiated | Unsubstantiated | Exonerated | Unfounded | Officers Unidentified | Total |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Force | 36 4% | 209 25% | 383 46% | 132 16% | 66 8% | 826 100% |
| Abuse of Authority | 516 17% | 890 29% | 1066 35% | 248 8% | 362 12% | 3082 100% |
| Discourtesy | 94 20% | 173 37% | 63 13% | 76 16% | 63 13% | 469 100% |
| Offensive Language | 8 7% | 54 49% | 0 0% | 19 17% | 30 27% | 111 100% |
| Total | 654 15% | 1326 30% | 1512 34% | 475 11% | 521 12% | 4488 100% |

Dispositions - Untruthful Statement Allegations

Following the 2019 passage of Ballot Question #2 and the subsequent City Charter Revision, CCRB’s jurisdiction was expanded to include untruthful material statements made by police officers. As a result, CCRB added a new “Untruthful Statement” category of allegations.

There are four specific allegations in the new “Untruthful Statement” category: 1) False official statement, 2) Misleading official statement, 3) Inaccurate official statement and 4) Impeding an investigation.

Figure 27: Disposition of Untruthful Statement Allegations (October 2020)

| Untruthful Statement Allegation | Substantiated | | Exonerated | | Unsubstantiated | | Unfounded | | Administrative Closure | | Other | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|------|-----------|------|------------------------|------|-------|------|
| | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| False official statement | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Misleading official statement | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Inaccurate official statement | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Impeding an investigation | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |


Figure 28: Disposition of Untruthful Statement Allegations (YTD 2020)

| Untruthful Statement Allegation | Substantiated | | Exonerated | | Unsubstantiated | | Unfounded | | Administrative Closure | | Other | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|------|-----------|------|------------------------|------|-------|------|
| | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| False official statement | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Misleading official statement | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Inaccurate official statement | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Impeding an investigation | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 66 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 66 | 100% | 0 | 0% |

Substantiation Rates

The October 2020 case substantiation rate was 26%.

Figure 29: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2019 - October 2020)




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 30: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations without Video (Jan 2020 - Oct 2020) (% substantiated shown)



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

**Figure 31: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2020 - Oct 2020)
(% 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 32: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints*
(Oct 2019, Oct 2020, YTD 2019, YTD 2020)

| Disposition | October 2019 | | October 2020 | | YTD 2019 | | YTD 2020 | |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total |
| Charges | 4 | 10% | 1 | 7% | 44 | 14% | 21 | 8% |
| Command Discipline | 18 | 43% | 7 | 47% | 129 | 41% | 89 | 35% |
| Formalized Training | 8 | 19% | 3 | 20% | 66 | 21% | 64 | 25% |
| Instructions | 12 | 29% | 4 | 27% | 74 | 24% | 83 | 32% |
| MOS Unidentified | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 42 | | 15 | | 313 | | 257 | |

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 33: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints* (2020)



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 34: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations*
(Oct 2019, Oct 2020, YTD 2019, YTD 2020)

| Disposition | October 2019 | | October 2020 | | YTD 2019 | | YTD 2020 | |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total |
| Charges | 4 | 7.3% | 1 | 4.3% | 63 | 14.4% | 30 | 7.7% |
| Command Discipline | 23 | 41.8% | 8 | 34.8% | 177 | 40.4% | 125 | 32.1% |
| Formalized Training | 13 | 23.6% | 5 | 21.7% | 91 | 20.8% | 93 | 23.8% |
| Instructions | 15 | 27.3% | 9 | 39.1% | 107 | 24.4% | 142 | 36.4% |
| MOS Unidentified | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 55 | | 23 | | 438 | | 390 | |

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 35: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (October 2020)

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

| Board Disposition | FADO Category | Allegation | Precinct of Occurrence | Borough of Occurrence |
|--|--------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 14 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 14 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | Abuse of Authority | Threat of arrest | 19 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | Abuse of Authority | Stop | 19 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | Abuse of Authority | Stop | 19 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | Abuse of Authority | Stop | 19 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | Abuse of Authority | Stop | 19 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 19 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 19 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 19 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 19 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | Force | Physical force | 19 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | Abuse of Authority | Threat of force (verbal or physical) | 32 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | Force | Physical force | 32 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | Abuse of Authority | Frisk | 34 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | Abuse of Authority | Search (of person) | 34 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 34 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 34 | Manhattan |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | Abuse of Authority | Threat of arrest | 40 | Bronx |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | Abuse of Authority | Retaliatory summons | 40 | Bronx |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | Abuse of Authority | Retaliatory summons | 40 | Bronx |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | Abuse of Authority | Interference with recording | 40 | Bronx |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | Abuse of Authority | Threat of force (verbal or physical) | 41 | Bronx |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | Discourtesy | Word | 41 | Bronx |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | Force | Gun Pointed | 41 | Bronx |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 43 | Bronx |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | Discourtesy | Word | 68 | Brooklyn |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | Discourtesy | Other | 70 | Brooklyn |
| Substantiated (Charges) | Force | Gun fired | 75 | Brooklyn |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | Abuse of Authority | Refusal to provide name | 84 | Brooklyn |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | Abuse of Authority | Refusal to provide shield number | 84 | Brooklyn |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | Abuse of Authority | Refusal to provide shield number | 84 | Brooklyn |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | Abuse of Authority | Retaliatory arrest | 94 | Brooklyn |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | Abuse of Authority | Search (of person) | 110 | Queens |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | Abuse of Authority | Search (of person) | 110 | Queens |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 110 | Queens |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 110 | Queens |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 110 | Queens |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | Abuse of Authority | Failure to provide RTKA card | 110 | Queens |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | Abuse of Authority | Vehicle search | 113 | Queens |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | Abuse of Authority | Search (of person) | 113 | Queens |

Truncations

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

Figure 36: Truncated Allegations (October 2020)

| | Withdrawn | Uncooperative | Unavailable | Civilian Unidentified | Pending Litigation* | Total |
|--------------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Force | 6 | 20 | 6 | 3 | 110 | 145 |
| Abuse of Authority | 23 | 40 | 14 | 5 | 24 | 106 |
| Discourtesy | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 18 |
| Offensive Language | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Total | 34 | 66 | 22 | 8 | 142 | 272 |

Figure 37: Truncated CCRB Complaints (October 2020)

| | Withdrawn | Uncooperative | Unavailable | Civilian Unidentified | Pending Litigation* | Total |
|--------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Total | 18 | 29 | 12 | 2 | 32 | 93 |

Figure 38: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2020)

| | Withdrawn | Uncooperative | Unavailable | Civilian Unidentified | Pending Litigation* | Total |
|----------------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Untruthful Statement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Force | 170 | 513 | 286 | 18 | 589 | 1576 |
| Abuse of Authority | 652 | 1571 | 430 | 47 | 360 | 3060 |
| Discourtesy | 82 | 216 | 64 | 5 | 46 | 413 |
| Offensive Language | 22 | 49 | 24 | 1 | 10 | 106 |
| Total | 926 | 2349 | 804 | 71 | 1005 | 5155 |

Figure 39: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2020)

| | Withdrawn | Uncooperative | Unavailable | Civilian Unidentified | Pending Litigation* | Total |
|--------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Total | 347 | 787 | 324 | 29 | 288 | 1775 |

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

| | Oct 2019 | Oct 2020 | YTD 2019 | YTD 2020 |
|------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| PSA Complaints | 10 | 6 | 132 | 109 |
| Total Complaints | 332 | 162 | 4018 | 2768 |
| PSA Complaints as % of Total | 3.0% | 3.7% | 3.3% | 3.9% |

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 41: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

| | Oct 2019 | Oct 2020 | YTD 2019 | YTD 2020 |
|-------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| PSA 1 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 12 |
| PSA 2 | 7 | 0 | 33 | 27 |
| PSA 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 23 |
| PSA 4 | 3 | 0 | 51 | 18 |
| PSA 5 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 16 |
| PSA 6 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 20 |
| PSA 7 | 5 | 15 | 22 | 71 |
| PSA 8 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 14 |
| PSA 9 | 1 | 1 | 23 | 10 |
| Total | 21 | 16 | 236 | 211 |

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

| | Oct 2019 | | Oct 2020 | | YTD 2019 | | YTD 2020 | |
|------------------------|----------|------------|----------|------------|----------|------------|----------|------------|
| | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total |
| Force (F) | 10 | 37% | 11 | 69% | 101 | 33% | 88 | 32% |
| Abuse of Authority (A) | 14 | 52% | 4 | 25% | 163 | 54% | 139 | 51% |
| Discourtesy (D) | 3 | 11% | 1 | 6% | 29 | 10% | 36 | 13% |
| Offensive Language (O) | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 10 | 3% | 9 | 3% |
| Total | 27 | 100% | 16 | 100% | 303 | 100% | 272 | 99% |

Dispositions of Officers Assigned to PSAs

The following tables show the Board disposition of officers assigned to a PSA with a FADO allegation made against them.

Figure 43: Disposition of PSA Officers (2019 vs 2020)

| | Oct 2019 | | Oct 2020 | | YTD 2019 | | YTD 2020 | |
|--|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total |
| Full Investigations | | | | | | | | |
| Substantiated | 3 | 30% | 2 | 100% | 17 | 16% | 22 | 23% |
| Exonerated | 4 | 40% | 0 | 0% | 35 | 34% | 34 | 36% |
| Unfounded | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 6 | 6% | 10 | 11% |
| Unsubstantiated | 3 | 30% | 0 | 0% | 46 | 44% | 28 | 30% |
| MOS Unidentified | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total - Full Investigations | 10 | | 2 | | 104 | | 94 | |
| Mediation Closures | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total |
| Mediated | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 10 | 30% | 2 | 100% |
| Mediation Attempted | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 23 | 70% | 0 | 0% |
| Total - ADR Closures | 0 | | 0 | | 33 | | 2 | |
| Resolved Case Total | 10 | 48% | 2 | 12% | 137 | 58% | 96 | 45% |
| Truncations / Other Closures | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total | Count | %of Total |
| Complaint withdrawn | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 12 | 12% | 19 | 17% |
| Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative | 4 | 36% | 1 | 7% | 48 | 48% | 48 | 42% |
| Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 17 | 17% | 22 | 19% |
| Alleged Victim unidentified | 0 | 0% | 2 | 14% | 1 | 1% | 2 | 2% |
| Closed - Pending Litigation* | 7 | 64% | 8 | 57% | 21 | 21% | 21 | 18% |
| Miscellaneous | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Administrative closure* | 0 | 0% | 3 | 21% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 3% |
| Total - Other Case Dispositions | 11 | | 14 | | 99 | | 115 | |
| Total - Closed Cases | 21 | | 16 | | 236 | | 211 | |

* Closed - Pending Litigation is a truncation category added in August 2017. It indicates that the complaint was truncated due to the complainant/alleged victim's attorney.

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

Mediation Unit

Whenever mediation between a complainant/alleged victim and subject officer is suitable, it is offered by CCRB investigators. If the complainant/alleged victim and subject officer both agree to participate, a neutral, third-party mediator facilitates a conversation between the parties. “Mediation Attempted” refers to a situation in which an officer agrees to mediate and the complainant becomes unavailable (after the complainant initially agreed to mediation). The chart below indicates the number of mediations and attempted mediations in October and this year.

Figure 44: Mediated Complaints Closed

| | October 2020 | | | YTD 2020 | | |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| | Mediated | Mediation Attempted | Total | Mediated | Mediation Attempted | Total |
| Mediated Complaints | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 29 |

Figure 45: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

| | October 2020 | | | YTD 2020 | | |
|----------------------|--------------|---------------------|----------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|
| | Mediated | Mediation Attempted | Total | Mediated | Mediation Attempted | Total |
| Force | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Abuse of Authority | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 61 |
| Discourtesy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| Offensive Language | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Untruthful Statement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 76 |

Figure 46: Mediated Complaints By Borough (October 2020)

| | Mediations |
|---------------|------------|
| Bronx | 0 |
| Brooklyn | 0 |
| Manhattan | 0 |
| Queens | 0 |
| Staten Island | 0 |

Figure 47: Mediated Allegations By Borough (October 2020)

| | Mediations |
|---------------|------------|
| Bronx | 0 |
| Brooklyn | 0 |
| Manhattan | 0 |
| Queens | 0 |
| Staten Island | 0 |

**Figure 48: Mediated Complaints By Precinct
(Oct 2020 - YTD 2020)**

| Precinct | Oct 2020 | YTD 2020 | Precinct | Oct 2020 | YTD 2020 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 19 | 0 | 1 | 62 | 0 | 1 |
| 23 | 0 | 1 | 67 | 0 | 1 |
| 24 | 0 | 1 | 71 | 0 | 1 |
| 28 | 0 | 2 | 75 | 0 | 1 |
| 34 | 0 | 1 | 78 | 0 | 3 |
| 43 | 0 | 1 | 81 | 0 | 1 |
| 44 | 0 | 1 | 84 | 0 | 1 |
| 45 | 0 | 1 | 103 | 0 | 1 |
| 47 | 0 | 1 | 104 | 0 | 1 |
| 50 | 0 | 2 | 107 | 0 | 1 |
| 52 | 0 | 1 | 110 | 0 | 1 |
| 61 | 0 | 1 | 121 | 0 | 1 |
| | | | 122 | 0 | 1 |

**Figure 49: Mediated Allegations By Precinct
(Oct 2020 - YTD 2020)**

| Precinct | Oct 2020 | YTD 2020 | Precinct | Oct 2020 | YTD 2020 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 19 | 0 | 5 | 62 | 0 | 1 |
| 23 | 0 | 1 | 67 | 0 | 2 |
| 24 | 0 | 1 | 71 | 0 | 9 |
| 28 | 0 | 4 | 75 | 0 | 8 |
| 34 | 0 | 2 | 78 | 0 | 4 |
| 43 | 0 | 3 | 81 | 0 | 3 |
| 44 | 0 | 1 | 84 | 0 | 1 |
| 45 | 0 | 1 | 103 | 0 | 4 |
| 47 | 0 | 5 | 104 | 0 | 1 |
| 50 | 0 | 2 | 107 | 0 | 2 |
| 52 | 0 | 9 | 110 | 0 | 1 |
| 61 | 0 | 2 | 121 | 0 | 3 |
| | | | 122 | 0 | 1 |

Administrative Prosecution Unit

The CCRB’s Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) prosecutes police misconduct cases when the Board has recommended charges, in the NYPD Trial Room. The APU is also able to offer pleas to officers who admit guilt rather than going to trial. Following a plea agreement or the conclusion of a disciplinary trial, cases are sent to the Police Commissioner for final penalties.

Figure 50: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

| Disposition Category | Prosecution Disposition | Oct 2020 | YTD 2020 |
|------------------------|--|----------|-----------|
| Disciplinary Action | Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed | 0 | 0 |
| | Guilty after trial | 0 | 10 |
| | 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 | 5 |
| | 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 | 6 |
| | Disciplinary Action Total | | 0 |
| No Disciplinary Action | Not guilty after trial | 0 | 10 |
| | Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty | 0 | 3 |
| | Plea set aside, Without discipline | 0 | 0 |
| | **Retained, without discipline | 0 | 1 |
| | Dismissed by APU | 0 | 0 |
| | SOL Expired in APU | 0 | 0 |
| | No Disciplinary Action Total | | 0 |
| Not Adjudicated | Charges not served | 0 | 0 |
| | Deceased | 0 | 0 |
| | Other | 0 | 1 |
| | ***Previously adjudicated, with discipline | 0 | 0 |
| | ***Previously adjudicated, without discipline | 0 | 0 |
| | †Reconsidered by CCRB Board | 0 | 0 |
| | Retired | 0 | 0 |
| | SOL Expired prior to APU | 0 | 0 |
| | Not Adjudicated Total | | 0 |
| | Total Closures | 0 | 36 |

*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 51: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

| Discipline* | October 2020 | YTD 2020 |
|---|---------------------|-----------------|
| 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 | 3 |
| Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days | 0 | 12 |
| Command Discipline B | 0 | 2 |
| Command Discipline A | 0 | 3 |
| Formalized Training** | 0 | 0 |
| Instructions*** | 0 | 1 |
| Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded | 0 | 0 |
| Disciplinary Action† Total | 0 | 21 |
| No Disciplinary Action† | 0 | 14 |
| Adjudicated Total | 0 | 35 |
| Discipline Rate | 0% | 60% |
| Not Adjudicated† Total | 0 | 1 |
| Total Closures | 0 | 36 |

*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 52: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

| Disposition | Disposition Type* | October 2020 | YTD 2020 |
|------------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------|
| Disciplinary Action | Terminated | 0 | 0 |
| | Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation | 0 | 0 |
| | Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days | 0 | 1 |
| | Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days | 1 | 1 |
| | Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days | 0 | 1 |
| | Command Discipline B | 5 | 35 |
| | Command Discipline A | 5 | 78 |
| | Formalized Training** | 9 | 99 |
| | Instructions*** | 20 | 189 |
| | Warned & admonished/Reprimanded | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 40 | 404 |
| No Disciplinary Action | Filed †† | 2 | 12 |
| | SOL Expired | 0 | 3 |
| | Department Unable to Prosecute††† | 0 | 23 |
| | No Finding †††† | 3 | 11 |
| | Total | 5 | 49 |
| | Discipline Rate | 89% | 89% |
| | 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.

† 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 53: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (October 2020)

| Board Disposition | FADO Type | Allegation | Precinct | Borough | NYPD Discipline |
|--|-----------|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------------------|
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | F | Physical force | 7 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | A | Threat of arrest | 7 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | A | Refusal to process civilian complaint | 7 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | A | Retaliatory summons | 7 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | A | Retaliatory summons | 7 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | D | Word | 7 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | A | Stop | 7 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | A | Stop | 7 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | A | Vehicle stop | 13 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | A | Threat of summons | 13 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | A | Question | 13 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | F | Pepper spray | 14 | Manhattan | Formalized Training |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | F | Physical force | 14 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | A | Threat of force (verbal or physical) | 14 | Manhattan | Formalized Training |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | D | Word | 14 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | D | Gesture | 14 | Manhattan | No Discipline |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Search (of person) | 14 | Manhattan | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 18 | Manhattan | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | F | Physical force | 20 | Manhattan | No Discipline |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | A | Threat of force (verbal or physical) | 30 | Manhattan | Command Discipline A |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | D | Word | 30 | Manhattan | Command Discipline A |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | F | Radio as club | 34 | Manhattan | Command Discipline B |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | A | Threat of arrest | 42 | Bronx | Formalized Training |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | A | Frisk | 42 | Bronx | Formalized Training |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | A | Frisk | 42 | Bronx | Formalized Training |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | A | Property damaged | 44 | Bronx | No Discipline |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | A | Refusal to provide name | 44 | Bronx | No Discipline |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline B) | A | Refusal to provide shield number | 44 | Bronx | No Discipline |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | A | Vehicle search | 46 | Bronx | Command Discipline A |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | A | Frisk | 48 | Bronx | Formalized Training |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 48 | Bronx | Instructions |

| Board Disposition | FADO Type | Allegation | Precinct | Borough | NYPD Discipline |
|--|------------------|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | D | Word | 49 | Bronx | No Discipline |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 49 | Bronx | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Entry of Premises | 50 | Bronx | Formalized Training |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | A | Entry of Premises | 67 | Brooklyn | Formalized Training |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | D | Word | 70 | Brooklyn | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | D | Action | 73 | Brooklyn | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 73 | Brooklyn | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 73 | Brooklyn | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 73 | Brooklyn | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 73 | Brooklyn | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | A | Vehicle search | 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 | Interference with recording | 75 | Brooklyn | Command Discipline A |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 75 | Brooklyn | Formalized Training |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 75 | Brooklyn | Command Discipline A |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 75 | Brooklyn | Command Discipline A |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | A | Refusal to process civilian complaint | 77 | Brooklyn | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Formalized Training) | A | Threat of force (verbal or physical) | 88 | Brooklyn | Formalized Training |
| Substantiated (Command Discipline A) | D | Word | 90 | Brooklyn | Command Discipline A |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | D | Word | 101 | Queens | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 104 | Queens | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 104 | Queens | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 104 | Queens | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 104 | Queens | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 104 | Queens | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 104 | Queens | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 110 | Queens | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | D | Word | 113 | Queens | Forfeit vacation |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal) | 113 | Queens | Forfeit vacation |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal) | 113 | Queens | Forfeit vacation |

| Board Disposition | FADO Type | Allegation | Precinct | Borough | NYPD Discipline |
|--|------------------|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition) | 113 | Queens | Forfeit vacation |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Photography/Videography | 113 | Queens | Forfeit vacation |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 115 | Queens | Instructions |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Search (of person) | 121 | Staten Island | Formalized Training |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 121 | Staten Island | Formalized Training |
| Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions) | A | Failure to provide RTKA card | 121 | Staten Island | Instructions |

Figure 54: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (October 2020)

| 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 55: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

| | October 2020 | | September 2020 | | Change | % Change |
|----------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total | | |
| Cases 0-4 Months | 1058 | 37.8% | 1243 | 46.2% | -185 | -14.9% |
| Cases 5-7 Months | 733 | 26.2% | 558 | 20.7% | 175 | 31.4% |
| Cases 8 Months | 161 | 5.7% | 145 | 5.4% | 16 | 11.0% |
| Cases 9 Months | 142 | 5.1% | 114 | 4.2% | 28 | 24.6% |
| Cases 10 Months | 110 | 3.9% | 103 | 3.8% | 7 | 6.8% |
| Cases 11 Months | 102 | 3.6% | 100 | 3.7% | 2 | 2.0% |
| Cases 12 Months | 100 | 3.6% | 87 | 3.2% | 13 | 14.9% |
| Cases 13 Months | 85 | 3.0% | 90 | 3.3% | -5 | -5.6% |
| Cases 14 Months | 88 | 3.1% | 79 | 2.9% | 9 | 11.4% |
| Cases 15 Months | 66 | 2.4% | 50 | 1.9% | 16 | 32.0% |
| Cases 16 Months | 49 | 1.7% | 39 | 1.4% | 10 | 25.6% |
| Cases 17 Months | 31 | 1.1% | 24 | 0.9% | 7 | 29.2% |
| Cases 18 Months | 20 | 0.7% | 13 | 0.5% | 7 | 53.8% |
| Cases Over 18 Months | 57 | 2.0% | 45 | 1.7% | 12 | 26.7% |
| NA | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | NA |
| Total | 2802 | 100.0% | 2690 | 100.0% | 112 | 4.2% |

Figure 56: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On CCRB Received Date

| | October 2020 | | September 2020 | | Change | % Change |
|----------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total | | |
| Cases 0-4 Months | 1294 | 46.2% | 1392 | 51.7% | -98 | -7.0% |
| Cases 5-7 Months | 630 | 22.5% | 549 | 20.4% | 81 | 14.8% |
| Cases 8 Months | 169 | 6.0% | 120 | 4.5% | 49 | 40.8% |
| Cases 9 Months | 117 | 4.2% | 114 | 4.2% | 3 | 2.6% |
| Cases 10 Months | 109 | 3.9% | 98 | 3.6% | 11 | 11.2% |
| Cases 11 Months | 97 | 3.5% | 86 | 3.2% | 11 | 12.8% |
| Cases 12 Months | 84 | 3.0% | 75 | 2.8% | 9 | 12.0% |
| Cases 13 Months | 71 | 2.5% | 92 | 3.4% | -21 | -22.8% |
| Cases 14 Months | 82 | 2.9% | 53 | 2.0% | 29 | 54.7% |
| Cases 15 Months | 43 | 1.5% | 43 | 1.6% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cases 16 Months | 42 | 1.5% | 27 | 1.0% | 15 | 55.6% |
| Cases 17 Months | 25 | 0.9% | 14 | 0.5% | 11 | 78.6% |
| Cases 18 Months | 13 | 0.5% | 8 | 0.3% | 5 | 62.5% |
| Cases Over 18 Months | 26 | 0.9% | 19 | 0.7% | 7 | 36.8% |
| NA | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | NA |
| Total | 2802 | 100.0% | 2690 | 100.0% | 112 | 4.2% |

Figure 57: CCRB Investigations Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

| | October 2020 | | September 2020 | | Change | % Change |
|----------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|-----------|-------------|
| | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total | | |
| Cases 0-4 Months | 757 | 40.2% | 907 | 50.2% | -150 | -16.5% |
| Cases 5-7 Months | 542 | 28.8% | 390 | 21.6% | 152 | 39.0% |
| Cases 8 Months | 103 | 5.5% | 99 | 5.5% | 4 | 4.0% |
| Cases 9 Months | 96 | 5.1% | 68 | 3.8% | 28 | 41.2% |
| Cases 10 Months | 64 | 3.4% | 56 | 3.1% | 8 | 14.3% |
| Cases 11 Months | 57 | 3.0% | 60 | 3.3% | -3 | -5.0% |
| Cases 12 Months | 58 | 3.1% | 43 | 2.4% | 15 | 34.9% |
| Cases 13 Months | 41 | 2.2% | 51 | 2.8% | -10 | -19.6% |
| Cases 14 Months | 48 | 2.5% | 40 | 2.2% | 8 | 20.0% |
| Cases 15 Months | 39 | 2.1% | 27 | 1.5% | 12 | 44.4% |
| Cases 16 Months | 26 | 1.4% | 17 | 0.9% | 9 | 52.9% |
| Cases 17 Months | 11 | 0.6% | 11 | 0.6% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cases 18 Months | 8 | 0.4% | 6 | 0.3% | 2 | 33.3% |
| Cases Over 18 Months | 33 | 1.8% | 31 | 1.7% | 2 | 6.5% |
| NA | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | NA |
| Total | 1883 | 100.0% | 1806 | 100.0% | 77 | 4.3% |

Figure 58: CCRB DA Hold Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

| | October 2020 | |
|----------------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Count | % of Total |
| Cases 0-4 Months | 2 | 28.6% |
| Cases 5-7 Months | 2 | 28.6% |
| Cases 8 Months | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cases 9 Months | 1 | 14.3% |
| Cases 10 Months | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cases 11 Months | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cases 12 Months | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cases 13 Months | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cases 14 Months | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cases 15 Months | 1 | 14.3% |
| Cases 16 Months | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cases 17 Months | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cases 18 Months | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cases Over 18 Months | 1 | 14.3% |
| NA | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 7 | 100.0% |

Figure 59: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2020)

| Force Allegation | Substantiated | | Exonerated | | Unsubstantiated | | Unfounded | | Officer Unidentified | | Miscellaneous | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|
| | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| Gun Pointed | 3 | 7.3% | 12 | 29.3% | 13 | 31.7% | 8 | 19.5% | 5 | 12.2% | 0 | 0% |
| Gun fired | 1 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton) | 0 | 0% | 2 | 40% | 2 | 40% | 1 | 20% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Gun as club | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 50% | 0 | 0% |
| Radio as club | 1 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 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 | 50% | 1 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Vehicle | 1 | 12.5% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 50% | 2 | 25% | 1 | 12.5% | 0 | 0% |
| Other blunt instrument as a club | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 50% | 1 | 50% | 0 | 0% |
| Hit against inanimate object | 2 | 11.1% | 2 | 11.1% | 7 | 38.9% | 5 | 27.8% | 2 | 11.1% | 0 | 0% |
| Chokehold | 2 | 7.7% | 0 | 0% | 12 | 46.2% | 7 | 26.9% | 5 | 19.2% | 0 | 0% |
| Pepper spray | 1 | 7.7% | 1 | 7.7% | 11 | 84.6% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Physical force | 23 | 3.7% | 337 | 54.4% | 121 | 19.5% | 94 | 15.2% | 45 | 7.3% | 0 | 0% |
| Handcuffs too tight | 0 | 0% | 1 | 12.5% | 4 | 50% | 2 | 25% | 1 | 12.5% | 0 | 0% |
| Nonlethal restraining device | 0 | 0% | 27 | 73% | 7 | 18.9% | 3 | 8.1% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Animal | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Other | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 66.7% | 1 | 33.3% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Restricted Breathing | 2 | 5.3% | 0 | 0% | 24 | 63.2% | 7 | 18.4% | 5 | 13.2% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 36 | 4.4% | 383 | 46.4% | 209 | 25.3% | 132 | 16% | 66 | 8% | 0 | 0% |

Figure 60: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2020)

| Abuse of Authority Allegation | Substantiated | | Exonerated | | Unsubstantiated | | Unfounded | | Officer Unidentified | | Miscellaneous | |
|--|---------------|-------|------------|-------|-----------------|-------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-------|---------------|------|
| | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| Gun Drawn | 0 | 0% | 6 | 75% | 2 | 25% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Entry of Premises | 46 | 14.6% | 213 | 67.6% | 35 | 11.1% | 4 | 1.3% | 16 | 5.1% | 1 | 0.3% |
| Strip-searched | 13 | 40.6% | 2 | 6.2% | 13 | 40.6% | 4 | 12.5% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Vehicle stop | 2 | 1.8% | 55 | 48.7% | 44 | 38.9% | 2 | 1.8% | 10 | 8.8% | 0 | 0% |
| Vehicle search | 17 | 9.7% | 71 | 40.6% | 67 | 38.3% | 11 | 6.3% | 9 | 5.1% | 0 | 0% |
| Threat of summons | 1 | 4.2% | 14 | 58.3% | 8 | 33.3% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 4.2% | 0 | 0% |
| Threat of arrest | 20 | 8.2% | 125 | 51.2% | 58 | 23.8% | 19 | 7.8% | 22 | 9% | 0 | 0% |
| Threat to notify ACS | 0 | 0% | 4 | 36.4% | 3 | 27.3% | 1 | 9.1% | 3 | 27.3% | 0 | 0% |
| Threat of force (verbal or physical) | 21 | 14.9% | 36 | 25.5% | 47 | 33.3% | 15 | 10.6% | 22 | 15.6% | 0 | 0% |
| Threat to damage/seize property | 0 | 0% | 14 | 40% | 12 | 34.3% | 3 | 8.6% | 6 | 17.1% | 0 | 0% |
| Property damaged | 8 | 11.4% | 16 | 22.9% | 17 | 24.3% | 8 | 11.4% | 20 | 28.6% | 1 | 1.4% |
| Refusal to process civilian complaint | 10 | 21.7% | 1 | 2.2% | 16 | 34.8% | 1 | 2.2% | 18 | 39.1% | 0 | 0% |
| Retaliatory arrest | 8 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Retaliatory summons | 4 | 44.4% | 1 | 11.1% | 4 | 44.4% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Refusal to obtain medical treatment | 5 | 11.6% | 0 | 0% | 18 | 41.9% | 14 | 32.6% | 6 | 14% | 0 | 0% |
| Improper dissemination of medical info | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 80% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 20% | 0 | 0% |
| Other | 13 | 37.1% | 14 | 40% | 5 | 14.3% | 1 | 2.9% | 2 | 5.7% | 0 | 0% |
| Seizure of property | 4 | 7.8% | 31 | 60.8% | 10 | 19.6% | 2 | 3.9% | 4 | 7.8% | 0 | 0% |
| Refusal to show search warrant | 1 | 3.6% | 1 | 3.6% | 19 | 67.9% | 2 | 7.1% | 5 | 17.9% | 0 | 0% |
| Frisk | 34 | 18.6% | 51 | 27.9% | 69 | 37.7% | 4 | 2.2% | 25 | 13.7% | 0 | 0% |
| Search (of person) | 20 | 13.8% | 28 | 19.3% | 63 | 43.4% | 5 | 3.4% | 29 | 20% | 0 | 0% |
| Stop | 50 | 24.2% | 86 | 41.5% | 39 | 18.8% | 0 | 0% | 32 | 15.5% | 0 | 0% |
| Question | 9 | 10.8% | 23 | 27.7% | 25 | 30.1% | 7 | 8.4% | 19 | 22.9% | 0 | 0% |
| Refusal to show arrest warrant | 0 | 0% | 1 | 14.3% | 4 | 57.1% | 1 | 14.3% | 1 | 14.3% | 0 | 0% |
| Interference with recording | 10 | 14.9% | 21 | 31.3% | 14 | 20.9% | 18 | 26.9% | 4 | 6% | 0 | 0% |
| Search of recording device | 2 | 15.4% | 0 | 0% | 6 | 46.2% | 3 | 23.1% | 2 | 15.4% | 0 | 0% |
| Electronic device information deletion | 1 | 14.3% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 28.6% | 2 | 28.6% | 2 | 28.6% | 0 | 0% |
| Forcible Removal to Hospital | 13 | 7.3% | 145 | 81% | 12 | 6.7% | 3 | 1.7% | 5 | 2.8% | 1 | 0.6% |
| Threat re: removal to hospital | 6 | 28.6% | 6 | 28.6% | 9 | 42.9% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|---|------|
| Threat re: immigration status | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Disseminated immigration status | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Questioned immigration status | 0 | 0% | 2 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Search of Premises | 19 | 12.8% | 80 | 54.1% | 35 | 23.6% | 3 | 2% | 11 | 7.4% | 0 | 0% |
| Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal) | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 45.5% | 1 | 9.1% | 5 | 45.5% | 0 | 0% |
| Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture) | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation) | 4 | 36.4% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 45.5% | 2 | 18.2% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition) | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 50% | 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 | 3 | 13% | 7 | 30.4% | 8 | 34.8% | 2 | 8.7% | 3 | 13% | 0 | 0% |
| Body Cavity Searches | 0 | 0% | 1 | 16.7% | 3 | 50% | 2 | 33.3% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Refusal to provide name | 13 | 8.8% | 0 | 0% | 77 | 52% | 44 | 29.7% | 14 | 9.5% | 0 | 0% |
| Refusal to provide shield number | 22 | 13.3% | 2 | 1.2% | 74 | 44.6% | 48 | 28.9% | 19 | 11.4% | 1 | 0.6% |
| Failure to provide RTKA card | 133 | 54.7% | 9 | 3.7% | 45 | 18.5% | 13 | 5.3% | 43 | 17.7% | 0 | 0% |
| Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation | 4 | 23.5% | 0 | 0% | 11 | 64.7% | 1 | 5.9% | 1 | 5.9% | 0 | 0% |
| Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Question) | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Obstructed Shield Number | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Obstructed Rank Designation | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|-------|------|-------|-----|-------|-----|----|-----|-------|---|------|
| Total | 516 | 16.7% | 1066 | 34.5% | 890 | 28.8% | 248 | 8% | 362 | 11.7% | 4 | 0.1% |
|--------------|-----|-------|------|-------|-----|-------|-----|----|-----|-------|---|------|

Figure 61: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2020)

| Discourtesy Allegation | Substantiated | | Exonerated | | Unsubstantiated | | Unfounded | | Officer Unidentified | | Miscellaneous | |
|------------------------|---------------|------------|------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|
| | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| Word | 81 | 19.9% | 61 | 15% | 151 | 37.1% | 59 | 14.5% | 55 | 13.5% | 0 | 0% |
| Gesture | 1 | 25% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 25% | 0 | 0% |
| Demeanor/tone | 3 | 60% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 40% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Action | 7 | 14% | 1 | 2% | 18 | 36% | 17 | 34% | 7 | 14% | 0 | 0% |
| Other | 2 | 66.7% | 1 | 33.3% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 94 | 20% | 63 | 13.4% | 173 | 36.9% | 76 | 16.2% | 63 | 13.4% | 0 | 0% |

Figure 62: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2020)

| Offensive Language Allegation | Substantiated | | Exonerated | | Unsubstantiated | | Unfounded | | Officer Unidentified | | Miscellaneous | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|-----------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|----------------------|------------|---------------|-----------|
| | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| Race | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 14 | 63.6% | 3 | 13.6% | 5 | 22.7% | 0 | 0% |
| Ethnicity | 2 | 16.7% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 8.3% | 4 | 33.3% | 5 | 41.7% | 0 | 0% |
| Religion | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Sexual orientation | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 6 | 54.5% | 1 | 9.1% | 4 | 36.4% | 0 | 0% |
| Physical disability | 2 | 33.3% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 16.7% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 50% | 0 | 0% |
| Other | 1 | 7.1% | 0 | 0% | 6 | 42.9% | 4 | 28.6% | 3 | 21.4% | 0 | 0% |
| Gender Identity | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 40% | 1 | 20% | 2 | 40% | 0 | 0% |
| Gender | 3 | 7.7% | 0 | 0% | 22 | 56.4% | 6 | 15.4% | 8 | 20.5% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 8 | 7.2% | 0 | 0% | 54 | 48.6% | 19 | 17.1% | 30 | 27% | 0 | 0% |

Figure 63: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (October 2020)

| Case Stage | Cases | Percent |
|---|--------------|----------------|
| Awaiting filing of charges | 0 | 0% |
| Trial commenced | 0 | 0% |
| Charges filed, awaiting service | 10 | 10% |
| Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending | 67 | 69% |
| Charges served, Conference Date Requested | 3 | 3% |
| Calendared for court appearance | 4 | 4% |
| Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending | 5 | 5% |
| Trial scheduled | 6 | 6% |
| Plea agreed - paperwork pending | 2 | 2% |
| 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 64: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (October 2020)

| Case Stage | Cases | Percent |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| Disposition modified, awaiting final disp. | 2 | 15% |
| Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC | 4 | 31% |
| Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC | 1 | 8% |
| Verdict rendered - Fogel response due | 0 | 0% |
| Trial completed, awaiting verdict | 6 | 46% |
| Total | 13 | 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 65: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command

| Patrol Services Bureau | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total | 0 | 11 | 4 | 206 |
| Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total | 7 | 25 | 16 | 250 |
| Patrol Borough Bronx Total | 3 | 79 | 24 | 475 |
| Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total | 2 | 58 | 32 | 420 |
| Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total | 1 | 68 | 18 | 366 |
| Patrol Borough Queens South Total | 2 | 12 | 35 | 273 |
| Patrol Borough Queens North Total | 2 | 16 | 13 | 170 |
| Patrol Borough Staten Island Total | 0 | 24 | 10 | 132 |
| Special Operations Division Total | 0 | 7 | 2 | 34 |
| Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Total | 17 | 300 | 154 | 2329 |
| | | | | |
| Other Bureaus | | | | |
| Traffic Control Division Total | 0 | 1 | 2 | 29 |
| Transit Bureau Total | 2 | 16 | 4 | 138 |
| Housing Bureau Total | 2 | 21 | 16 | 211 |
| Organized Crime Control Bureau Total | 0 | 17 | 2 | 100 |
| Detective Bureau Total | 0 | 13 | 4 | 87 |
| Other Bureaus Total | 1 | 13 | 4 | 97 |
| Total | 5 | 81 | 32 | 662 |
| | | | | |
| Other Commands | | | | |
| Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total | 1 | 5 | 2 | 36 |
| Undetermined | 0 | 4 | 0 | 27 |
| Total | 23 | 390 | 188 | 3054 |

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

Figure 66A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

| Manhattan South | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 001 Precinct | 0 | 2 | 0 | 15 |
| 005 Precinct | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| 006 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 1 | 21 |
| 007 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| 009 Precinct | 0 | 2 | 0 | 30 |
| 010 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 013 Precinct | 0 | 1 | 0 | 22 |
| Midtown South Precinct | 0 | 5 | 1 | 39 |
| 017 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Midtown North Precinct | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Precincts Total | 0 | 11 | 4 | 199 |
| Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total | 0 | 11 | 4 | 206 |

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

Figure 66B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

| Manhattan North | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 019 Precinct | 4 | 4 | 4 | 24 |
| 020 Precinct | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| 023 Precinct | 0 | 1 | 1 | 33 |
| 024 Precinct | 0 | 1 | 0 | 23 |
| 025 Precinct | 0 | 3 | 2 | 30 |
| 026 Precinct | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| Central Park Precinct | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 028 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 |
| 030 Precinct | 0 | 1 | 0 | 24 |
| 032 Precinct | 1 | 1 | 1 | 26 |
| 033 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 034 Precinct | 2 | 9 | 3 | 33 |
| Precincts Total | 7 | 24 | 16 | 248 |
| Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Manhattan North Impact Response Team | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total | 7 | 25 | 16 | 250 |

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

Figure 66C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

| Bronx | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 040 Precinct | 0 | 4 | 4 | 30 |
| 041 Precinct | 1 | 1 | 4 | 26 |
| 042 Precinct | 0 | 5 | 2 | 34 |
| 043 Precinct | 1 | 4 | 4 | 39 |
| 044 Precinct | 0 | 14 | 1 | 73 |
| 045 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 |
| 046 Precinct | 0 | 7 | 0 | 41 |
| 047 Precinct | 0 | 15 | 2 | 73 |
| 048 Precinct | 0 | 10 | 0 | 36 |
| 049 Precinct | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 |
| 050 Precinct | 1 | 3 | 1 | 19 |
| 052 Precinct | 0 | 5 | 3 | 55 |
| Precincts Total | 3 | 70 | 23 | 459 |
| Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| Patrol Borough Bronx HQ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit | 0 | 6 | 0 | 8 |
| Bronx Impact Response Team | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Bronx Total | 3 | 79 | 24 | 475 |

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

Figure 66D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

| Brooklyn South | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 060 Precinct | 0 | 3 | 1 | 29 |
| 061 Precinct | 0 | 8 | 4 | 32 |
| 062 Precinct | 0 | 6 | 0 | 19 |
| 063 Precinct | 0 | 1 | 2 | 26 |
| 066 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 067 Precinct | 0 | 8 | 2 | 79 |
| 068 Precinct | 1 | 4 | 4 | 33 |
| 069 Precinct | 0 | 5 | 0 | 14 |
| 070 Precinct | 1 | 11 | 1 | 60 |
| 071 Precinct | 0 | 2 | 10 | 41 |
| 072 Precinct | 0 | 2 | 6 | 36 |
| 076 Precinct | 0 | 2 | 2 | 14 |
| 078 Precinct | 0 | 3 | 0 | 15 |
| Precincts Total | 2 | 55 | 32 | 411 |
| Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 |
| Brooklyn South Impact Response Team | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total | 2 | 58 | 32 | 420 |

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

Figure 66E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

| Brooklyn North | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 073 Precinct | 0 | 10 | 2 | 63 |
| 075 Precinct | 0 | 13 | 6 | 75 |
| 077 Precinct | 0 | 10 | 5 | 50 |
| 079 Precinct | 0 | 7 | 2 | 41 |
| 081 Precinct | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| 083 Precinct | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 |
| 084 Precinct | 0 | 3 | 0 | 25 |
| 088 Precinct | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 |
| 090 Precinct | 0 | 14 | 0 | 57 |
| 094 Precinct | 1 | 3 | 3 | 18 |
| Precincts Total | 1 | 68 | 18 | 366 |
| Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brooklyn North Impact Response Team | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total | 1 | 68 | 18 | 366 |

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

Figure 66F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

| Queens South | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 100 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 101 Precinct | 0 | 1 | 0 | 33 |
| 102 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 |
| 103 Precinct | 0 | 3 | 7 | 78 |
| 105 Precinct | 0 | 3 | 6 | 26 |
| 106 Precinct | 0 | 2 | 7 | 32 |
| 107 Precinct | 1 | 1 | 5 | 18 |
| 113 Precinct | 1 | 2 | 5 | 53 |
| Precincts Total | 2 | 12 | 34 | 265 |
| Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| Patrol Borough Queens South HQ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Queens South Impact Response Team | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Queens South Total | 2 | 12 | 35 | 273 |

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

Figure 66G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

| Queens North | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 104 Precinct | 0 | 2 | 4 | 35 |
| 108 Precinct | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| 109 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 2 | 23 |
| 110 Precinct | 2 | 2 | 3 | 23 |
| 111 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 112 Precinct | 0 | 2 | 0 | 15 |
| 114 Precinct | 0 | 2 | 0 | 25 |
| 115 Precinct | 0 | 7 | 0 | 30 |
| Precincts Total | 2 | 16 | 13 | 163 |
| Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Queens North HQ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Patrol Borough Queens North Total | 2 | 16 | 13 | 170 |

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

Figure 66H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

| Staten Island | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 120 Precinct | 0 | 7 | 0 | 37 |
| 122 Precinct | 0 | 0 | 3 | 24 |
| 123 Precinct | 0 | 10 | 6 | 31 |
| 121 Precinct | 0 | 5 | 1 | 31 |
| Precincts Total | 0 | 22 | 10 | 123 |
| Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 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 | 2 |
| Staten Island Impact Response Team | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrol Borough Staten Island Total | 0 | 24 | 10 | 132 |

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

Figure 66I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Special Operations Division

| Special Operations | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| Harbor Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Aviation Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canine Team | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mounted Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 SOD Strategic Response Group | 0 | 7 | 0 | 12 |
| Special Operations Division Headquarters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Special Operations Division Total | 0 | 7 | 2 | 34 |

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

Figure 66J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

| Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 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 66K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Traffic Control Division

| Traffic Control Division | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Manhattan Traffic Task Force | 0 | 1 | 1 | 16 |
| 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 | 2 |
| Bus Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Traffic Control Parking Enforcement District | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Traffic Control Tow Units | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Traffic Control Summons Enforcement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Traffic Command Intersection Control | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Traffic Control Intelligence Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Highway District | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Highway Unit #1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Highway Unit #2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Highway Unit #3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Traffic Control Division Total | 0 | 1 | 2 | 29 |

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

Figure 66L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Transit Bureau

| Transit Bureau | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| TB DT02 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| TB DT03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| TB DT04 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| TB DT11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 |
| TB DT12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| TB DT20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 |
| TB DT23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| TB DT30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| TB DT32 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 15 |
| TB DT33 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| TB DT34 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 |
| Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | 1 |
| Transit Division Canine Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Transit Bureau Vandal Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TB Anti-Terrorism | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 |
| Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Transit Bureau Total | 2 | 16 | 4 | 138 |

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

Figure 66M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Housing Bureau

| Housing Bureau | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Housing Bureau Special Operations Section | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PSA 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 13 |
| PSA 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 25 |
| PSA 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| PSA 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| PSA 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| PSA 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| PSA 7 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 71 |
| PSA 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 |
| PSA 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 |
| Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Housing Bureau Manhattan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Housing Bureau Bronx/Queens | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Housing Bureau Investigations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Housing Bureau Elevator Vandalism Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Housing Bureau Operations and Misc. Commands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Housing Bureau Total | 2 | 21 | 16 | 211 |
| Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Housing Bureau Total | 2 | 21 | 16 | 211 |

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

Figure 66N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

| Organized Crime Control Bureau | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Queens Narcotics | 0 | 11 | 0 | 33 |
| Manhattan North Narcotics | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Manhattan South Narcotics | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Bronx Narcotics | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Staten Island Narcotics | 0 | 5 | 0 | 14 |
| Brooklyn North Narcotics | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 |
| Brooklyn South Narcotics | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| Narcotics Headquarters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Auto Crime Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vice Enforcement Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Drug Enforcement Task Force | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Organized Crime Headquarters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Organized Crime Control Bureau Total | 0 | 17 | 2 | 100 |

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

Figure 660: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Detective Bureau

| Detective Bureau | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Detective Bureau Headquarters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Central Investigation and Resource Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Special Investigations Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Special Victims Division | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Forensic Investigations Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fugitive Enforcement Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gang Division | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 |
| Detective Borough Bronx | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 |
| Detective Borough Manhattan | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| Detective Borough Brooklyn | 0 | 3 | 4 | 24 |
| Detective Borough Queens | 0 | 4 | 0 | 10 |
| Detective Borough Staten Island | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| DB Queens North Operations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DB Queens South Operations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Detective Bureau Total | 0 | 13 | 4 | 87 |

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

Figure 66P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Other Bureaus

| Other Bureaus | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|-------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Internal Affairs Bureau | | | | |
| Internal Affairs Bureau | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| Criminal Justice Bureau | | | | |
| Court Division | 1 | 13 | 3 | 86 |
| 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 | 0 |
| Fleet Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Central Records Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Personnel Bureau | | | | |
| Applicant Processing Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Health Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Personnel Bureau Headquarters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Other Bureaus Total | 1 | 13 | 4 | 97 |

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

Figure 66Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

| Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands | Substantiated MOS Oct 2020 | Substantiated MOS YTD 2020 | Total MOS Oct 2020 | Total MOS YTD 2020 |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - Legal Bureau | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DC Training | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy Training | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Police Commissioner Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Community Affairs Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chief of Community Affairs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Community Affairs Juvenile Section | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| School Safety Bronx/Manhattan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| School Safety Queens/Brooklyn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Office of Equal Employment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deputy Commissioner Operations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DC Operations Financial Mgmt. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Intelligence Division | 0 | 3 | 0 | 23 |
| Chief of Department | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Department Advocate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deputy Commissioner Public Information | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Crime Prevention | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| First Deputy Commissioner | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Office of Management, Analysis and Planning | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Quality Assurance Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deputy Commissioner Counterterrorism | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Chief of Department Evaluation Section | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total | 1 | 5 | 2 | 36 |

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