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

BILL DE BLASIO
MAYOR

FREDERICK DAVIE
CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report

January 2019

(Statistics for December 2018)

Contents

Executive Summary

The Civilian Complaint Review Board ("CCRB") is an independent municipal Agency that investigates complaints of NYPD misconduct. Every month, the CCRB prepares an Executive Director report for its public meeting. Data for December 2018 included the following highlights:

1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 76% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 91% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In December, the CCRB opened 409 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 2,058 cases (page 11).

2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 18% of its fully investigated cases (page 15).

3) The CCRB fully investigated 26% of the cases it closed in December (page 12) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 34% of the cases it closed (page 16). The Agency's truncation rate was 65% (page 12). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.

4) For December, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 20% of cases - compared to 15% of cases in which video was not available (page 19-20).

5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6, 24).

6) In December the Police Commissioner finalized 3 decisions against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases (page 30). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 10 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; no trials were conducted against respondent officers in December.

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 December 2018, the CCRB initiated 409 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2017 - December 2018)



Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2017 - December 2018)



Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (YTD 2010 - 2018)



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Of the five boroughs, the largest number of misconduct complaints stemmed from incidents occurring in Brooklyn, followed by Manhattan. The 18th Precinct had the highest number at 18 incidents.

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (December 2018)



Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2018)



Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (December 2018)

NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	4
5	7
6	3
7	10
9	7
10	3
13	3
14	11
17	2
18	18
19	2
23	5
24	2
25	6
26	3
28	6
30	4
32	6
33	3
34	1
40	4
41	2
42	6
43	7
44	9
46	8
47	6
48	9
49	5
50	3
52	12
60	6
61	7
62	1
63	2

NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
67	13
68	2
69	3
70	4
71	7
72	3
73	8
75	7
77	12
78	5
79	9
81	5
83	7
84	7
88	3
90	5
94	1
100	1
101	6
102	7
103	1
104	9
105	9
106	2
107	4
108	6
109	1
110	3
111	3
112	3
113	9
114	6
115	6
120	16
121	5
122	2
123	1
1000	2
Unknown	13

*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 December 2017 to December 2018, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is up, Abuse of Authority complaints are up, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are up. Figures for the year-to-date comparison show that in 2018, complaints containing an allegation of Force are up, Abuse of Authority are up, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (December 2017 vs. December 2018)



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

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

	December 2017		December 2018			
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints	Change	% Change
Force (F)	121	38%	132	32%	11	9%
Abuse of Authority (A)	243	77%	307	75%	64	26%
Discourtesy (D)	90	28%	74	18%	-16	-18%
Offensive Language (O)	17	5%	18	4%	1	6%
Total FADO Allegations	471		531		60	13%
Total Complaints	316		409		93	29%

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 2017 vs. YTD 2018)



*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 2017		YTD 2018			
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints	Change	% Change
Force (F)	1737	39%	1769	37%	32	2%
Abuse of Authority (A)	3257	73%	3608	76%	351	11%
Discourtesy (D)	1442	32%	1265	27%	-177	-12%
Offensive Language (O)	363	8%	307	6%	-56	-15%
Total FADO Allegations	6799		6949		150	2%
Total Complaints	4486		4747		261	6%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	December 2017		December 2018			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	231	23%	258	22%	27	12%
Abuse of Authority (A)	630	63%	808	68%	178	28%
Discourtesy (D)	120	12%	93	8%	-27	-23%
Offensive Language (O)	20	2%	23	2%	3	15%
Total Allegations	1001		1182		181	18%
Total Complaints	316		409		93	29%

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

	YTD 2017		YTD 2018			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	3421	23%	3781	23%	360	11%
Abuse of Authority (A)	8751	60%	10525	64%	1774	20%
Discourtesy (D)	2033	14%	1839	11%	-194	-10%
Offensive Language (O)	462	3%	416	3%	-46	-10%
Total Allegations	14667		16561		1894	13%
Total Complaints	4486		4747		261	6%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of December 2018, 76% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 91% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (December 2018)

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1408	76.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	273	14.8%
Cases 8-11 Months	128	6.9%
Cases 12-18 Months*	36	1.9%
Cases Over 18 Months**	5	0.3%
Total	**1850**	**100%**

*12-18 Months: 13 cases that were reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold.
**Over18 Months: 2 cases that were reopened; 5 cases that were on DA Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (December 2018)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1281	69.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	297	16.1%
Cases 8-11 Months	181	9.8%
Cases 12-18 Months*	73	3.9%
Cases Over 18 Months**	18	1.0%
Total	**1850**	**100%**

*12-18 Months: 14 cases that were reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold.
**Over18 Months: 3 cases that were reopened; 5 cases that were on DA Hold.

An active case is here defined as an investigation; cases in mediation are excluded.

Figure 15: Number of Active Investigations (January 2017 - December 2018)



Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis



Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	November 2018		December 2018			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Investigations	1166	59%	1152	56%	-14	-1%
Pending Board Review	604	31%	698	34%	94	16%
Mediation	180	9%	198	10%	18	10%
On DA Hold	11	1%	10	0%	-1	-9%
Total	1961		2058		97	5%

Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In December 2018, the CCRB fully investigated 26% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 34% of the cases it closed.

Figure 18: Case Resolutions (January 2017 - December 2018) (%)



Dispositions

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

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

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

Case Abstracts

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

1. Substantiated
Officers responded to a gang assault involving multiple civilians and victims. Shortly thereafter, officers began following two individuals who they believed were perpetrators of the crime. During this time, the officers did not attempt to establish contact with the individuals nor indicate to them that they were involved in a hot pursuit. The individuals entered their apartment, and despite repeated objections, the officers followed them in. Video evidence shows the individuals, as well as other apartment residents, verbally and physically asking the officers to leave. As multiple individuals objected to the officers' presence, they were not justified in entering the apartment pursuant to alleged consent. While the officers had probable cause to arrest the two individuals for assault, none of the officers could point to any exigent circumstance or safety concerns that would justify a warrantless entry. The investigation determined that by a preponderance of the evidence that the officers were not justified in entering the apartment. The Board substantiated the entry allegation.

2. Unsubstantiated
An individual was stopped by an officer for speeding. The individual provided the officer with her license, registration, and a PBA card, which belongs to her husband, an NYPD officer. The officer then went to his patrol vehicle and called the individual's husband. Upon returning to the individual's vehicle, the officer allegedly stated that he "ripped her husband a new asshole," in regard to the stop. Dash camera footage only captured audio for the initial interaction between the individual and the officer. Due to the lack of video footage capturing the allegation, as well as inconsistent statements, the Board unsubstantiated the allegation.

3. Unfounded
An individual was stopped for tinted windows. Upon approach, an officer allegedly stuck his head inside the car and stated it smelled like marijuana. Body worn camera footage revealed that while the officer did comment on an odor of marijuana, he did not stick his head inside the car, or breach the plane of the individual's vehicle. In light of the video evidence, the investigation determined by a preponderance of the evidence that the officer never searched the individual's car. The Board unfounded the allegation.

4. Exonerated
An individual and his friend stole a document from a man, who in return called 911. Upon arrival of the police, the man positively identified the individual as one of the thieves. Officers then went to arrest the individual, who admitted to resisting arrest. In response, officers grabbed the individual and forcibly took him to the ground. Surveillance footage capturing the incident showed that officers did not use excessive force. The investigation determined the officers were justified in their use of force to execute the individual's arrest. The Board exonerated the use of force allegation.

5. Officer Unidentified
An individual went to the Precinct stationhouse to obtain information pertaining to a vehicle stop. In response to his request for information, an unidentified officer allegedly called the individual a "smartass." Police records identified two potential subject officers—none of whom matched the description provided. At a subsequent photo viewing session, the alleged victim was unable to identify potential subject officers. Due to the inability to identify potential subject officers, the Board closed the allegation as officer unidentified.

Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 19: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (December 2018)



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

Figure 20: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2018)



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 21: Disposition of Cases (2017 vs 2018)

	Dec 2017		Dec 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
Full Investigations	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Substantiated	3	7%	15	18%	258	19%	226	19%
Exonerated	7	17%	18	21%	240	18%	218	18%
Unfounded	6	15%	4	5%	87	6%	92	8%
Unsubstantiated	22	54%	42	50%	653	48%	578	48%
MOS Unidentified	3	7%	5	6%	110	8%	94	8%
Total - Full Investigations	41		84		1348		1208	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	18	43%	24	100%	204	49%	232	50%
Mediation Attempted	24	57%	0	0%	213	51%	231	50%
Total - ADR Closures	42		24		417		463	
Resolved Case Total	83	28%	108	34%	1765	44%	1671	41%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	51	24%	51	24%	517	23%	456	19%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	113	53%	84	40%	1265	55%	1183	50%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	21	10%	39	19%	349	15%	345	15%
Alleged Victim unidentified	3	1%	6	3%	32	1%	48	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	24	11%	26	12%	79	3%	309	13%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	7	0%	6	0%
Administrative closure**	1	0%	3	1%	37	2%	10	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	213		209		2286		2357	
Total - Closed Cases	296		317		4051		4029	

* 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 6% for the month of December 2018, and the allegation substantiation rate is 10% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is Abuse of Authority – substantiating 9% of such allegations during December 2018, and 11% for the year.

Figure 22: Disposition of Allegations (2017 vs 2018)

	Dec 2017		Dec 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	4	2%	24	6%	638	11%	545	10%
Unsubstantiated	71	40%	171	44%	2386	40%	2190	40%
Unfounded	20	11%	26	7%	477	8%	463	8%
Exonerated	55	31%	142	36%	1718	29%	1716	31%
MOS Unidentified	26	15%	27	7%	711	12%	608	11%
Total - Full Investigations	176		390		5930		5522	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	36	38%	57	100%	465	49%	504	45%
Mediation Attempted	58	62%	0	0%	484	51%	628	55%
Total - ADR Closures	94		57		949		1132	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	102	21%	126	21%	1115	20%	1025	16%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	271	57%	234	39%	3422	61%	3339	52%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	38	8%	113	19%	695	12%	800	13%
Alleged Victim unidentified	3	1%	22	4%	82	1%	124	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	60	13%	90	15%	194	3%	996	16%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	1	0%	27	0%	56	1%
Administrative closure	1	0%	7	1%	55	1%	29	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	475		593		5590		6369	
Total - Closed Allegations	746		1040		12472		13027	

Figure 23: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (December 2018)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	2	39	29	5	8	83
	2%	47%	35%	6%	10%	100%
Abuse of Authority	21	89	111	13	13	247
	9%	36%	45%	5%	5%	100%
Discourtesy	1	35	2	3	5	46
	2%	76%	4%	7%	11%	100%
Offensive Language	0	8	0	5	1	14
	0%	57%	0%	36%	7%	100%
	24	171	142	26	27	390
Total	6%	44%	36%	7%	7%	100%

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (YTD 2018)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	73	408	429	168	148	1226
	6%	33%	35%	14%	12%	100%
Abuse of Authority	394	1264	1263	183	326	3430
	11%	37%	37%	5%	10%	100%
Discourtesy	69	424	24	74	110	701
	10%	60%	3%	11%	16%	100%
Offensive Language	9	94	0	38	20	161
	6%	58%	0%	24%	12%	100%
	545	2190	1716	463	604	5518
Total	10%	40%	31%	8%	11%	100%

Substantiation Rates

The December 2018 case substantiation rate was 18%.

Figure 25: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2017 - December 2018)



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 26: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations without Video (Jan 2018 - Dec 2018) (% substantiated shown)



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

Figure 27: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2018 - Dec 2018) (% 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 28: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints* (Dec 2017, Dec 2018, YTD 2017, YTD 2018)

	December 2017		December 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
Disposition	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	0	0%	2	13%	29	11%	48	21%
Command Discipline	0	0%	4	27%	124	48%	92	41%
Formalized Training	2	67%	2	13%	59	23%	34	15%
Instructions	1	33%	7	47%	46	18%	52	23%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	3		15		258		226	

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 29: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints* (2018)



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 30: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations* (Dec 2017, Dec 2018, YTD 2017, YTD 2018)

	December 2017		December 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
Disposition	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	0	0%	4	20%	38	10.7%	73	22.4%
Command Discipline	0	0%	4	20%	179	50.4%	128	39.3%
Formalized Training	2	66.7%	5	25%	78	22%	55	16.9%
Instructions	1	33.3%	7	35%	60	16.9%	70	21.5%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	3		20		355		326	

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 31: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (December 2018)

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Threat re: removal to hospital	68	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	108	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	108	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Force	Physical force	112	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	114	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	114	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 32: Truncated Allegations (December 2018)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	26	52	29	0	57	164
Abuse of Authority	85	144	74	22	26	351
Discourtesy	12	27	8	0	6	53
Offensive Language	3	11	2	0	1	17
Total	126	234	113	22	90	585

Figure 33: Truncated CCRB Complaints (December 2018)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	51	84	39	6	26	206

Figure 34: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2018)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	169	754	289	22	537	1771
Abuse of Authority	701	2113	420	91	361	3686
Discourtesy	129	396	70	10	79	684
Offensive Language	26	76	21	1	19	143
Total	1025	3339	800	124	996	6284

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2018)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	456	1183	345	48	309	2341

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

	Dec 2017	Dec 2018	YTD 2017	YTD 2018
PSA Complaints	11	14	172	189
Total Complaints	296	317	4051	4029
PSA Complaints as % of Total	3.7%	4.4%	4.2%	4.7%

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 37: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

	Dec 2017	Dec 2018	YTD 2017	YTD 2018
PSA 1	2	0	33	17
PSA 2	1	5	32	80
PSA 3	0	3	28	31
PSA 4	1	5	14	48
PSA 5	2	4	46	38
PSA 6	1	3	27	27
PSA 7	1	0	69	57
PSA 8	3	6	29	34
PSA 9	2	3	23	28
Total	13	29	301	360

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

	Dec 2017		Dec 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	7	41%	7	19%	113	28%	145	30%
Abuse of Authority (A)	7	41%	22	59%	211	53%	249	52%
Discourtesy (D)	2	12%	5	14%	59	15%	63	13%
Offensive Language (O)	1	6%	3	8%	16	4%	26	5%
Total	17	100%	37	100%	399	100%	483	100%

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 39: Disposition of PSA Officers (2017 vs 2018)

	Dec 2017		Dec 2018		YTD 2017		YTD 2018	
Full Investigations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	0	0%	5	33%	35	20%	33	18%
Exonerated	1	17%	3	20%	59	34%	43	23%
Unfounded	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	6	3%
Unsubstantiated	5	83%	7	47%	76	44%	104	56%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	6		15		173		186	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	1	50%	0	0%	12	33%	8	24%
Mediation Attempted	1	50%	0	0%	24	67%	25	76%
Total - ADR Closures	2		0		36		33	
Resolved Case Total	8	62%	15	52%	209	69%	219	61%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	2	40%	0	0%	16	17%	18	13%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	2	40%	4	29%	57	62%	69	49%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	0	0%	0	0%	12	13%	20	14%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	5	36%	0	0%	5	4%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	1	20%	4	29%	5	5%	27	19%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	1	7%	2	2%	1	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	5		14		92		141	
Total - Closed Cases	13		29		301		360	

* 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 December and this year.

Figure 40: Mediated Complaints Closed

	December 2018			YTD 2018		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	24	0	24	232	231	463

Figure 41: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	December 2018			YTD 2018		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	0	0	0	46	50	96
Abuse of Authority	49	0	49	364	456	820
Discourtesy	7	0	7	82	101	183
Offensive Language	1	0	1	12	21	33
Total	57	0	57	504	628	1132

Figure 42: Mediated Complaints By Borough (December 2018)

	Mediations
Bronx	5
Brooklyn	6
Manhattan	4
Queens	9
Staten Island	0

Figure 43: Mediated Allegations By Borough (December 2018)

	Mediations
Bronx	9
Brooklyn	14
Manhattan	5
Queens	29
Staten Island	0

Figure 44: Mediated Complaints By Precinct (Dec 2018 - YTD 2018)

Precinct	Dec 2018	YTD 2018
1	0	1
5	0	2
6	1	4
9	0	4
10	0	2
13	0	3
14	0	5
17	0	5
18	1	6
19	1	4
20	0	3
23	0	2
24	0	4
25	0	3
26	0	2
28	0	3
32	1	5
33	0	4
34	0	3
40	0	2
42	0	2
43	1	2
44	0	6
45	0	1
46	0	9
47	1	4
49	2	4
50	1	4
52	0	2
60	0	3
61	0	2
62	0	1
63	0	4
66	0	2
67	0	5
68	0	1

Precinct	Dec 2018	YTD 2018
69	0	9
70	1	6
71	0	3
72	1	3
73	0	4
75	0	6
76	1	1
77	1	5
78	0	2
79	0	2
81	0	3
83	0	1
84	0	2
88	0	1
90	1	3
94	0	1
100	0	3
101	1	5
102	1	3
103	0	4
104	2	6
105	0	1
106	0	1
107	0	1
108	0	2
109	3	3
110	0	1
111	0	1
112	0	5
113	3	8
114	0	4
115	0	3
120	0	1
121	0	4
122	0	3
123	0	1
NA	0	1

Figure 45: Mediated Allegations By Precinct (Dec 2018 - YTD 2018)

Precinct	Dec 2018	YTD 2018
1	0	1
5	0	3
6	1	6
9	0	8
10	0	9
13	0	7
14	0	12
17	0	9
18	1	16
19	1	10
20	0	6
23	0	2
24	0	8
25	0	11
26	0	4
28	0	5
32	2	13
33	0	6
34	0	7
40	0	3
42	0	3
43	1	3
44	0	11
45	0	4
46	0	15
47	1	8
49	2	5
50	5	13
52	0	5
60	0	12
61	0	2
62	0	2
63	0	7
66	0	4
67	0	9
68	0	4

Precinct	Dec 2018	YTD 2018
69	0	26
70	7	18
71	0	4
72	1	4
73	0	4
75	0	10
76	3	3
77	1	8
78	0	7
79	0	6
81	0	6
83	0	2
84	0	4
88	0	2
90	1	9
94	0	1
100	0	6
101	2	14
102	1	4
103	0	11
104	7	18
105	0	4
106	0	1
107	0	2
108	0	6
109	4	4
110	0	1
111	0	2
112	0	10
113	16	24
114	0	4
115	0	7
120	0	2
121	0	11
122	0	4
123	0	1
NA	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 46: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Dec 2018	YTD 2018
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	0	9
	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	20
	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	1
	*Retained, with discipline	3	5
	Disciplinary Action Total	**3**	**35**
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	0	3
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	1
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	0	2
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total	**0**	**6**
Not Adjudicated	Charges not filed	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	6
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	0	4
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total	**0**	**10**
	Total Closures	**3**	**51**

*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 47: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	December 2018	YTD 2018
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	1
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	4
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	24
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	3	3
Formalized Training**	0	2
Instructions***	0	1
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	**3**	**35**
No Disciplinary Action†	0	6
Adjudicated Total	**3**	**41**
Discipline Rate	**100%**	**85%**
Not Adjudicated† Total	0	10
Total Closures	**3**	**51**

*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 48: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	**Disposition Type***	December 2018	YTD 2018
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	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	1
	Command Discipline B	0	10
	Command Discipline A	3	71
	Formalized Training**	5	142
	Instructions***	9	55
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total	**17**	**280**
No Disciplinary Action	Not Guilty †	0	1
	Dismissed †	0	1
	Filed ††	3	8
	SOL Expired	0	4
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	7	55
	No Finding ††††	2	8
	Total	**12**	**77**
	Discipline Rate	**59%**	**78%**
	DUP Rate	**24%**	**15%**

*Where the respondent is found guilty of charges, and the penalty imposed would fall into more than one of the above listed categories, it is reported under the more severe penalty.
** Formalized training is conducted by the Police Academy, the NYPD Legal Bureau, or other NYPD Unit.
*** Instructions are conducted at the command level.
† Trial outcomes in non-APU cases typically involve MOS who turned down command discipline, prompting the police department to proceed with charges.
†† "Filed" is a term used when the police department is not required to take action against the subject officer because the officer has resigned or retired from the department, or has been terminated.
††† When the department decides that it will not discipline an officer against whom the Board recommended discipline other than charges, those cases are referred to as "Department Unable to Prosecute," or DUP.
†††† "No Finding" refers to cases which the department reports as "Administratively Closed."

Figure 49: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (December 2018)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	5	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	5	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Action	5	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	19	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	19	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Other	19	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	23	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	23	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	25	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	30	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Seizure of property	34	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Seizure of property	34	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	34	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	34	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	34	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of summons	43	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle stop	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Action	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Strip-searched	50	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Strip-searched	50	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Physical force	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Physical force	67	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	67	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	67	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	79	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	94	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	94	Brooklyn	No Discipline

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	101	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	106	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	106	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Search (of person)	114	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Search (of person)	114	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	123	Staten Island	Instructions

Figure 50: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (December 2018)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	113	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	113	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	113	Queens	Command Discipline A

Appendix

Over the years, the CCRB has made many types of data publicly available. In reorganizing the Monthly Report, we do not intend to remove any valuable information from the public domain. However, the Agency believes that some information is essential to place in the main body of the Monthly Report, while more granular charts and figures are better suited to the Appendix. We welcome you to contact the CCRB at www.nyc.gov or 212-912-7235 if you are having difficulty finding information on CCRB data that was formerly available.

Figure 51: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	December 2018		November 2018			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	1430	69.8%	1410	72.3%	20	1.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	338	16.5%	284	14.6%	54	19.0%
Cases 8 Months	59	2.9%	71	3.6%	-12	-16.9%
Cases 9 Months	60	2.9%	39	2.0%	21	53.8%
Cases 10 Months	31	1.5%	45	2.3%	-14	-31.1%
Cases 11 Months	37	1.8%	20	1.0%	17	85.0%
Cases 12 Months	17	0.8%	16	0.8%	1	6.3%
Cases 13 Months	14	0.7%	19	1.0%	-5	-26.3%
Cases 14 Months	18	0.9%	9	0.5%	9	100.0%
Cases 15 Months	9	0.4%	13	0.7%	-4	-30.8%
Cases 16 Months	11	0.5%	6	0.3%	5	83.3%
Cases 17 Months	4	0.2%	2	0.1%	2	100.0%
Cases 18 Months	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	18	0.9%	16	0.8%	2	12.5%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**2048**	**100.0%**	**1950**	**100.0%**	**98**	**5.0%**

Figure 52: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On CCRB Received Date

	December 2018		November 2018			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	1574	76.9%	1526	78.3%	48	3.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	302	14.7%	274	14.1%	28	10.2%
Cases 8 Months	50	2.4%	51	2.6%	-1	-2.0%
Cases 9 Months	39	1.9%	30	1.5%	9	30.0%
Cases 10 Months	26	1.3%	20	1.0%	6	30.0%
Cases 11 Months	15	0.7%	8	0.4%	7	87.5%
Cases 12 Months	7	0.3%	11	0.6%	-4	-36.4%
Cases 13 Months	10	0.5%	14	0.7%	-4	-28.6%
Cases 14 Months	12	0.6%	5	0.3%	7	140.0%
Cases 15 Months	5	0.2%	3	0.2%	2	66.7%
Cases 16 Months	3	0.1%	2	0.1%	1	50.0%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	5	0.2%	6	0.3%	-1	-16.7%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**2048**	**100.0%**	**1950**	**100.0%**	**98**	**5.0%**

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

	December 2018		November 2018			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	862	74.8%	903	77.4%	-41	-4.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	163	14.1%	140	12.0%	23	16.4%
Cases 8 Months	23	2.0%	33	2.8%	-10	-30.3%
Cases 9 Months	27	2.3%	19	1.6%	8	42.1%
Cases 10 Months	16	1.4%	20	1.7%	-4	-20.0%
Cases 11 Months	16	1.4%	9	0.8%	7	77.8%
Cases 12 Months	5	0.4%	7	0.6%	-2	-28.6%
Cases 13 Months	7	0.6%	8	0.7%	-1	-12.5%
Cases 14 Months	7	0.6%	6	0.5%	1	16.7%
Cases 15 Months	5	0.4%	7	0.6%	-2	-28.6%
Cases 16 Months	6	0.5%	3	0.3%	3	100.0%
Cases 17 Months	3	0.3%	0	0.0%	3	NA
Cases 18 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	11	1.0%	11	0.9%	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**1152**	**100.0%**	**1166**	**100.0%**	**-14**	**-1.2%**

Figure 54: CCRB DA Hold Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	December 2018	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	1	10.0%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	1	10.0%
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	2	20.0%
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	1	10.0%
Cases 15 Months	1	10.0%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	1	10.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	3	30.0%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	**10**	**100.0%**

Figure 55: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2018)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	8	8.2%	41	42.3%	22	22.7%	12	12.4%	13	13.4%	1	1%
Gun fired	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	1	4.3%	13	56.5%	4	17.4%	3	13%	2	8.7%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
Radio as club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Flashlight as club	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Police shield	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
Vehicle	1	14.3%	0	0%	4	57.1%	2	28.6%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	1	8.3%	7	58.3%	1	8.3%	3	25%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	0	0%	5	12.8%	14	35.9%	19	48.7%	1	2.6%	0	0%
Chokehold	5	9.3%	0	0%	27	50%	14	25.9%	8	14.8%	0	0%
Pepper spray	14	63.6%	7	31.8%	1	4.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical force	36	4.2%	335	39.4%	274	32.2%	96	11.3%	110	12.9%	0	0%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	0	0%	10	83.3%	2	16.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	3	15%	13	65%	2	10%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	4	10.5%	8	21.1%	18	47.4%	6	15.8%	2	5.3%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	0	0%	1	2.6%	20	51.3%	9	23.1%	9	23.1%	0	0%
Total	73	5.9%	429	34.9%	408	33.2%	168	13.7%	150	12.2%	1	0.1%

Figure 56: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2018)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	0	0%	19	70.4%	5	18.5%	3	11.1%	0	0%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	25	10.1%	155	62.5%	59	23.8%	2	0.8%	7	2.8%	0	0%
Strip-searched	5	11.6%	9	20.9%	21	48.8%	6	14%	2	4.7%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	7	3.6%	92	47.9%	76	39.6%	0	0%	17	8.9%	0	0%
Vehicle search	22	12.9%	69	40.6%	60	35.3%	3	1.8%	16	9.4%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	20	8%	167	67.1%	47	18.9%	5	2%	10	4%	0	0%
Threat of summons	3	18.8%	8	50%	2	12.5%	3	18.8%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	13	3.7%	137	39.5%	137	39.5%	25	7.2%	35	10.1%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	2	14.3%	4	28.6%	7	50%	1	7.1%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	16	8.8%	27	14.8%	92	50.5%	25	13.7%	22	12.1%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	4	7.1%	20	35.7%	20	35.7%	2	3.6%	10	17.9%	0	0%
Property damaged	2	2.7%	13	17.6%	32	43.2%	5	6.8%	22	29.7%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	14	41.2%	0	0%	11	32.4%	3	8.8%	6	17.6%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	26	8.9%	5	1.7%	201	68.8%	39	13.4%	21	7.2%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	7	87.5%	0	0%	1	12.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	5	71.4%	1	14.3%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	5	5.8%	2	2.3%	62	72.1%	12	14%	5	5.8%	0	0%
Improper dissemination of medical info	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Other	29	31.5%	41	44.6%	17	18.5%	0	0%	5	5.4%	0	0%
Seizure of property	3	7.9%	28	73.7%	6	15.8%	0	0%	1	2.6%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	0	0%	0	0%	27	75%	4	11.1%	5	13.9%	0	0%
Frisk	59	24.6%	55	22.9%	80	33.3%	7	2.9%	39	16.2%	0	0%
Search (of person)	36	16.4%	44	20%	101	45.9%	5	2.3%	34	15.5%	0	0%
Stop	39	13.5%	129	44.8%	81	28.1%	6	2.1%	32	11.1%	1	0.3%
Question	6	9.8%	16	26.2%	25	41%	4	6.6%	10	16.4%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	7	77.8%	0	0%	2	22.2%	0	0%
Interference with recording	15	20.8%	12	16.7%	25	34.7%	9	12.5%	11	15.3%	0	0%
Search of recording device	0	0%	2	16.7%	8	66.7%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%

Forcible Removal to Hospital	9	6%	122	81.9%	11	7.4%	6	4%	1	0.7%	0	0%
Threat re: removal to hospital	4	19%	3	14.3%	11	52.4%	1	4.8%	2	9.5%	0	0%
Threat re: immigration status	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Disseminated immigration status	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Questioned immigration status	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Search of Premises	13	11.2%	79	68.1%	18	15.5%	0	0%	6	5.2%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	2	16.7%	0	0%	5	41.7%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Arrest)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Frisk)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Strip-Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Vehicle Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Photo/Video)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Summons)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Photography/Videography	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Refusal to provide shield number	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	394	11.5%	1263	36.8%	1264	36.8%	183	5.3%	328	9.6%	1	0%

Figure 57: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2018)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	62	10.1%	19	3.1%	376	61%	63	10.2%	95	15.4%	1	0.2%
Gesture	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Action	6	7.6%	5	6.3%	44	55.7%	9	11.4%	15	19%	0	0%
Other	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	69	9.8%	24	3.4%	424	60.4%	74	10.5%	110	15.7%	1	0.1%

Figure 58: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2018)

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	1	1.8%	0	0%	39	70.9%	11	20%	4	7.3%	0	0%
Ethnicity	0	0%	0	0%	2	10.5%	9	47.4%	8	42.1%	0	0%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	8	88.9%	0	0%	1	11.1%	0	0%
Physical disability	1	33.3%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%
Other	2	10.5%	0	0%	9	47.4%	5	26.3%	3	15.8%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gender	1	16.7%	0	0%	1	16.7%	4	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	5	4.4%	0	0%	60	53.1%	30	26.5%	18	15.9%	0	0%

Figure 59: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (December 2018)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	0	0%
Trial commenced	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	12	14%
Charges filed, awaiting service	31	37%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	18	22%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	3	4%
Calendared for court appearance	9	11%
Trial scheduled	9	11%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	1	1%
Total	**83**	**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 60: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (December 2018)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	1	5%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	14	70%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	4	20%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	0	0%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	1	5%
Total	**20**	**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 61: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	1	10	16	271
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	1	46	39	448
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	3	57	52	778
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	6	43	65	605
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	2	40	56	589
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	0	15	36	400
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	2	15	22	224
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	18	2	181
Special Operations Division Total	0	1	2	46
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	1	0	4
Total	**15**	**246**	**290**	**3546**
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	4	4	68
Transit Bureau Total	0	7	19	159
Housing Bureau Total	5	33	29	366
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	10	4	138
Detective Bureau Total	0	6	13	149
Other Bureaus Total	0	15	12	123
Total	**5**	**75**	**81**	**1003**
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	1	2	41
Undetermined	0	4	5	45
Total	**20**	**326**	**378**	**4635**

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

Figure 62A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
001 Precinct	0	1	3	32
005 Precinct	0	1	0	22
006 Precinct	0	3	1	38
007 Precinct	0	0	0	17
009 Precinct	0	1	3	34
010 Precinct	0	1	0	11
013 Precinct	0	0	2	12
Midtown South Precinct	0	0	1	30
017 Precinct	0	0	2	9
Midtown North Precinct	0	2	1	42
Precincts Total	**0**	**9**	**13**	**247**
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	1	1	2	12
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	0	1	12
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	**1**	**10**	**16**	**271**

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

Figure 62B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
019 Precinct	0	3	1	33
020 Precinct	0	2	0	29
023 Precinct	0	3	8	44
024 Precinct	0	0	1	23
025 Precinct	0	4	5	52
026 Precinct	0	1	0	13
Central Park Precinct	0	1	0	5
028 Precinct	1	6	11	48
030 Precinct	0	3	2	27
032 Precinct	0	4	2	38
033 Precinct	0	1	1	53
034 Precinct	0	15	8	77
Precincts Total	**1**	**43**	**39**	**442**
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	3	0	4
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	2
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	**1**	**46**	**39**	**448**

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

Figure 62C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
040 Precinct	0	7	0	56
041 Precinct	0	6	5	67
042 Precinct	0	0	9	56
043 Precinct	0	1	6	43
044 Precinct	0	3	3	111
045 Precinct	1	9	1	35
046 Precinct	0	2	7	65
047 Precinct	0	10	2	74
048 Precinct	1	8	6	83
049 Precinct	0	2	7	49
050 Precinct	0	1	0	30
052 Precinct	0	6	2	95
Precincts Total	**2**	**55**	**48**	**764**
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	0	2	5
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	1	1	6
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	1	1	1	3
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	**3**	**57**	**52**	**778**

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

Figure 62D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
060 Precinct	5	6	11	47
061 Precinct	0	2	0	35
062 Precinct	0	1	6	39
063 Precinct	0	5	1	43
066 Precinct	0	0	4	19
067 Precinct	0	4	9	95
068 Precinct	1	7	9	35
069 Precinct	0	8	7	74
070 Precinct	0	0	7	58
071 Precinct	0	5	3	59
072 Precinct	0	1	2	44
076 Precinct	0	0	4	22
078 Precinct	0	0	1	17
Precincts Total	**6**	**39**	**64**	**587**
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	4	0	9
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	1	9
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	**6**	**43**	**65**	**605**

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

Figure 62E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
073 Precinct	0	3	4	60
075 Precinct	0	4	9	115
077 Precinct	2	8	10	95
079 Precinct	0	7	5	85
081 Precinct	0	6	4	60
083 Precinct	0	3	5	44
084 Precinct	0	4	9	54
088 Precinct	0	2	7	24
090 Precinct	0	0	3	24
094 Precinct	0	1	0	18
Precincts Total	**2**	**38**	**56**	**579**
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	2	0	3
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	7
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	**2**	**40**	**56**	**589**

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

Figure 62F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
100 Precinct	0	0	0	25
101 Precinct	0	1	6	81
102 Precinct	0	4	1	33
103 Precinct	0	0	5	58
105 Precinct	0	2	4	42
106 Precinct	0	2	0	28
107 Precinct	0	1	0	29
113 Precinct	0	5	20	100
Precincts Total	**0**	**15**	**36**	**396**
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	3
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	**0**	**15**	**36**	**400**

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

Figure 62G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
104 Precinct	0	1	3	25
108 Precinct	1	2	2	14
109 Precinct	0	0	3	25
110 Precinct	0	2	2	22
111 Precinct	0	0	1	16
112 Precinct	1	3	3	18
114 Precinct	0	6	8	72
115 Precinct	0	0	0	22
Precincts Total	**2**	**14**	**22**	**214**
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	1	0	5
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	5
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	**2**	**15**	**22**	**224**

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

Figure 62H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
120 Precinct	0	7	1	78
122 Precinct	0	4	0	47
123 Precinct	0	2	1	18
121 Precinct	0	0	0	23
Precincts Total	**0**	**13**	**2**	**166**
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	0	0	2
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	5	0	10
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	3
Staten Island Housing Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Court Section	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	**0**	**18**	**2**	**181**

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

Figure 62I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	0	2	31
Harbor Unit	0	1	0	5
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	0	0	1
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	1
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	0	0	8
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	**0**	**1**	**2**	**46**

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

Figure 62J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Chiefs Office	0	1	0	4
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	**0**	**1**	**0**	**4**

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

Figure 62K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	1	1	12
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	4
Traffic Control Parking Enforcement District	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Tow Units	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Summons Enforcement	0	0	0	0
Traffic Command Intersection Control	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Intelligence Unit	0	0	0	0
Highway District	0	1	0	4
Highway Unit #1	0	1	2	18
Highway Unit #2	0	0	0	11
Highway Unit #3	0	1	1	12
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	5
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Division Total	**0**	**4**	**4**	**68**

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

Figure 62L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
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	0	2	6
TB DT02	0	2	0	19
TB DT03	0	0	7	29
TB DT04	0	0	0	13
TB DT11	0	0	1	6
TB DT12	0	1	2	10
TB DT20	0	0	0	4
TB DT23	0	0	4	8
TB DT30	0	0	0	6
TB DT32	0	0	0	10
TB DT33	0	0	1	9
TB DT34	0	0	0	6
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	2	1	15
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	1	0	3
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	1
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	3
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	4
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	1	1	7
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	**0**	**7**	**19**	**159**

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

Figure 62M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	0	1	0	17
PSA 2	0	3	5	77
PSA 3	0	1	3	29
PSA 4	0	0	5	48
PSA 5	3	6	4	37
PSA 6	0	1	3	27
PSA 7	0	12	0	57
PSA 8	1	6	6	34
PSA 9	1	1	3	30
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Bronx/Queens	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Investigations	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Elevator Vandalism Unit	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Operations and Misc. Commands	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	**5**	**33**	**29**	**366**
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	2	0	10
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	**5**	**33**	**29**	**366**

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

Figure 62N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Queens Narcotics	0	2	2	33
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	2	0	6
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	14
Bronx Narcotics	0	3	0	23
Staten Island Narcotics	0	0	0	14
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	1	25
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	3	1	17
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	4
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	2
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	**0**	**10**	**4**	**138**

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

Figure 62O: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	4
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	0	10
Special Victims Division	0	3	2	12
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	1	1
Gang Division	0	1	0	25
Detective Borough Bronx	0	0	1	17
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	0	4	27
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	1	4	32
Detective Borough Queens	0	1	1	20
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	0	1
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	**0**	**6**	**13**	**149**

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

Figure 62P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	4
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	0	15	11	111
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	2
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	1	4
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	1
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	1
Other Bureaus Total	**0**	**15**	**12**	**123**

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

Figure 62Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2018 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Dec 2018	Substantiated MOS YTD 2018	Total MOS Dec 2018	Total MOS YTD 2018
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division	0	0	0	1
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - Legal Bureau	0	0	0	0
DC Training	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy Training	0	0	0	3
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	0	2
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	0	0	0	0
Police Commissioner Office	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Division	0	0	0	0
Chief of Community Affairs	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Juvenile Section	0	0	0	0
School Safety Bronx/Manhattan	0	0	0	0
School Safety Queens/Brooklyn	0	0	0	4
Office of Equal Employment	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Operations	0	0	0	1
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	1	2	26
Chief of Department	0	0	0	3
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	1
Quality Assurance Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Counterterrorism	0	0	0	0
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	**0**	**1**	**2**	**41**

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