



ERIC L. ADAMS
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
January 2022
(Statistics for December 2021)

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
Disposition for Substantiated Complaints	23
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Officers	24
Unable to Investigate / Withdrawn	27
Complaints by PSA	28
Mediation Unit	30
Administrative Prosecution Unit	32
NYPD Discipline	33
Appendix	38

Executive Summary

The Civilian Complaint Review Board (“CCRB”) is an independent municipal Agency that investigates complaints of NYPD misconduct. Every month, the CCRB prepares an Executive Director report for its public meeting. Data for December 2021 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 33% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 45% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In December, the CCRB opened 277 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 3,563 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 26% of its fully investigated cases (page 16).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 30% of the cases it closed in December (page 13) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 42% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency was unable to investigate /withdrawn 49% of the cases received (page 13).
- 4) For December, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 28% of cases - compared to 9% 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, 25-26).
- 6) In December the Police Commissioner finalized 5 decision(s) against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases (page 32). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 21 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 1 trial was 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 15 members. 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.

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.

Unable to Investigate / Withdrawn: When the CCRB is unable to obtain a sworn statement from the complainant/alleged victim, the case is closed as unable to investigate. When the complainant/alleged victim asks that their complaint be withdrawn, the case is closed as withdrawn.

Closed Pending Litigation: Sometimes when a complainant is involved in criminal or civil litigation, their attorney advises against making sworn statements until the conclusion of the court case. When a complainant declines to cooperate with an investigation on the advice of their attorney, the complaint disposition is "Closed Pending Litigation."

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 2021, the CCRB initiated 277 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2020 - December 2021)




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2020 - December 2021)





Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (YTD 2010 - 2021)



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Of the five boroughs, the largest number of misconduct complaints stemmed from incidents occurring in Brooklyn, followed by Manhattan. The 75th Precinct had the highest number at 11 incidents.

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (December 2021)




Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2021)




Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (December 2021)


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
0	1	67	10
1	3	68	2
5	1	69	5
6	2	70	4
7	3	71	1
9	2	72	3
10	4	73	8
13	6	75	11
14	7	76	2
17	2	77	3
18	2	78	7
19	5	79	6
20	2	81	5
23	3	84	3
24	1	88	2
25	3	90	3
26	1	94	3
28	4	100	1
30	2	101	3
32	5	102	3
33	3	103	4
34	2	104	1
40	5	105	4
41	2	106	6
42	6	107	2
43	4	108	1
44	8	109	4
45	4	110	2
46	3	111	3
47	6	112	1
48	4	113	1
49	4	114	5
52	5	115	3
60	2	120	7
61	1	121	2
62	1	122	3
63	4	123	3
		Unknown	17

*These figures track where an incident occurred, not necessarily the Command of the officer. Please review Figures 65A-65Q for Command Level data for cases closed in 2022.

Allegations Received

As described in the previous section, the CCRB has jurisdiction over four categories of NYPD misconduct. In comparing December 2020 to December 2021, 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 2021, complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (December 2020 vs. December 2021)




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

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

	December 2020		December 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	127	46%	123	44%	-4	-3%
Abuse of Authority (A)	214	78%	186	67%	-28	-13%
Discourtesy (D)	68	25%	57	21%	-11	-16%
Offensive Language (O)	15	5%	10	4%	-5	-33%
Total FADO Allegations	424		376		-48	-11%
Total Complaints	276		277		1	0%

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 2020 vs. YTD 2021)



*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 2020		YTD 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	1625	42%	1424	42%	-201	-12%
Abuse of Authority (A)	2889	75%	2638	77%	-251	-9%
Discourtesy (D)	1092	28%	850	25%	-242	-22%
Offensive Language (O)	293	8%	241	7%	-52	-18%
Total FADO Allegations	5899		5153		-746	-13%
Total Complaints	3872		3409		-463	-12%

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 2020		December 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	287	23%	236	30%	-51	-18%
Abuse of Authority (A)	840	66%	474	60%	-366	-44%
Discourtesy (D)	121	10%	75	9%	-46	-38%
Offensive Language (O)	19	1%	11	1%	-8	-42%
Total Allegations	1267		796		-471	-37%
Total Complaints	276		277		1	0%

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

	YTD 2020		YTD 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	4431	26%	3410	25%	-1021	-23%
Abuse of Authority (A)	10369	61%	8606	63%	-1763	-17%
Discourtesy (D)	1799	11%	1270	9%	-529	-29%
Offensive Language (O)	389	2%	324	2%	-65	-17%
Total Allegations	16988		13610		-3378	-20%
Total Complaints	3872		3409		-463	-12%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of December 2021, 33% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 45% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (December 2021)

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1153	33.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	429	12.3%
Cases 8-11 Months	590	16.9%
Cases 12-18 Months*	752	21.6%
Cases Over 18 Months**	557	16.0%
Total	3481	100%

*12-18 Months: 14 cases that were reopened; 4 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 29 cases that were reopened; 6 cases that were on DA Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (December 2021)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1000	28.7%
Cases 5-7 Months	441	12.7%
Cases 8-11 Months	574	16.5%
Cases 12-18 Months*	772	22.2%
Cases Over 18 Months**	694	19.9%
Total	3481	100%

*12-18 Months: 8 cases that were reopened; 4 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 39 cases that were reopened; 6 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 2020 - December 2021)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	November 2021		December 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	1996	56%	1951	55%	-45	-2%
Pending Board Review	1465	41%	1530	43%	65	4%
Mediation	113	3%	79	2%	-34	-30%
On DA Hold	3	0%	3	0%	0	0%
Total	3577		3563		-14	0%

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	49	49.0%
30 <= Days < 60	13	13.0%
60 <= Days < 90	3	3.0%
90 >= Days	35	35.0%
Total	100	100%

Figure 19: Percentage of Open Investigations Docket with Pending BWC Requests (January 2020 - December 2021)




Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In December 2021, the CCRB fully investigated 30% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 42% of the cases it closed.

Figure 20: Case Resolutions (January 2020 - December 2021) (%)



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 closed as **substantiated**.
- If there is not enough evidence to determine whether or not the alleged misconduct occurred, the allegation is closed as **unable to determine**.*
- If the preponderance of the evidence suggests that the event or alleged act did not occur, the allegation is closed as **unfounded**.
- If the event did occur, but was not improper by a preponderance of evidence, the allegation is closed as **within NYPD guidelines**.**
- 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 because the CCRB was unable to obtain a sworn statement from the complainant/victim is closed as **unable to investigate**.

Case Abstracts

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

1. Substantiated

A government official was attending a protest when police officers began kettling protestors with bicycles. The government official was holding onto another individual and was relaying the police instructions when subject officer 1 with extended his hand to the side of the government official's head, his hand holding a pepper spray canister by his head. Several protestors were standing ahead of the government official, their backs also to subject officer 1. Neither the government official nor the protestors were pushing on the surrounding officers. The government official moved with the crowd to cross the street to disperse when subject officer 2 shoved him in the back.

Both subject officers were captured on BWC footage – it showed subject officer 1's arm extending over the government official's shoulder with the pepper spray canister by his head. The investigation determined that subject officer 1 threatened to use force by holding the pepper spray canister next the government official's face in violation of the distance requirement for use of pepper spray and the fact that the government official had made no physical or verbal actions towards subject officer 1. BWC showed subject officer 2 shoving the government official in the back after it was clear that government official had stopped to cross the street safely and was not engaging in any conduct that threatened the safety of either subject officer 2 or surrounding officers. The Board substantiated the Abuse of Authority and Use of Force allegations.

2. Unable to Determine

Two individuals were participating in a protest marching along a street. The march was blocked by officers with bicycles. The protestors turned to go down another street and were met with uniformed officers in riot gear lining the street. Some of the officers marched on the protestors and shouted, "you've got to fucking move", "get the fuck out of here". As one of the individuals turned to leave, she felt a baton repeatedly shove her in the back. The other individual who also turned around to leave was also pushed in the back by a baton. The individuals observed officers pushing other protestors with batons as well. The individuals could not identify specific officers – just that they were in uniform. BWC footage of the protest location were recovered but did not capture the protest section that the individuals were in. The BWC showed than an

officer is captured telling a group of officers that everyone on the street was being arrested for unlawful assembly. Officers that were interviewed per their BWC footage were not in the protest area where the individuals had their incident. Without further corroborating evidence the investigation was unable to determine which officers were involved. The Board closed the Abuse of Authority allegations as Unable to Determine.

3. Unfounded

An individual was at her home when approximately eight officers arrived following the individual's dispute with one of her tenants. She alleged that upon arrival, the subject officer grabbed her arms, took her cane, held her by the neck, pushed her down the stairs and dragged her outside. Once outside, the subject officer slammed her against a concrete partition and handcuffed her. The subject officer walked the individual to his vehicle and took her to the precinct. The incident was captured on the subject officer's BWC. It showed the subject officer arriving at the location and speaking first with the tenant, verifying damage to his property. The subject officer then exited the residence and spoke to the individual who was already outside. The subject officer told the individual to turn around and put her hands behind her back. The individual complied. The subject officer handed the individual's cane to another officer and told her that he would support her as he walked her over to the police vehicle. The individual entered the vehicle and was transported to the precinct. The BWC showed that the subject officer did not use any of the force as described by the individual. The Board closed the Use of Force allegation as Unfounded.

4. Within NYPD Guidelines

An individual stated that she lived with an ex-boyfriend in a two-level apartment. She stated that she was doing laundry in the basement when she heard loud noises from multiple people coming from upstairs. She stated that she was not expecting anyone, became alarmed and hid in her bedroom which was also in the basement. She stated that people identifying themselves as police officers came to her bedroom door and spoke through the door, trying to get her to leave her bedroom. The individual believed that the call was a ploy by her ex-boyfriend to seek revenge for the break-up. She stated that she told the officers that she was fine, but they ignored her, and she denied needing medical attention. She stated that a supervisor arrived and forced her bedroom door open. She stated that she was rear cuffed, taken upstairs and was placed in an ambulance that took her the hospital. BWC footage as well as cellphone video taken by the individual showed that police officers arrived at the residence and verified the individual's history with her ex-boyfriend, as well as his 911 call, as well as the ex-boyfriend being a legal resident of the shared two-level apartment. The officers saw the individual as she stood upstairs and followed her as she went downstairs to her bedroom. Over a 40-minute timespan, both the officers and EMTs tried to talk the individual out of her room. The EMTs decided that the individual be taken to the hospital. The subject officer arrived on scene, conferred with the onsite officers and EMTs. He then went to the individual's bedroom and used his shoulder to push the bedroom door open in a calm manner. Other officers come in and rear cuffed the individual and there was no struggle. The individual was escorted out and she was told that they were taking her the hospital. The Board found the subject officer's conduct to be within the Department's guidelines and closed the Abuse of Authority allegation as being Within NYPD Guidelines.

5. Officer Unidentified


An individual was participating in a protest when unidentified officers approached the individual and used physical force against him by striking him with a baton and dragging him for a few feet. The individual stated that he was handcuffed and then later released with one unidentified officer telling him, "get the fuck out of here. If I see you again, I'll actually fucking arrest you." The individual was able to give a description of the height and build of 2 of the officers. BWC footage from around the time and location of the incident did not show officers as described by the individual. A bystander video showed the individual on the ground with a group of officers crouched around him – only one officer could be identified, and he could not be interviewed due to retiring from NYPD. The others could not be identified, and no discernable actions could be observed. The Board closed the Use of Force, Discourtesy, and Abuse of Authority allegations as Officer Unidentified.

* Unable to determine is reported to the Commissioner as Unsubstantiated, meaning that there was insufficient evidence to establish whether or not there was an act of misconduct.

** Within NYPD Guidelines is reported to the Commissioner as Exonerated, meaning there was a preponderance of the evidence that the acts alleged occurred but did not constitute misconduct.


Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 21: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (December 2021)



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

Figure 22: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2021)



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

Dispositions - All CCRB Cases

The following table lists all the CCRB case closures for the current month and year-to-date.

Figure 23: Disposition of Cases (2020 vs 2021)

	Dec 2020		Dec 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
Full Investigations	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Substantiated	32	34%	23	26%	293	30%	210	34%
Within NYPD Guidelines	12	13%	10	11%	200	20%	82	13%
Unfounded	8	8%	13	14%	93	9%	53	9%
Unable to Determine	35	37%	31	34%	299	30%	175	29%
MOS Unidentified	8	8%	13	14%	96	10%	94	15%
Total - Full Investigations	95		90		981		614	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	1	1%	20	59%	30	22%	120	46%
Mediation Attempted	109	99%	14	41%	109	78%	140	54%
Total - ADR Closures	110		34		139		260	
Resolved Case Total	205	59%	124	42%	1120	34%	874	33%
Unable to Investigate / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	32	22%	31	18%	407	19%	357	20%
Unable to Investigate	86	60%	114	66%	1335	62%	1059	58%
Closed - Pending Litigation	23	16%	26	15%	333	15%	318	18%
Miscellaneous	1	1%	2	1%	9	0%	15	1%
Administrative closure*	1	1%	1	1%	80	4%	65	4%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	143		174		2164		1814	
Total - Closed Cases	348		298		3284		2688	

*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 11% for the month of December 2021, and the allegation substantiation rate is 20% year-to-date.

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2020 vs 2021)

	Dec 2020		Dec 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Fully Investigated Allegations								
Substantiated	81	20%	54	11%	741	15%	691	20%
Unable to Determine	120	30%	104	21%	1453	30%	863	25%
Unfounded	45	11%	71	14%	532	11%	332	10%
Within NYPD Guidelines	129	32%	170	34%	1645	33%	917	26%
MOS Unidentified	27	7%	102	20%	548	11%	667	19%
Total - Full Investigations	402		501		4919		3470	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	2	1%	53	62%	78	21%	325	43%
Mediation Attempted	298	99%	33	38%	298	0%	424	0%
Total - ADR Closures	300		86		376		749	
Unable to Investigate / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	53	16%	62	14%	1050	17%	898	17%
Unable to Investigate	194	60%	267	60%	3656	61%	2859	54%
Closed - Pending Litigation	59	18%	94	21%	1105	18%	1229	23%
Miscellaneous	18	6%	24	5%	101	2%	129	2%
Administrative closure	2	1%	1	0%	102	2%	192	4%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	326		448		6014		5307	
Total - Closed Allegations	1028		1085		11309		9577	

Figure 25: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (December 2021)

	Substantiated	Unable to Determine	Within NYPD Guidelines	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	14 9%	28 18%	46 29%	30 19%	40 25%	158 100%
Abuse of Authority	21 8%	61 22%	120 43%	31 11%	47 17%	280 100%
Discourtesy	10 20%	13 27%	4 8%	8 16%	14 29%	49 100%
Offensive Language	6 60%	1 10%	0 0%	2 20%	1 10%	10 100%
Total	51 10%	103 21%	170 34%	71 14%	102 21%	497 100%

Figure 26: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (YTD 2021)

	Substantiated	Unable to Determine	Within NYPD Guidelines	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	127 12%	240 22%	285 26%	107 10%	320 30%	1079 100%
Abuse of Authority	369 21%	452 26%	556 32%	143 8%	229 13%	1749 100%
Discourtesy	123 25%	132 27%	75 15%	64 13%	99 20%	493 100%
Offensive Language	48 41%	32 27%	1 1%	18 15%	19 16%	118 100%
Total	667 19%	856 25%	917 27%	332 10%	667 19%	3439 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 (December 2021)

Untruthful Statement Allegation	Substantiated		Within NYPD Guidelines		Unable to Determine		Unfounded		Administrative Closure		Other	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
False official statement	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Misleading official statement	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Inaccurate official statement	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	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	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%


Figure 28: Disposition of Untruthful Statement Allegations (YTD 2021)

Untruthful Statement Allegation	Substantiated		Within NYPD Guidelines		Unable to Determine		Unfounded		Administrative Closure		Other	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
False official statement	14	87.5%	0	0%	2	12.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Misleading official statement	7	63.6%	0	0%	4	36.4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Inaccurate official statement	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Impeding an investigation	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	24	77.4%	0	0%	7	22.6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Substantiation Rates

The December 2021 case substantiation rate was 26%.

Figure 29: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2020 - December 2021)




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 2021 - Dec 2021) (% substantiated shown)




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

Figure 31: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2021 - Dec 2021)
 (% substantiated shown)



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

Figure 32: Disposition of Substantiated Complaints* (2021)



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

* A substantiated complaint may contain a number of substantiated allegations with different dispositions. To determine the disposition associated with the complaint as a whole, the CCRB uses the most severe of the substantiated allegation dispositions. The order of severity is: 1) Charges 2) Command Discipline 3) Formalized Training 4) Instructions.

Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Officers

After a CCRB investigative team has completed its investigation, a panel of Board members determines whether to substantiate the allegation(s) and make a disciplinary recommendation against the officer(s).

- “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 if the officer is found guilty.
- “Command Discipline B” and "Command Discipline A" are recommended for misconduct that is moderately serious. An officer can lose up to ten vacation days as a result of Command Discipline B and up to five vacation days as a result of Command Discipline A.
- “Formalized Training” and “Instructions*” are the least severe discipline, often recommended for officers who misunderstand a policy. This determination results in training at the Police Academy or NYPD Legal Bureau (Formalized Training) or training at the command level (Instructions*).
- 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 33: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations
(Dec 2020, Dec 2021, YTD 2020, YTD 2021)**

Disposition	December 2020		December 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Charges	4	8%	13	41%	35	8%	168	48%
Command Discipline B	8	16%	5	16%	53	12%	58	17%
Command Discipline A	14	29%	11	34%	97	22%	94	27%
Formalized Training	13	27%	3	9%	106	24%	23	7%
Instructions	10	20%	0	0%	152	34%	6	2%
Total	49		32		443		349	

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

*With the adoption of the NYPD Disciplinary Matrix on 03/15/2021, the CCRB no longer issues Instructions as a Board Discipline Recommendation.

** The Board issues a separate Board Discipline Recommendation for each officer in a complaint against whom an allegation is substantiated.

Prior to the CCRB's adoption of the NYPD's Disciplinary Matrix on 03/15/2021, the Board Discipline Recommendation for each officer was determined by the most severe disposition of the allegation(s) substantiated against the officer, with the order of severity as follows: 1. Charges 2. Command Discipline B 3. Command Discipline A 4. Formalized Training 5. Instructions.

Following the adoption of the NYPD Disciplinary Matrix on 03/15/2021, the Board Discipline Recommendation for each officer is determined by the sum of the Matrix penalty days associated with the allegation(s) substantiated against the officer as follows: 1. Charges (penalty days >= 11) 2. Command Discipline B (6 <= penalty days <= 10) 3. Command Discipline A (1 <= penalty days <= 5) 4. Formalized Training (0 < penalty days < 1)

Figure 34: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (December 2021)

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Hit against inanimate object	19	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	19	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Gender Identity	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Obstructed Shield Number	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Chokehold	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Gender	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Untruthful Statement	False official statement	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	72	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	78	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	78	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	78	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Untruthful Statement	Misleading official statement	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Untruthful Statement	Misleading official statement	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Other blunt instrument as a club	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	94	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Offensive Language	Gender	94	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	103	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	103	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	103	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	103	Queens

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	114	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	114	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	114	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	114	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	114	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Religion	114	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Other	114	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Other	114	Queens

Unable to Investigate and Withdrawn Complaints

When the CCRB is unable to obtain a sworn statement from the complainant/alleged victim, the case is closed as unable to investigate. When the complainant/alleged victim asks that their complaint be withdrawn, the case is closed as withdrawn.

Figure 35: Unable to Investigate and Withdrawn Allegations (December 2021)

	Withdrawn	Unable to Investigate	Total
	0	0	0
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0
Force	10	90	100
Abuse of Authority	42	144	186
Discourtesy	6	26	32
Offensive Language	4	7	11
Total	62	267	329

Figure 36: Unable to Investigate and Withdrawn CCRB Complaints (December 2021)

	Withdrawn	Unable to Investigate	Total
Total	31	114	145

Figure 37: Unable to Investigate and Withdrawn Allegations (YTD 2021)

	Withdrawn	Unable to Investigate	Total
	0	0	0
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0
Force	173	865	1038
Abuse of Authority	608	1672	2280
Discourtesy	98	234	332
Offensive Language	19	88	107
Total	898	2859	3757

Figure 38: Unable to Investigate and Withdrawn CCRB Complaints (YTD 2021)

	Withdrawn	Unable to Investigate	Total
Total	357	1059	1416

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 39: PSA Complaints Closed as % of Total Complaints Closed

	Dec 2020	Dec 2021	YTD 2020	YTD 2021
PSA Complaints	15	13	151	126
Total Complaints	348	298	3284	2688
PSA Complaints as % of Total	4.3%	4.4%	4.6%	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 40: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

	Dec 2020	Dec 2021	YTD 2020	YTD 2021
PSA 1	6	4	25	25
PSA 2	1	0	38	38
PSA 3	4	2	33	22
PSA 4	1	0	25	6
PSA 5	2	9	24	35
PSA 6	1	1	26	11
PSA 7	6	7	82	57
PSA 8	5	0	20	23
PSA 9	1	3	15	15
Total	27	26	288	232

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

	Dec 2020		Dec 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	7	18%	10	26%	112	30%	124	40%
Abuse of Authority (A)	19	50%	21	55%	193	51%	138	45%
Discourtesy (D)	9	24%	6	16%	55	15%	35	11%
Offensive Language (O)	3	8%	1	3%	15	4%	10	3%
Total	38	100%	38	100%	375	100%	307	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 42: Disposition of PSA Officers (2020 vs 2021)

	Dec 2020		Dec 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Full Investigations								
Substantiated	0	0%	3	50%	21	19%	15	32%
Within NYPD Guidelines	6	100%	2	33%	42	38%	12	26%
Unfounded	0	0%	0	0%	15	14%	5	11%
Unable to Determine	0	0%	0	0%	28	25%	14	30%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	1	17%	4	4%	1	2%
Total - Full Investigations	6		6		110		47	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	4	44%	2	11%	6	20%
Mediation Attempted	16	100%	5	56%	16	89%	24	80%
Total - ADR Closures	16		9		18		30	
Resolved Case Total	22	81%	15	58%	128	44%	77	33%
Unable to Investigate / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	0	0%	0	0%	24	15%	18	12%
Unable to Investigate	5	100%	1	11%	103	64%	90	59%
Closed - Pending Litigation	0	0%	8	89%	30	19%	41	27%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	1	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	5		9		160		153	
Total - Closed Cases	27		26		288		232	

*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 43: Mediated Complaints Closed

	December 2021			YTD 2021		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	20	14	34	120	140	260

Figure 44: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	December 2021			YTD 2021		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
	0	0	0	0	0	0
Force	2	1	3	17	27	44
Abuse of Authority	40	29	69	248	331	579
Discourtesy	9	3	12	47	53	100
Offensive Language	2	0	2	13	13	26
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	53	33	86	325	424	749

Figure 45: Mediated Complaints By Borough (December 2021)

	Mediations
	0
Bronx	4
Brooklyn	8
Manhattan	3
Queens	5
Staten Island	0

Figure 46: Mediated Allegations By Borough (December 2021)

	Mediations
	0
Bronx	23
Brooklyn	15
Manhattan	4
Queens	11
Staten Island	0

**Figure 47: Mediated Complaints By Precinct
(Dec 2021 - YTD 2021)**

Precinct	Dec 2021	YTD 2021	Precinct	Dec 2021	YTD 2021
0	0	1	67	0	1
5	0	2	68	0	2
9	0	2	69	4	4
10	0	2	70	0	4
14	1	4	71	0	4
17	0	1	72	0	1
18	1	5	73	0	4
19	0	2	75	1	4
23	0	1	76	0	1
25	0	2	77	0	4
28	0	1	79	0	5
32	0	1	81	1	3
34	1	2	84	0	3
40	2	3	88	0	2
41	1	4	90	1	3
42	0	1	100	0	1
44	0	3	101	1	1
45	0	1	102	0	4
47	0	1	103	1	5
48	0	2	104	0	1
50	0	1	105	2	4
52	1	4	109	1	1
61	1	2	113	0	1
62	0	1	115	0	2
63	0	2	120	0	1
			122	0	3

**Figure 48: Mediated Allegations By Precinct
(Dec 2021 - YTD 2021)**

Precinct	Dec 2021	YTD 2021	Precinct	Dec 2021	YTD 2021
0	0	1	67	0	1
5	0	5	68	0	3
9	0	17	69	5	5
10	0	2	70	0	6
14	2	11	71	0	16
17	0	5	72	0	4
18	1	10	73	0	8
19	0	6	75	3	11
23	0	1	76	0	3
25	0	3	77	0	24
28	0	4	79	0	16
32	0	2	81	4	11
34	1	2	84	0	6
40	8	9	88	0	7
41	11	25	90	2	5
42	0	3	100	0	3
44	0	6	101	1	1
45	0	1	102	0	9
47	0	1	103	4	16
48	0	5	104	0	2
50	0	2	105	4	7
52	4	9	109	2	2
61	1	2	113	0	14
62	0	1	115	0	4
63	0	3	120	0	1
			122	0	4

Administrative Prosecution Unit

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

Figure 49: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Dec 2021	YTD 2021
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	0	15
	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	1
	Disciplinary Action Total		0
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	0	6
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	4
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	5	6
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total		5
Not Adjudicated	Charges not served	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	1
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	4
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	0	0
	Retired	0	6
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total		0
	Total Closures	5	48

*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 50: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	December 2021	YTD 2021
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	5
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	2
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	14
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	0
Formalized Training**	0	0
Instructions***	0	0
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	0	21
No Disciplinary Action†	5	16
Adjudicated Total	5	37
Discipline Rate	0%	57%
Not Adjudicated† Total	0	11
Total Closures	5	48

*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 51: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	Disposition Type*	November 2021	YTD 2021
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	2	18
	Command Discipline B	0	15
	Command Discipline A	2	66
	Formalized Training**	3	79
	Instructions***	0	42
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total		7
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	3	10
	SOL Expired	0	1
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	17	28
	No Finding ††††	0	14
	Total	20	53
	Discipline Rate	26%	81%
	DUP Rate	63%	10%

*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 52: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (November 2021)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Gun Pointed	6	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Gun Drawn	6	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	6	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	6	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	6	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	6	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	10	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	26	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	28	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search of recording device	34	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	40	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	40	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	40	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	40	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	45	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	45	Bronx	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Question	45	Bronx	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	47	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	47	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	47	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	47	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	47	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	47	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	50	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	50	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	60	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	60	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Restricted Breathing	60	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Property damaged	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search of Premises	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search of Premises	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	75	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	77	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	77	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	77	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	77	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	77	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	77	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search (of person)	77	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search (of person)	77	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Entry of Premises	79	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Entry of Premises	79	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	79	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	79	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	79	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	79	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	108	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide shield number	108	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	120	Staten Island	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	120	Staten Island	No Discipline

Figure 53: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (December 2021)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Pepper spray		Manhattan	No Discipline (Retained, without discipline)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Pepper spray	6	Manhattan	No Discipline (Retained, without discipline)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Pepper spray	6	Manhattan	No Discipline (Retained, without discipline)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Pepper spray	6	Manhattan	No Discipline (Retained, without discipline)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Other	24	Manhattan	No Discipline (Retained, without discipline)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	90	Brooklyn	No Discipline (Retained, without discipline)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Nonlethal restraining device	90	Brooklyn	No Discipline (Retained, without 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 54: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	December 2021		November 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1000	28.1%	1031	28.8%	-31	-3.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	441	12.4%	411	11.5%	30	7.3%
Cases 8 Months	102	2.9%	177	5.0%	-75	-42.4%
Cases 9 Months	174	4.9%	151	4.2%	23	15.2%
Cases 10 Months	148	4.2%	175	4.9%	-27	-15.4%
Cases 11 Months	170	4.8%	129	3.6%	41	31.8%
Cases 12 Months	127	3.6%	118	3.3%	9	7.6%
Cases 13 Months	115	3.2%	135	3.8%	-20	-14.8%
Cases 14 Months	131	3.7%	111	3.1%	20	18.0%
Cases 15 Months	109	3.1%	100	2.8%	9	9.0%
Cases 16 Months	98	2.8%	76	2.1%	22	28.9%
Cases 17 Months	74	2.1%	165	4.6%	-91	-55.2%
Cases 18 Months	151	4.2%	200	5.6%	-49	-24.5%
Cases Over 18 Months	720	20.2%	595	16.6%	125	21.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	3560	100.0%	3574	100.0%	-14	-0.4%

Figure 55: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On CCRB Received Date

	December 2021		November 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1153	32.4%	1169	32.7%	-16	-1.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	429	12.1%	447	12.5%	-18	-4.0%
Cases 8 Months	134	3.8%	186	5.2%	-52	-28.0%
Cases 9 Months	181	5.1%	154	4.3%	27	17.5%
Cases 10 Months	150	4.2%	149	4.2%	1	0.7%
Cases 11 Months	147	4.1%	136	3.8%	11	8.1%
Cases 12 Months	132	3.7%	112	3.1%	20	17.9%
Cases 13 Months	106	3.0%	117	3.3%	-11	-9.4%
Cases 14 Months	114	3.2%	116	3.2%	-2	-1.7%
Cases 15 Months	114	3.2%	87	2.4%	27	31.0%
Cases 16 Months	82	2.3%	86	2.4%	-4	-4.7%
Cases 17 Months	83	2.3%	169	4.7%	-86	-50.9%
Cases 18 Months	154	4.3%	167	4.7%	-13	-7.8%
Cases Over 18 Months	581	16.3%	479	13.4%	102	21.3%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	3560	100.0%	3574	100.0%	-14	-0.4%

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

	December 2021		November 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	792	40.6%	783	39.2%	9	1.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	323	16.6%	309	15.5%	14	4.5%
Cases 8 Months	65	3.3%	118	5.9%	-53	-44.9%
Cases 9 Months	106	5.4%	86	4.3%	20	23.3%
Cases 10 Months	81	4.2%	101	5.1%	-20	-19.8%
Cases 11 Months	91	4.7%	66	3.3%	25	37.9%
Cases 12 Months	63	3.2%	67	3.4%	-4	-6.0%
Cases 13 Months	52	2.7%	62	3.1%	-10	-16.1%
Cases 14 Months	52	2.7%	38	1.9%	14	36.8%
Cases 15 Months	33	1.7%	39	2.0%	-6	-15.4%
Cases 16 Months	33	1.7%	27	1.4%	6	22.2%
Cases 17 Months	20	1.0%	52	2.6%	-32	-61.5%
Cases 18 Months	46	2.4%	72	3.6%	-26	-36.1%
Cases Over 18 Months	194	9.9%	176	8.8%	18	10.2%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1951	100.0%	1996	100.0%	-45	-2.3%

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

	December 2021	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	1	33.3%
Cases Over 18 Months	2	66.7%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	3	100.0%

Figure 58: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2021)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Within NYPD Guidelines		Unable to Determine		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	4	7%	14	24.6%	18	31.6%	10	17.5%	11	19.3%	0	0%
Gun fired	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	9	9.5%	11	11.6%	8	8.4%	1	1.1%	66	69.5%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Radio as club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	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	1	12.5%	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%	5	62.5%	0	0%
Vehicle	2	13.3%	0	0%	8	53.3%	1	6.7%	4	26.7%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	5	35.7%	3	21.4%	2	14.3%	0	0%	4	28.6%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	4	14.8%	3	11.1%	9	33.3%	8	29.6%	3	11.1%	0	0%
Chokehold	5	14.7%	0	0%	17	50%	8	23.5%	4	11.8%	0	0%
Pepper spray	12	26.1%	3	6.5%	5	10.9%	1	2.2%	25	54.3%	0	0%
Physical force	70	10%	234	33.6%	139	19.9%	64	9.2%	184	26.4%	6	0.9%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	7	23.3%	11	36.7%	11	36.7%	1	3.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	6	60%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	6	15%	0	0%	19	47.5%	8	20%	7	17.5%	0	0%
Less Than Lethal Force/Device	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	127	11.7%	285	26.3%	240	22.1%	107	9.9%	320	29.5%	6	0.6%

Figure 59: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2021)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Within NYPD Guidelines		Unable to Determine		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	0	0%	5	35.7%	3	21.4%	1	7.1%	5	35.7%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	43	21.4%	101	50.2%	43	21.4%	1	0.5%	10	5%	3	1.5%
Strip-searched	3	17.6%	0	0%	5	29.4%	9	52.9%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	2	5.9%	23	67.6%	5	14.7%	0	0%	4	11.8%	0	0%
Vehicle search	8	12.3%	42	64.6%	13	20%	0	0%	2	3.1%	0	0%
Threat of summons	4	26.7%	8	53.3%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	15	9.4%	60	37.7%	42	26.4%	16	10.1%	22	13.8%	4	2.5%
Threat to notify ACS	1	20%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	25	18.7%	38	28.4%	24	17.9%	16	11.9%	31	23.1%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	3	14.3%	8	38.1%	3	14.3%	5	23.8%	2	9.5%	0	0%
Property damaged	8	11.1%	15	20.8%	22	30.6%	9	12.5%	18	25%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	12	42.9%	1	3.6%	8	28.6%	0	0%	7	25%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	8	80%	0	0%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	6	19.4%	1	3.2%	16	51.6%	0	0%	8	25.8%	0	0%
Improper dissemination of medical info	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	15	65.2%	5	21.7%	2	8.7%	0	0%	1	4.3%	0	0%
Seizure of property	6	19.4%	21	67.7%	1	3.2%	1	3.2%	2	6.5%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	3	21.4%	0	0%	5	35.7%	4	28.6%	2	14.3%	0	0%
Frisk	21	29.2%	28	38.9%	18	25%	0	0%	5	6.9%	0	0%
Search (of person)	24	24%	27	27%	37	37%	0	0%	12	12%	0	0%
Stop	34	30.6%	36	32.4%	30	27%	0	0%	11	9.9%	0	0%
Question	5	15.6%	12	37.5%	7	21.9%	0	0%	8	25%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
Interference with recording	10	29.4%	5	14.7%	6	17.6%	3	8.8%	10	29.4%	0	0%
Search of recording device	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%
Forcible Removal to Hospital	10	10.4%	61	63.5%	14	14.6%	4	4.2%	6	6.2%	1	1%
Threat re: removal to hospital	2	11.8%	4	23.5%	7	41.2%	4	23.5%	0	0%	0	0%

Threat re: immigration status	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Disseminated immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Questioned immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Search of Premises	27	28.7%	36	38.3%	23	24.5%	1	1.1%	7	7.4%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	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)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Arrest)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Frisk)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Strip-Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Vehicle Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Photo/Video)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Summons)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Photography/Videography	2	25%	3	37.5%	0	0%	1	12.5%	2	25%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	9	10.7%	2	2.4%	34	40.5%	23	27.4%	16	19%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	12	11.4%	2	1.9%	41	39%	32	30.5%	18	17.1%	0	0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	37	40.7%	10	11%	28	30.8%	5	5.5%	10	11%	1	1.1%
Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	5	41.7%	0	0%	2	16.7%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%	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	5	55.6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11.1%	3	33.3%	0	0%
Obstructed Rank Designation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Sex Miscon (Humiliation: fail to cover)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Untruthful Statement	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sexual Miscon (Inappropriate Touching)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Forcible Touching)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Rape)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Sexual Assault)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (On-duty Sexual Activity)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Penetrative Sex. Contact)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unlawful Arrest	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unlawful Summons	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Enforcement Action	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	369	21%	556	31.6%	452	25.7%	143	8.1%	229	13%	9	0.5%

Figure 60: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2021)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Within NYPD Guidelines		Unable to Determine		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	102	24.1%	72	17%	109	25.7%	50	11.8%	90	21.2%	1	0.2%
Gesture	1	16.7%	0	0%	4	66.7%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Action	14	25.5%	3	5.5%	18	32.7%	13	23.6%	7	12.7%	0	0%
Other	6	85.7%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	123	24.9%	75	15.2%	132	26.7%	64	13%	99	20%	1	0.2%

Figure 61: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2021)

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Within NYPD Guidelines		Unable to Determine		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	5	31.2%	0	0%	3	18.8%	4	25%	4	25%	0	0%
Ethnicity	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%
Religion	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	4	44.4%	0	0%	3	33.3%	0	0%	2	22.2%	0	0%
Physical disability	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	17	51.5%	0	0%	7	21.2%	5	15.2%	4	12.1%	0	0%
Other Misconduct	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Failure to produce stop and frisk report	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
False official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Failure to document strip search	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Failure to prepare a memo book entry	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender Identity	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender	19	40.4%	0	0%	14	29.8%	8	17%	6	12.8%	0	0%
Improper use of body-worn camera	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Total	48	39.7%	2	1.7%	33	27.3%	18	14.9%	19	15.7%	1	0.8%

Figure 62: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (December 2021)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	0	0%
Trial commenced	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	14	6%
Case Re-Opened at ED's Request/Returned to Investigations	2	1%
Charges filed, awaiting service	40	18%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	144	66%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	1	0%
Calendared for court appearance	3	1%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	2	1%
Trial scheduled	8	4%
Previously adjudicated	4	2%
Total	218	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 63: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (December 2021)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	0	0%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	3	38%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	3	38%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	1	13%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	1	13%
Total	8	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 64: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	0	20	28	176
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	2	25	21	229
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	4	71	43	495
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	6	51	54	377
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	4	67	30	480
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	4	9	40	262
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	14	18	165
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	1	9	3	94
Special Operations Division Total	2	5	8	34
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	1	1	4
Total	23	272	246	2316
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	2	0	36
Transit Bureau Total	0	7	20	131
Housing Bureau Total	4	13	27	210
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	3	10	77
Detective Bureau Total	2	16	19	104
Other Bureaus Total	0	14	8	79
Total	6	55	84	637
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	2	14	12	73
Undetermined	1	8	8	43
Total	32	349	350	3069

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

Figure 65A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
001 Precinct	0	2	3	19
005 Precinct	0	1	3	11
006 Precinct	0	0	1	7
007 Precinct	0	3	4	28
009 Precinct	0	0	0	11
010 Precinct	0	1	0	6
013 Precinct	0	3	0	13
Midtown South Precinct	0	2	6	23
017 Precinct	0	5	0	15
Midtown North Precinct	0	0	5	15
Precincts Total	0	17	22	148
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	1	3	11
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	2	2	15
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	1	2
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	0	20	28	176

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

Figure 65B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
019 Precinct	0	2	1	20
020 Precinct	0	1	0	6
023 Precinct	0	3	1	24
024 Precinct	0	1	0	17
025 Precinct	1	2	7	36
026 Precinct	0	1	1	5
Central Park Precinct	0	0	0	2
028 Precinct	0	3	1	25
030 Precinct	0	1	2	13
032 Precinct	1	3	2	24
033 Precinct	0	1	5	21
034 Precinct	0	5	1	30
Precincts Total	2	23	21	223
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	1	0	2
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	0	4
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	2	25	21	229

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

Figure 65C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
040 Precinct	0	3	3	34
041 Precinct	0	9	2	49
042 Precinct	0	3	1	46
043 Precinct	0	1	2	18
044 Precinct	3	11	7	74
045 Precinct	1	4	1	23
046 Precinct	0	9	5	57
047 Precinct	0	4	4	38
048 Precinct	0	4	3	30
049 Precinct	0	1	0	16
050 Precinct	0	4	1	21
052 Precinct	0	16	8	64
Precincts Total	4	69	37	470
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	2	6	18
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	7
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	4	71	43	495

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

Figure 65D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
060 Precinct	1	4	4	34
061 Precinct	0	0	8	28
062 Precinct	0	3	0	10
063 Precinct	0	0	0	16
066 Precinct	0	0	0	11
067 Precinct	2	9	9	52
068 Precinct	0	3	0	20
069 Precinct	0	3	3	36
070 Precinct	0	5	8	40
071 Precinct	0	4	3	36
072 Precinct	0	4	10	34
076 Precinct	0	5	2	21
078 Precinct	0	2	4	18
Precincts Total	3	42	51	356
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	3	9	3	20
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	6	51	54	377

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

Figure 65E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
073 Precinct	0	8	4	50
075 Precinct	0	23	5	199
077 Precinct	0	3	3	43
079 Precinct	0	8	4	47
081 Precinct	0	3	4	28
083 Precinct	0	2	1	27
084 Precinct	0	5	1	18
088 Precinct	0	1	1	17
090 Precinct	3	11	5	37
094 Precinct	1	3	1	11
Precincts Total	4	67	29	477
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	0	1	2
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	4	67	30	480

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

Figure 65F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
100 Precinct	0	0	0	12
101 Precinct	0	0	2	27
102 Precinct	0	3	7	38
103 Precinct	4	4	16	73
105 Precinct	0	1	1	32
106 Precinct	0	0	2	21
107 Precinct	0	1	0	12
113 Precinct	0	0	10	39
Precincts Total	4	9	38	254
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	2	6
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	4	9	40	262

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

Figure 65G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
104 Precinct	0	1	2	22
108 Precinct	0	1	1	13
109 Precinct	0	2	7	27
110 Precinct	0	1	0	14
111 Precinct	0	6	0	17
112 Precinct	0	0	0	17
114 Precinct	0	0	3	32
115 Precinct	0	2	5	18
Precincts Total	0	13	18	160
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	1	0	4
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	14	18	165

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

Figure 65H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
120 Precinct	0	5	1	39
122 Precinct	0	0	0	18
123 Precinct	0	0	0	8
121 Precinct	0	2	1	21
Precincts Total	0	7	2	86
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	1	1	1	2
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	1	0	6
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Housing Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Court Section	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	1	9	3	94

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

Figure 65I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	1	3	7	24
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	0
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	1	0	1
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	0
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	0	0	6
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	2
Disorder control	1	1	1	1
Special Operations Division Total	2	5	8	34

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

Figure 65J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Chiefs Office	0	1	1	4
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	1	1	4

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

Figure 65K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	18
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	0
Bus Unit	0	0	0	0
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	3
Highway Unit #1	0	1	0	2
Highway Unit #2	0	0	0	5
Highway Unit #3	0	1	0	7
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	1
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Division Total	0	2	0	36

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

Figure 65L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	1	0	1
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	1
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	0	0	4	5
TB DT02	0	1	5	15
TB DT03	0	1	2	8
TB DT04	0	2	3	22
TB DT11	0	0	0	5
TB DT12	0	0	0	9
TB DT20	0	0	0	6
TB DT23	0	0	0	2
TB DT30	0	0	0	9
TB DT32	0	0	1	14
TB DT33	0	0	2	17
TB DT34	0	0	0	2
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	2	3
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	0	0	2
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	2
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	2	0	5
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	0
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	0	1	2
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	0	7	20	131

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

Figure 65M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
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	5	22
PSA 2	0	0	0	35
PSA 3	0	2	1	18
PSA 4	0	0	0	6
PSA 5	1	2	9	30
PSA 6	0	0	1	10
PSA 7	1	6	7	49
PSA 8	0	0	0	23
PSA 9	1	1	3	15
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	1	1	1	1
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	4	13	27	210
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	0	1
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	4	13	27	210

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

Figure 65N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Queens Narcotics	0	0	5	17
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	1	2	15
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	3
Bronx Narcotics	0	2	0	7
Staten Island Narcotics	0	0	3	9
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	0	8
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	0	0	12
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	2
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	4
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	3	10	77

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

Figure 650: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	0	2
Special Victims Division	0	1	1	2
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	1
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	1
Gang Division	0	0	0	0
Detective Borough Bronx	0	3	3	20
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	4	2	23
Detective Borough Brooklyn	2	8	9	34
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	4	18
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	0	3
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	2	16	19	104

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

Figure 65P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	4
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	0	14	7	65
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	1
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	1
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	2
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	1	6
Other Bureaus Total	0	14	8	79

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

Figure 65Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Dec 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Dec 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - Legal Bureau	0	0	0	3
DC Training	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy Training	1	1	2	7
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	1	1	2	4
Police Commissioner Office	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Division	0	0	0	0
Chief of Community Affairs	0	2	0	5
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	2
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	9	5	39
Chief of Department	0	1	3	10
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	2
Office of Management, Analysis and Planning	0	0	0	0
Quality Assurance Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Counterterrorism	0	0	0	1
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	2	14	12	73

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