



BILL DE BLASIO
MAYOR

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



FREDERICK DAVIE
CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report
July 2019
(Statistics for June 2019)

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	20
Substantiation Rates and Video	21
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints	22
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Allegations	24
Truncations	28
Complaints by PSA	29
Mediation Unit	31
Administrative Prosecution Unit	33
NYPD Discipline	34
Appendix	39

Executive Summary

The Civilian Complaint Review Board (“CCRB”) is an independent municipal Agency that investigates complaints of NYPD misconduct. Every month, the CCRB prepares an Executive Director report for its public meeting. Data for June 2019 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 73% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 88% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In June, the CCRB opened 473 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 2,016 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 26% of its fully investigated cases (page 16).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 42% of the cases it closed in June (page 12) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 49% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency's truncation rate was 49% (page 12). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.
- 4) For June, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 31% of cases - compared to 19% of cases in which video was not available (page 20-21).
- 5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6, 25-27).
- 6) In June the Police Commissioner finalized 3 decisions against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases; 2 were guilty verdicts won by the APU (page 33). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 14 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 2 trials were conducted against respondent officers in June.

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 June 2019, the CCRB initiated 473 new complaints.

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




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





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



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Of the five boroughs, the largest number of misconduct complaints stemmed from incidents occurring in Brooklyn, followed by Bronx. The 75th Precinct had the highest number at 36 incidents.

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




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




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


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	4	67	11
5	4	68	7
6	5	69	5
7	2	70	8
9	7	71	12
10	4	72	2
13	5	73	12
14	10	75	36
17	2	76	1
18	13	77	6
19	2	78	3
20	3	79	11
23	6	81	3
24	2	83	7
25	7	84	2
26	5	88	2
28	5	90	6
32	6	94	1
33	3	100	1
34	7	101	4
40	10	102	6
41	4	103	6
42	15	104	5
43	13	105	7
44	16	106	2
45	2	107	3
46	14	108	4
47	13	109	8
48	10	110	1
49	8	111	1
50	4	112	4
52	15	113	4
60	10	114	4
61	4	115	6
62	7	120	6
63	2	121	1
66	1	122	4
		123	3
		Unknown	8

*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 June 2018 to June 2019, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is up, Abuse of Authority complaints are up, Discourtesy are up and Offensive Language are up. Figures for the year-to-date comparison show that in 2019, complaints containing an allegation of Force are up, Abuse of Authority are up, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (June 2018 vs. June 2019)




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

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

	June 2018		June 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	133	37%	161	34%	28	21%
Abuse of Authority (A)	272	76%	369	78%	97	36%
Discourtesy (D)	98	27%	101	21%	3	3%
Offensive Language (O)	21	6%	35	7%	14	67%
Total FADO Allegations	524		666		142	27%
Total Complaints	357		473		116	32%

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

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



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

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

	YTD 2018		YTD 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	817	38%	1028	38%	211	26%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1656	76%	2106	79%	450	27%
Discourtesy (D)	639	29%	579	22%	-60	-9%
Offensive Language (O)	155	7%	149	6%	-6	-4%
Total FADO Allegations	3267		3862		595	18%
Total Complaints	2175		2673		498	23%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	June 2018		June 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	272	24%	329	22%	57	21%
Abuse of Authority (A)	673	60%	985	66%	312	46%
Discourtesy (D)	140	13%	132	9%	-8	-6%
Offensive Language (O)	28	3%	42	3%	14	50%
Total Allegations	1113		1488		375	34%
Total Complaints	357		473		116	32%

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

	YTD 2018		YTD 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	1703	23%	2195	22%	492	29%
Abuse of Authority (A)	4563	62%	6826	68%	2263	50%
Discourtesy (D)	914	12%	803	8%	-111	-12%
Offensive Language (O)	208	3%	184	2%	-24	-12%
Total Allegations	7388		10008		2620	35%
Total Complaints	2175		2673		498	23%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of June 2019, 73% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 88% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

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

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1330	72.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	287	15.7%
Cases 8-11 Months	160	8.7%
Cases 12-18 Months*	49	2.7%
Cases Over 18 Months**	6	0.3%
Total	1832	100%

*12-18 Months: 10 cases that were reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 2 cases that were reopened; 4 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1204	65.7%
Cases 5-7 Months	309	16.9%
Cases 8-11 Months	211	11.5%
Cases 12-18 Months*	91	5.0%
Cases Over 18 Months**	17	0.9%
Total	1832	100%

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

**Over18 Months: 3 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 2018 - June 2019)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	May 2019		June 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	1190	60%	1239	61%	49	4%
Pending Board Review	606	31%	593	29%	-13	-2%
Mediation	178	9%	179	9%	1	1%
On DA Hold	7	0%	5	0%	-2	-29%
Total	1981		2016		35	2%

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	348	48.5%
30 <= Days < 60	256	35.7%
60 <= Days < 90	69	9.6%
90 <= Days	45	6.3%
Total	718	100%

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




Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In June 2019, the CCRB fully investigated 42% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 49% of the cases it closed.

Figure 20: Case Resolutions (January 2018 - June 2019) (%)



Dispositions

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

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

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

Case Abstracts

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

1. Substantiated

An officer, acting in a law enforcement capacity, engaged in a text message conversation with a domestic violence victim regarding a case he was investigating. During the text conversation, the officer made a sexually suggestive remark to the individual about her gender and appearance. A copy of the texts was provided to the CCRB. During his statement, the officer confirmed that he had sent the message. He stated the text was an effort to compliment the individual since she had a long history of bad relationships with men. The investigation determined that the officer abused his authority by making a sexually suggestive remark to the individual. The Board substantiated the allegation.

2. Unsubstantiated

Officers responded to a dispute at a vehicle repair shop between an individual and a mechanic. While investigating the dispute, an officer allegedly told the mechanic that if he did not release the vehicle, he would be arrested for holding the vehicle hostage. Both officers were consistent in their statements that while they instructed the mechanic to release the vehicle, neither they, nor any other officer, threatened to arrest him. The individual involved in the dispute also stated that he did not hear an officer threaten to arrest anyone—however, the investigation determined that the individual could not be credited as an independent third-party since he had called 911 to report his dispute with the mechanic. Given the conflicting statements, lack of independent third-party testimony, or video footage or documentary evidence capturing the allegation, the investigation was unable to determine by a preponderance of evidence whether the officer threatened to arrest the individual. The Board unsubstantiated the allegation.

3. Unfounded

An individual went to the stationhouse to file a complaint. While waiting to speak to the desk sergeant, an officer leaving the stationhouse allegedly pushed the individual in the mid-section of her back, towards the stationhouse doors. Video footage returned from the stationhouse lobby captured the incident and did not show the officer pushing the individual out of the door. Based on the stationhouse video footage, the investigation determined that the officer did not use force against the individual. The Board unfounded the allegation.

4. Exonerated


Officers approached an individual with an open I-card (an “investigation card,” which is a type of document issued by the NYPD to denote when a suspect or person of interest is wanted for questioning), who in response, provided a false name before running away. Officers proceeded to chase the individual, until an officer took him to the ground. Body-worn camera footage and surveillance video captured the incident. Because the individual ran from officers to evade lawful arrest, the investigation determined it was reasonable for officers to forcibly take down the individual in order to apprehend him. As a result, the Board exonerated the force allegation.

5. Officer Unidentified

An individual was double-parked, when an unmarked vehicle pulled up next to her. An unidentified male officer then rolled down his window, gave the individual the middle finger, and drove off. The investigation obtained no video footage of this incident, and there were no summonses or arrests. The individual estimated the subject officer’s height and provided a 20-year possible age range. However, by her own account, the individual only viewed this officer briefly while he was across the street from her and partially obscured by a tinted car window and car door. With the limited information that she did provide, searches to determine additional information yielded negative results. As a result, the investigation was left with a total of 29 officers who were assigned to unmarked vehicles and potentially operating in the incident area. Furthermore, the investigation obtained no direct evidence that the discourteous gesture was made by an NYPD officer. While the individual believed that the person she observed was an officer she had observed take police action in the past, she was not sure of it. In this incident, the unmarked vehicle and its occupants took no police action that would have been documented, and the individual observed no police uniforms, equipment, or IDs. Based on the large pool of potential subjects that could not be narrowed down by physical descriptions or NYPD documents, and the fact that the CCRB could not conclusively determine that the individual interacted with an NYPD officer, the investigation could not determine, by a preponderance of the evidence, who made a discourteous gesture towards the individual. The Board closed the allegation as officer unidentified.


Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 21: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (June 2019)



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

Figure 22: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2019)



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

Dispositions - All CCRB Cases

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

Figure 23: Disposition of Cases (2018 vs 2019)

	Jun 2018		Jun 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
Full Investigations	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Substantiated	11	22%	48	26%	112	19%	182	23%
Exonerated	9	18%	44	24%	96	16%	177	22%
Unfounded	3	6%	12	6%	47	8%	63	8%
Unsubstantiated	24	47%	74	40%	287	48%	315	40%
MOS Unidentified	4	8%	7	4%	50	8%	55	7%
Total - Full Investigations	51		185		592		792	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	13	46%	15	50%	120	48%	90	37%
Mediation Attempted	15	54%	15	50%	132	52%	151	63%
Total - ADR Closures	28		30		252		241	
Resolved Case Total	79	24%	215	49%	844	43%	1033	38%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	50	20%	37	17%	185	17%	351	21%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	129	52%	112	50%	604	55%	810	48%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	37	15%	33	15%	153	14%	282	17%
Alleged Victim unidentified	4	2%	4	2%	13	1%	32	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	27	11%	31	14%	137	12%	208	12%
Miscellaneous	2	1%	1	0%	4	0%	6	0%
Administrative closure**	0	0%	6	3%	4	0%	11	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	249		224		1100		1700	
Total - Closed Cases	328		439		1944		2733	

* 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 11% for the month of June 2019, and the allegation substantiation rate is 12% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is Discourtesy – substantiating 23% of such allegations during June 2019, and 19% for the year.

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2018 vs 2019)

	Jun 2018		Jun 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Fully Investigated Allegations								
Substantiated	18	7%	87	11%	280	10%	422	12%
Unsubstantiated	94	37%	283	35%	1067	39%	1174	33%
Unfounded	21	8%	71	9%	244	9%	305	9%
Exonerated	92	36%	310	39%	864	31%	1262	36%
MOS Unidentified	29	11%	50	6%	292	11%	372	11%
Total - Full Investigations	254		801		2747		3535	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	34	47%	48	55%	265	43%	216	33%
Mediation Attempted	39	53%	40	45%	348	57%	429	67%
Total - ADR Closures	73		88		613		645	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	109	17%	85	13%	436	15%	900	18%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	375	57%	304	46%	1687	57%	2507	50%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	91	14%	88	13%	349	12%	678	13%
Alleged Victim unidentified	5	1%	11	2%	30	1%	103	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	71	11%	135	21%	429	14%	790	16%
Miscellaneous	9	1%	13	2%	30	1%	48	1%
Administrative closure	0	0%	19	3%	14	0%	27	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	660		655		2975		5053	
Total - Closed Allegations	987		1544		6335		9234	

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	11 5%	67 33%	81 40%	31 15%	13 6%	203 100%
Abuse of Authority	52 11%	158 32%	221 45%	32 7%	24 5%	487 100%
Discourtesy	22 23%	49 51%	8 8%	7 7%	11 11%	97 100%
Offensive Language	2 14%	9 64%	0 0%	1 7%	2 14%	14 100%
Total	87 11%	283 35%	310 39%	71 9%	50 6%	801 100%


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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	60 8%	241 31%	297 38%	118 15%	60 8%	776 100%
Abuse of Authority	278 12%	692 31%	935 41%	118 5%	241 11%	2264 100%
Discourtesy	77 19%	194 48%	29 7%	53 13%	54 13%	407 100%
Offensive Language	7 8%	47 53%	1 1%	16 18%	17 19%	88 100%
Total	422 12%	1174 33%	1262 36%	305 9%	372 11%	3535 100%

Substantiation Rates

The June 2019 case substantiation rate was 26%.

Figure 27: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2018 - June 2019)




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

Substantiation Rates and Video


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

Figure 28: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations without Video (Jan 2019 - Jun 2019) (% substantiated shown)



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

Figure 29: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2019 - Jun 2019)
 (% substantiated shown)



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

Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints

After a CCRB investigative team has completed its investigation and recommended the substantiation of a complaint against an officer, a panel of three Board members determines whether to substantiate the allegation and make a disciplinary recommendation.

- “Charges and Specifications” are the most severe form of discipline. A decision to assign Charges commences a process that may result in an administrative trial in the NYPD Trial Room. An officer may lose vacation days, be suspended, or be terminated from the Department if the officer is found guilty.
- “Instructions” or “Formalized Training” are the least severe discipline, often recommended for officers who misunderstand a policy. This determination results in training at the command level (Instructions) or training at the Police Academy or NYPD Legal Bureau (Formalized Training).
- “Command Discipline” is recommended for misconduct that is moderately serious, but does not rise to the level of that associated with Charges. An officer can lose up to ten vacation days as a result of a Command Discipline.
- When the Board has recommended Instructions, Formalized Training or Command Discipline, the case is sent to the NYPD Commissioner to impose training and/or other penalties. Cases where the Board recommends charges are prosecuted by the CCRB’s Administrative Prosecution Unit.


**Figure 30: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints*
(Jun 2018, Jun 2019, YTD 2018, YTD 2019)**

Disposition	June 2018		June 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	1	9%	8	17%	29	26%	31	17%
Command Discipline	2	18%	15	31%	45	40%	71	39%
Formalized Training	4	36%	10	21%	15	13%	40	22%
Instructions	4	36%	15	31%	23	21%	40	22%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	11		48		112		182	

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

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

Figure 31: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints* (2019)



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

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

Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations

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

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

Figure 32: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations*
(Jun 2018, Jun 2019, YTD 2018, YTD 2019)

Disposition	June 2018		June 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	1	7.1%	15	22.7%	46	27.1%	48	19%
Command Discipline	4	28.6%	20	30.3%	70	41.2%	98	38.7%
Formalized Training	5	35.7%	12	18.2%	22	12.9%	52	20.6%
Instructions	4	28.6%	19	28.8%	32	18.8%	55	21.7%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	14		66		170		253	

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

* The counts in this table reflect the number of distinct MOS with a substantiated allegation in each complaint.

Figure 33: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (June 2019)

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	5	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	5	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	10	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Action	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	19	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat re: immigration status	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	52	Bronx

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	61	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	61	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	63	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	66	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	66	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	66	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	66	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Gun fired	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Gun fired	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	68	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	68	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	68	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	68	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Chokehold	68	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Offensive Language	Other	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Other	76	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat to notify ACS	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	102	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	102	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Pepper spray	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	OMN	Other Misconduct	102	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	105	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	108	Queens

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	108	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	113	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	113	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	114	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to show search warrant	114	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to show search warrant	114	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Offensive Language	Gender	120	Outside NYC
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	1000	Manhattan

Truncations

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

Figure 34: Truncated Allegations (June 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	13	62	26	1	69	171
Abuse of Authority	59	220	53	10	59	401
Discourtesy	13	17	7	0	7	44
Offensive Language	0	5	2	0	0	7
Total	85	304	88	11	135	623

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (June 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	37	112	33	4	31	217

Figure 36: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	149	462	253	21	383	1268
Abuse of Authority	625	1790	364	73	357	3209
Discourtesy	104	211	47	8	46	416
Offensive Language	22	44	14	1	4	85
Total	900	2507	678	103	790	4978

Figure 37: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	351	810	282	32	208	1683

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

Complaints Against Officers Assigned to Police Service Areas

The Police Service Areas (PSA) are commands that police New York City Housing Developments throughout the five boroughs. PSA complaints are defined as complaints that contain at least one FADO allegation against an officer assigned to a PSA command.

Figure 38: PSA Complaints Closed as % of Total Complaints Closed

	Jun 2018	Jun 2019	YTD 2018	YTD 2019
PSA Complaints	11	12	87	90
Total Complaints	328	439	1944	2733
PSA Complaints as % of Total	3.4%	2.7%	4.5%	3.3%

A single PSA complaint may contain allegations against multiple officers assigned to multiple PSA commands. The following table breaks out the different PSAs and shows the number of officers assigned to each PSA against whom FADO allegations have been made.

Figure 39: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

	Jun 2018	Jun 2019	YTD 2018	YTD 2019
PSA 1	3	1	13	21
PSA 2	2	1	34	20
PSA 3	2	1	10	7
PSA 4	0	8	18	41
PSA 5	6	2	15	16
PSA 6	1	3	18	17
PSA 7	0	0	36	9
PSA 8	3	0	12	12
PSA 9	1	2	13	12
Total	18	18	169	155

Complaints typically contain more than one allegation. The following table shows the allegations made against officers assigned to PSA commands broken out by FADO type.

Figure 40: Closed Allegations Against Officers Assigned to a PSA by FADO Type

	Jun 2018		Jun 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	7	29%	6	24%	63	27%	61	30%
Abuse of Authority (A)	11	46%	14	56%	128	56%	112	56%
Discourtesy (D)	6	25%	4	16%	30	13%	19	9%
Offensive Language (O)	0	0%	1	4%	9	4%	9	4%
Total	24	100%	25	100%	230	100%	201	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 41: Disposition of PSA Officers (2018 vs 2019)

Full Investigations	Jun 2018		Jun 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	1	17%	3	20%	14	15%	11	15%
Exonerated	2	33%	5	33%	21	23%	23	32%
Unfounded	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	4	6%
Unsubstantiated	3	50%	7	47%	56	61%	33	46%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	6		15		92		71	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	1	33%	3	14%	5	26%
Mediation Attempted	4	100%	2	67%	18	86%	14	74%
Total - ADR Closures	4		3		21		19	
Resolved Case Total	10	56%	18	100%	113	67%	90	58%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	1	12%	0	NaN%	11	20%	10	15%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	2	25%	0	NaN%	25	45%	35	54%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	2	25%	0	NaN%	6	11%	10	15%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	NaN%	0	0%	1	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	2	25%	0	NaN%	13	23%	9	14%
Miscellaneous	1	12%	0	NaN%	1	2%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	NaN%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	8		0		56		65	
Total - Closed Cases	18		18		169		155	

* 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 June and this year.

Figure 42: Mediated Complaints Closed

	June 2019			YTD 2019		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	15	15	30	90	151	241

Figure 43: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	June 2019			YTD 2019		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	4	7	11	8	44	52
Abuse of Authority	42	26	68	179	323	502
Discourtesy	2	5	7	22	50	72
Offensive Language	0	2	2	7	12	19
Total	48	40	88	216	429	645

Figure 44: Mediated Complaints By Borough (June 2019)

	Mediations
Bronx	3
Brooklyn	2
Manhattan	5
Queens	5
Staten Island	0

Figure 45: Mediated Allegations By Borough (June 2019)

	Mediations
Bronx	15
Brooklyn	3
Manhattan	16
Queens	14
Staten Island	0

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

Precinct	Jun 2019	YTD 2019	Precinct	Jun 2019	YTD 2019
1	1	2	62	0	1
5	0	1	67	1	3
6	1	2	70	0	1
7	0	2	71	0	2
9	2	4	72	0	2
13	0	1	73	0	1
14	0	2	75	0	4
17	1	1	77	1	1
18	0	3	78	0	1
19	0	1	83	0	1
20	0	1	90	0	1
22	0	1	100	0	3
25	0	2	102	0	1
28	0	2	103	0	1
32	0	1	104	1	3
33	0	1	107	1	1
42	1	1	108	0	1
44	1	5	111	0	1
46	0	2	112	1	1
47	0	7	113	0	1
48	1	1	114	2	3
50	0	1	115	0	1
52	0	2	120	0	2
60	0	3	121	0	2
61	0	1	122	0	1

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

Precinct	Jun 2019	YTD 2019	Precinct	Jun 2019	YTD 2019
1	2	4	62	0	2
5	0	2	67	2	9
6	2	3	70	0	2
7	0	7	71	0	6
9	8	13	72	0	3
13	0	1	73	0	2
14	0	5	75	0	16
17	4	4	77	1	1
18	0	8	78	0	1
19	0	3	83	0	2
20	0	1	90	0	3
22	0	1	100	0	3
25	0	7	102	0	2
28	0	5	103	0	6
32	0	3	104	1	5
33	0	1	107	8	8
42	10	10	108	0	1
44	2	6	111	0	1
46	0	3	112	1	1
47	0	11	113	0	3
48	3	3	114	4	10
50	0	1	115	0	3
52	0	3	120	0	5
60	0	3	121	0	5
61	0	2	122	0	6

Administrative Prosecution Unit

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

Figure 48: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Jun 2019	YTD 2019
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	2	5
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. A imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. B imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Formalized Training imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Instructions imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Guilty	0	0
	Resolved by plea	0	1
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. B	0	0
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. A	0	0
	Plea set aside, Formalized Training	0	0
	Plea set aside, Instructions	0	0
	*Retained, with discipline	1	2
	Disciplinary Action Total		3
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	0	6
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	0
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	0	0
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total		0
Not Adjudicated	Charges not filed	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	2	5
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total		2
	Total Closures	5	19

*Retained cases are those in which the Department kept jurisdiction pursuant to Section 2 of the April 2, 2012 Memorandum of Understanding between the NYPD and the CCRB.

** When the Department keeps jurisdiction pursuant to Section 2 and does not impose any discipline on the officer, it is the equivalent of a category referred to as "Department Unable to Prosecute" (DUP). Cases are referred to as DUP when the department decides that it will not discipline an officer against whom the Board recommended discipline other than charges.

*** In some cases, the Department conducts its own investigation and prosecution prior to the completion of the CCRB's investigation. In those cases, the APU does not conduct a second prosecution.

† Under the Board's reconsideration process, an officer who has charges recommended as the penalty for a substantiated allegation may have the recommended penalty changed to something other than charges or have the disposition changed to something other than substantiated. In those cases, the APU ceases its prosecution.

NYPD Discipline

Under the New York City Charter, the Police Commissioner makes the final decision regarding discipline and the outcome of disciplinary trials.

The first chart reflects NYPD-imposed discipline for cases brought by the APU (Charges).

The chart on the following page reflects cases referred to the Police Commissioner where the Board recommended Command Discipline, Formalized Training or Instructions.

Figure 49: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	June 2019	YTD 2019
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	1	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	2
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	1	3
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	1	1
Formalized Training**	0	0
Instructions***	0	1
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	3	8
No Disciplinary Action†	0	6
Adjudicated Total	3	14
Discipline Rate	100%	57%
Not Adjudicated† Total	2	5
Total Closures	5	19

*Where more than one penalty is imposed on a respondent, it is reported under the more severe penalty.

** Formalized training is conducted by the Police Academy, the NYPD Legal Bureau, or other NYPD Unit.

*** Instructions are conducted at the command level.

† The case closure types that define the "Disciplinary Action", "No Disciplinary Action" and "Not Adjudicated" categories are listed in Figure 43 on the previous page.

Figure 50: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	Disposition Type*	June 2019	YTD 2019
Disciplinary Action	Terminated	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	1	1
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	0
	Command Discipline B	2	3
	Command Discipline A	5	24
	Formalized Training**	3	46
	Instructions***	5	37
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total		16
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	2	2
	SOL Expired	0	0
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	0	20
	No Finding ††††	0	5
	Total	2	27
	Discipline Rate	89%	80%
	DUP Rate	0%	14%

*Where the respondent is found guilty of charges, and the penalty imposed would fall into more than one of the above listed categories, it is reported under the more severe penalty.

** Formalized training is conducted by the Police Academy, the NYPD Legal Bureau, or other NYPD Unit.

*** Instructions are conducted at the command level.

† Trial outcomes in non-APU cases typically involve MOS who turned down command discipline, prompting the police department to proceed with charges.

†† "Filed" is a term used when the police department is not required to take action against the subject officer because the officer has resigned or retired from the department, or has been terminated.

††† When the department decides that it will not discipline an officer against whom the Board recommended discipline other than charges, those cases are referred to as "Department Unable to Prosecute," or DUP.

†††† "No Finding" refers to cases which the department reports as "Administratively Closed."

Figure 51: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (June 2019)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	6	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	6	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	6	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle search	25	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	26	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Property damaged	40	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide shield number	44	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	45	Bronx	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of arrest	45	Bronx	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Property damaged	45	Bronx	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	45	Bronx	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	45	Bronx	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	45	Bronx	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	45	Bronx	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	E	Other	45	Bronx	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	45	Bronx	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	45	Bronx	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Pepper spray	84	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Pepper spray	84	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	84	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	101	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to provide shield number	101	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	108	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	108	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	109	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	109	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Interference with recording	111	Queens	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search of recording device	111	Queens	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Action	113	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	114	Queens	Command Discipline A

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	122	Staten Island	Command Discipline A

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

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Gun Pointed	19	Manhattan	Dismissal Probation
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Gun as club	19	Manhattan	Dismissal Probation
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	19	Manhattan	Dismissal Probation
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Retaliatory arrest	77	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Seizure of property	77	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Frisk	77	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Search (of person)	77	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Search (of person)	77	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Stop	77	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	O	Gender	102	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 53: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	June 2019		May 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1336	66.4%	1265	64.1%	71	5.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	334	16.6%	348	17.6%	-14	-4.0%
Cases 8 Months	86	4.3%	72	3.6%	14	19.4%
Cases 9 Months	53	2.6%	76	3.9%	-23	-30.3%
Cases 10 Months	54	2.7%	45	2.3%	9	20.0%
Cases 11 Months	35	1.7%	33	1.7%	2	6.1%
Cases 12 Months	26	1.3%	32	1.6%	-6	-18.8%
Cases 13 Months	18	0.9%	20	1.0%	-2	-10.0%
Cases 14 Months	17	0.8%	22	1.1%	-5	-22.7%
Cases 15 Months	16	0.8%	24	1.2%	-8	-33.3%
Cases 16 Months	16	0.8%	10	0.5%	6	60.0%
Cases 17 Months	2	0.1%	4	0.2%	-2	-50.0%
Cases 18 Months	1	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	17	0.8%	22	1.1%	-5	-22.7%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	2011	100.0%	1974	100.0%	37	1.9%

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

	June 2019		May 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1480	73.6%	1406	71.2%	74	5.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	309	15.4%	337	17.1%	-28	-8.3%
Cases 8 Months	71	3.5%	60	3.0%	11	18.3%
Cases 9 Months	41	2.0%	52	2.6%	-11	-21.2%
Cases 10 Months	35	1.7%	27	1.4%	8	29.6%
Cases 11 Months	20	1.0%	25	1.3%	-5	-20.0%
Cases 12 Months	14	0.7%	29	1.5%	-15	-51.7%
Cases 13 Months	16	0.8%	11	0.6%	5	45.5%
Cases 14 Months	8	0.4%	8	0.4%	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	7	0.3%	7	0.4%	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	2	0.1%	3	0.2%	-1	-33.3%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	-2	NA
Cases 18 Months	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	6	0.3%	7	0.4%	-1	-14.3%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	2011	100.0%	1974	100.0%	37	1.9%

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

	June 2019		May 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	862	69.6%	847	71.2%	15	1.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	217	17.5%	190	16.0%	27	14.2%
Cases 8 Months	41	3.3%	35	2.9%	6	17.1%
Cases 9 Months	28	2.3%	31	2.6%	-3	-9.7%
Cases 10 Months	23	1.9%	16	1.3%	7	43.8%
Cases 11 Months	18	1.5%	14	1.2%	4	28.6%
Cases 12 Months	11	0.9%	6	0.5%	5	83.3%
Cases 13 Months	6	0.5%	11	0.9%	-5	-45.5%
Cases 14 Months	6	0.5%	11	0.9%	-5	-45.5%
Cases 15 Months	4	0.3%	13	1.1%	-9	-69.2%
Cases 16 Months	9	0.7%	1	0.1%	8	800.0%
Cases 17 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	12	1.0%	13	1.1%	-1	-7.7%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1239	100.0%	1190	100.0%	49	4.1%

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

	June 2019	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	1	20.0%
Cases 8 Months	1	20.0%
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	1	20.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	2	40.0%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	5	100.0%

Figure 57: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2019)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	1	2.6%	24	61.5%	7	17.9%	5	12.8%	2	5.1%	0	0%
Gun fired	2	28.6%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	0	0%	4	40%	2	20%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Radio as club	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%
Flashlight as club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Police shield	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	1	14.3%	5	71.4%	1	14.3%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	1	4.8%	7	33.3%	8	38.1%	3	14.3%	1	4.8%	1	4.8%
Chokehold	6	15.4%	0	0%	16	41%	12	30.8%	5	12.8%	0	0%
Pepper spray	1	11.1%	5	55.6%	0	0%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	0	0%
Physical force	31	5.7%	234	43.3%	161	29.8%	72	13.3%	40	7.4%	2	0.4%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	16	41%	17	43.6%	4	10.3%	2	5.1%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	0	0%	2	18.2%	6	54.5%	2	18.2%	1	9.1%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	2	5.3%	0	0%	20	52.6%	10	26.3%	5	13.2%	1	2.6%
Total	60	7.7%	297	38.1%	241	30.9%	118	15.1%	60	7.7%	4	0.5%

Figure 58: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2019)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	1	5.3%	10	52.6%	5	26.3%	2	10.5%	1	5.3%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	14	5.3%	200	76%	43	16.3%	2	0.8%	4	1.5%	0	0%
Strip-searched	7	26.9%	3	11.5%	11	42.3%	2	7.7%	3	11.5%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	3	2.7%	61	55%	26	23.4%	0	0%	21	18.9%	0	0%
Vehicle search	9	8.8%	42	41.2%	36	35.3%	2	2%	13	12.7%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	0	0%	5	83.3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Threat of summons	3	15%	7	35%	6	30%	1	5%	3	15%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	11	5.2%	101	47.4%	78	36.6%	9	4.2%	14	6.6%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	1	7.1%	9	64.3%	4	28.6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	11	11.6%	24	25.3%	34	35.8%	11	11.6%	14	14.7%	1	1.1%
Threat to damage/seize property	4	11.8%	11	32.4%	15	44.1%	0	0%	4	11.8%	0	0%
Property damaged	6	9.7%	10	16.1%	21	33.9%	6	9.7%	18	29%	1	1.6%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	13	24.5%	2	3.8%	28	52.8%	2	3.8%	8	15.1%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	9	15.5%	0	0%	37	63.8%	9	15.5%	3	5.2%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	8	80%	0	0%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	9	26.5%	1	2.9%	11	32.4%	8	23.5%	5	14.7%	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	9	26.5%	17	50%	5	14.7%	1	2.9%	2	5.9%	0	0%
Seizure of property	7	21.9%	15	46.9%	6	18.8%	1	3.1%	3	9.4%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	2	7.1%	1	3.6%	17	60.7%	4	14.3%	4	14.3%	0	0%
Frisk	28	21.1%	49	36.8%	27	20.3%	9	6.8%	20	15%	0	0%
Search (of person)	19	17.4%	38	34.9%	35	32.1%	3	2.8%	14	12.8%	0	0%
Stop	24	16.3%	68	46.3%	33	22.4%	8	5.4%	14	9.5%	0	0%
Question	7	13%	23	42.6%	15	27.8%	0	0%	9	16.7%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Interference with recording	7	18.4%	11	28.9%	9	23.7%	6	15.8%	5	13.2%	0	0%
Search of recording device	1	8.3%	0	0%	5	41.7%	2	16.7%	4	33.3%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0%	0	0%	3	37.5%	1	12.5%	4	50%	0	0%

Forcible Removal to Hospital	8	6.3%	110	86.6%	8	6.3%	0	0%	1	0.8%	0	0%
Threat re: removal to hospital	0	0%	4	33.3%	6	50%	0	0%	2	16.7%	0	0%
Threat re: immigration status	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Disseminated immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Questioned immigration status	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Search of Premises	6	4.2%	101	71.1%	23	16.2%	5	3.5%	7	4.9%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	3	33.3%	0	0%	3	33.3%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	8	66.7%	0	0%	2	16.7%	0	0%	2	16.7%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Arrest)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Frisk)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Strip-Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Vehicle Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Photo/Video)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Summons)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Photography/Videography	2	13.3%	3	20%	6	40%	0	0%	4	26.7%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	8	8.1%	1	1%	63	63.6%	13	13.1%	14	14.1%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	11	11.2%	3	3.1%	60	61.2%	10	10.2%	14	14.3%	0	0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	11	52.4%	4	19%	5	23.8%	0	0%	1	4.8%	0	0%
Total	278	12.3%	935	41.3%	692	30.5%	118	5.2%	241	10.6%	2	0.1%

Figure 59: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2019)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	68	19%	28	7.8%	161	45.1%	49	13.7%	50	14%	1	0.3%
Gesture	1	16.7%	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%	2	33.3%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Action	8	17.4%	1	2.2%	30	65.2%	4	8.7%	2	4.3%	1	2.2%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	77	18.8%	29	7.1%	194	47.4%	53	13%	54	13.2%	2	0.5%

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

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	1	3.6%	0	0%	16	57.1%	8	28.6%	3	10.7%	0	0%
Ethnicity	1	11.1%	0	0%	6	66.7%	2	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	4	44.4%	0	0%
Physical disability	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	2	16.7%	1	8.3%	7	58.3%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0%	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%
Gender	2	20%	0	0%	5	50%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%
Total	6	7.7%	1	1.3%	44	56.4%	13	16.7%	14	17.9%	0	0%

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

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	0	0%
Trial commenced	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	18	17%
Charges filed, awaiting service	25	24%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	43	42%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	3	3%
Calendared for court appearance	6	6%
Trial scheduled	5	5%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	3	3%
Total	103	100%

CORD is the CO's Report on MOS facing discipline.
 SoEH is the Summary of Employment History.
 DCS is the Disciplinary Cover Sheet.

Figure 62: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (June 2019)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	1	4%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	14	54%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	7	27%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	2	8%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	2	8%
Total	26	100%

A Fogel response is a letter to the Trial Commissioner with comments from the CCRB on the Trial Commissioner's report and recommendation.

Figure 63: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	6	13	38	180
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	6	27	47	292
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	12	51	102	558
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	16	41	76	356
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	2	34	53	387
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	9	25	48	324
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	2	11	43	181
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	4	27	156
Special Operations Division Total	0	1	10	27
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	2
Total	53	207	444	2463
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	3	40
Transit Bureau Total	5	11	31	131
Housing Bureau Total	3	12	22	167
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	1	8	18	104
Detective Bureau Total	2	5	13	102
Other Bureaus Total	1	6	12	77
Total	12	42	99	621
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	1	7	30
Undetermined	1	3	6	48
Total	66	253	556	3162

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

Figure 64A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
001 Precinct	0	0	5	16
005 Precinct	2	4	3	15
006 Precinct	0	0	4	16
007 Precinct	0	1	2	19
009 Precinct	0	0	5	16
010 Precinct	0	0	1	9
013 Precinct	0	0	3	16
Midtown South Precinct	0	0	2	26
017 Precinct	0	0	0	6
Midtown North Precinct	3	5	12	28
Precincts Total	5	10	37	167
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	1	3	1	12
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	6	13	38	180

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

Figure 64B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
019 Precinct	0	2	7	19
020 Precinct	0	0	0	13
023 Precinct	1	1	7	21
024 Precinct	0	0	6	15
025 Precinct	0	1	2	36
026 Precinct	0	0	2	14
Central Park Precinct	1	2	1	5
028 Precinct	0	3	0	22
030 Precinct	0	1	2	13
032 Precinct	1	2	7	32
033 Precinct	3	6	5	32
034 Precinct	0	7	6	57
Precincts Total	6	25	45	279
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	2	2	10
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	6	27	47	292

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

Figure 64C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
040 Precinct	1	3	3	39
041 Precinct	1	2	15	35
042 Precinct	0	5	6	50
043 Precinct	0	7	2	42
044 Precinct	3	8	18	70
045 Precinct	0	0	3	19
046 Precinct	1	8	12	73
047 Precinct	0	2	8	55
048 Precinct	0	5	6	50
049 Precinct	1	2	10	47
050 Precinct	0	3	2	16
052 Precinct	4	4	12	50
Precincts Total	11	49	97	546
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	1	1	2	3
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	1	3	8
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	12	51	102	558

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

Figure 64D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
060 Precinct	1	4	9	29
061 Precinct	0	0	10	21
062 Precinct	0	2	1	17
063 Precinct	1	5	5	27
066 Precinct	0	0	0	9
067 Precinct	0	2	11	59
068 Precinct	3	5	4	14
069 Precinct	0	2	4	23
070 Precinct	5	7	11	45
071 Precinct	3	8	7	51
072 Precinct	0	0	3	24
076 Precinct	1	1	3	12
078 Precinct	0	2	5	17
Precincts Total	14	38	73	348
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	0	1	1
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	2	3	2	7
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	16	41	76	356

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

Figure 64E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
073 Precinct	0	4	5	55
075 Precinct	0	5	5	73
077 Precinct	0	2	8	50
079 Precinct	1	9	10	50
081 Precinct	0	0	3	35
083 Precinct	0	6	1	30
084 Precinct	0	2	2	22
088 Precinct	0	3	4	21
090 Precinct	1	2	14	39
094 Precinct	0	0	1	9
Precincts Total	2	33	53	384
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	0	2
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	2	34	53	387

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

Figure 64F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
100 Precinct	0	0	1	27
101 Precinct	0	4	7	45
102 Precinct	5	7	11	35
103 Precinct	0	2	5	53
105 Precinct	1	6	9	58
106 Precinct	1	2	4	24
107 Precinct	0	1	1	15
113 Precinct	2	3	10	61
Precincts Total	9	25	48	318
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	0	5
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	0
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	9	25	48	324

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

Figure 64G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
104 Precinct	0	2	9	38
108 Precinct	1	2	3	12
109 Precinct	0	2	5	23
110 Precinct	0	1	1	12
111 Precinct	0	2	2	17
112 Precinct	0	0	2	6
114 Precinct	1	2	14	44
115 Precinct	0	0	5	24
Precincts Total	2	11	41	176
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	0	2	2
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	2	11	43	181

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

Figure 64H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
120 Precinct	0	0	13	64
122 Precinct	0	0	0	30
123 Precinct	0	3	6	28
121 Precinct	0	0	8	25
Precincts Total	0	3	27	147
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	1	0	7
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Staten Island Housing Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Court Section	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	4	27	156

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

Figure 64I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	1	10	24
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	1
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	0	0	0
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	0
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	0	0	2
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	0	1	10	27

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

Figure 64J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

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

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

Figure 64K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	1	1
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	2	22
Brooklyn Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Bronx Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Queens Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Surface Transportation Enforcement Division (STED)	0	0	0	1
Bus Unit	0	0	0	2
Traffic Control Parking Enforcement District	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Tow Units	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Summons Enforcement	0	0	0	0
Traffic Command Intersection Control	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Intelligence Unit	0	0	0	0
Highway District	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #1	0	0	0	6
Highway Unit #2	0	0	0	3
Highway Unit #3	0	0	0	4
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	1
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	3	40

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

Figure 64L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Authority Liaison	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Inspections	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Spec. Invest. Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Crime Analysis	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Patrol Operations	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	4	5	6	17
TB DT02	0	0	4	14
TB DT03	0	1	2	11
TB DT04	0	0	3	12
TB DT11	0	0	0	3
TB DT12	1	2	3	12
TB DT20	0	1	3	4
TB DT23	0	0	0	3
TB DT30	0	2	0	13
TB DT32	0	0	0	4
TB DT33	0	0	4	9
TB DT34	0	0	3	4
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	1	6
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	1	1
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	2
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	0	1	15
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	5	11	31	131

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

Figure 64M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	1	2	1	21
PSA 2	0	1	1	18
PSA 3	1	1	1	7
PSA 4	1	5	8	42
PSA 5	0	0	2	16
PSA 6	0	2	3	17
PSA 7	0	0	0	9
PSA 8	0	0	0	12
PSA 9	0	0	2	14
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Manhattan	0	0	1	2
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	3	12	22	167
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	3	6
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	1	0	2
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	1
Housing Bureau Total	3	12	22	167

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

Figure 64N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Queens Narcotics	0	1	3	16
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	3	0	13
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	8
Bronx Narcotics	0	1	2	16
Staten Island Narcotics	0	2	0	8
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	6	25
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	0	0	6
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	4	4
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Headquarters	1	1	3	8
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	1	8	18	104

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

Figure 640: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	2
Special Investigations Division	0	0	1	3
Special Victims Division	0	0	0	2
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	1
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	0	0	10
Detective Borough Bronx	0	0	2	19
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	3	1	26
Detective Borough Brooklyn	1	1	3	14
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	4	22
Detective Borough Staten Island	1	1	2	3
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	2	5	13	102

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

Figure 64P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	1	3
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	0	5	10	70
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	1
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	1
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	1	1	1	2
Other Bureaus Total	1	6	12	77

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

Figure 64Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Jun 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Jun 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - Legal Bureau	0	0	0	0
DC Training	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy Training	0	0	1	4
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	1	3
School Safety Queens/Brooklyn	0	0	1	1
Office of Equal Employment	0	0	0	1
Deputy Commissioner Operations	0	0	0	0
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	1	4	15
Chief of Department	0	0	0	1
Department Advocate	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Public Information	0	0	0	0
Crime Prevention	0	0	0	0
First Deputy Commissioner	0	0	0	0
Office of Management, Analysis and Planning	0	0	0	0
Quality Assurance Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Counterterrorism	0	0	0	2
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	1
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	1	7	30

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