



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

MAYA D. WILEY, ESQ.
CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report
February 2017
(Statistics for January 2017)

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Glossary	3
Complaints Received	4
CCRB Cases Received By Borough and Precinct	5
Allegations Received	7
CCRB Docket	10
Closed Cases	12
Resolving Cases	12
Dispositions / Case Abstracts	13
Dispositions - Full Investigations	15
Dispositions - All CCRB Cases	16
Dispositions - Allegations	17
Substantiation Rates	19
Substantiation Rates and Video	19
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints	20
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Allegations	22
Truncations	24
Mediation Unit	25
Administrative Prosecution Unit	27
NYPD Discipline	28
Appendix	33

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. In general, investigations are being conducted more efficiently than at any period in the Agency’s history. The raw number of substantiations and percentage of cases being substantiated are at historic levels. Video evidence is playing a crucial role in the outcome of cases. Data for January 2017 included the following highlights:

- 1) The CCRB continues to close its cases more efficiently. Of the cases that remain in the CCRB active docket, 86% have been open for four months or less, and 98% have been open for seven months or less (page 10). In January, the CCRB opened 358 new cases (page 4), and currently has a docket of 979 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 20% of its fully investigated cases (page 19).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 34% of the cases it closed in January (page 12) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 40% of the cases it closed in January (page 12). The Agency's truncation rate is 60% (page 12). This is primarily driven by complainant/victim/witness uncooperative.
- 4) For January, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 42% of cases - compared to 12% of substantiated cases in which video was not available (page 19).
- 5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6).
- 6) In January the PC finalized penalty decisions against 6 officers. The APU has conducted trials against 3 respondent officers year to date, and trials against 3 respondent officers in January. The CCRB's Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct.

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 welcome feedback on how to make our 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 appointed by the mayor. 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 a 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: If a case is not fully investigated due to the victim’s lack of interest or availability, the case is closed and is considered “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 January 2017, the CCRB initiated 358 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2016 - January 2017)




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2016 - January 2017)





Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (2010 - YTD 2017)



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. A leading 14 incidents took place in the 75th Precinct.

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (January 2017)




Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2017)




Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (January 2017)


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	1	67	9
5	4	68	4
6	8	69	2
7	5	70	5
9	4	71	3
10	4	72	6
13	1	73	10
14	4	75	14
17	2	76	3
18	4	77	10
19	6	78	2
20	1	79	7
23	6	81	8
24	1	83	3
25	5	84	3
28	5	88	1
30	4	90	2
32	7	94	1
33	3	100	2
34	5	101	5
40	8	102	2
41	10	103	2
42	9	104	2
43	12	105	4
44	8	106	5
45	5	107	4
46	7	108	5
47	9	109	3
48	8	110	4
49	4	111	2
50	4	112	1
52	4	113	9
60	4	114	8
61	4	115	3
62	3	120	5
63	2	121	5
66	3	122	1
		123	2
		Unknown	7

*These figures track where an incident occurred, not necessarily the Command of the officer. For example, a complaint filed against officers assigned to a Narcotics unit working in East New York would be counted as occurring in the 75th Precinct.

Allegations Received

As described in the previous section, the CCRB has jurisdiction over four categories of NYPD misconduct. In comparing January 2016 to January 2017, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are up. Figures for the year to date comparison show that in 2017 complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are up.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (January 2016 vs. January 2017)




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

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

	January 2016		January 2017		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	147	42%	139	39%	-8	-5%
Abuse of Authority (A)	257	74%	228	64%	-29	-11%
Discourtesy (D)	119	34%	108	30%	-11	-9%
Offensive Language (O)	24	7%	27	8%	3	13%
Total FADO Allegations	547		502		-45	-8%
Total Complaints	348		358		10	3%

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 2016 vs. YTD 2017)



*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 2016		YTD 2017		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	147	42%	139	39%	-8	-5%
Abuse of Authority (A)	257	74%	228	64%	-29	-11%
Discourtesy (D)	119	34%	108	30%	-11	-9%
Offensive Language (O)	24	7%	27	8%	3	13%
Total FADO Allegations	547		502		-45	-8%
Total Complaints	348		358		10	3%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	January 2016		January 2017		Change	% Change
	Count	%of Total Allegations	Count	%of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	286	25%	230	24%	-56	-20%
Abuse of Authority (A)	663	58%	560	58%	-103	-16%
Discourtesy (D)	167	15%	135	14%	-32	-19%
Offensive Language (O)	25	2%	38	4%	13	52%
Total Allegations	1141		963		-178	-16%
Total Complaints	348		358		10	3%

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

	YTD 2016		YTD 2017		Change	% Change
	Count	%of Total Allegations	Count	%of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	286	25%	230	24%	-56	-20%
Abuse of Authority (A)	663	58%	560	58%	-103	-16%
Discourtesy (D)	167	15%	135	14%	-32	-19%
Offensive Language (O)	25	2%	38	4%	13	52%
Total Allegations	1141		963		-178	-16%
Total Complaints	348		358		10	3%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of January 2017, 86% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 98% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (January 2017)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	834	86.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	108	11.2%
Cases 8-11 Months	15	1.6%
Cases 12-18 Months*	5	0.5%
Cases Over 18 Months**	3	0.3%
Total	965	100%

* 12-18 Months: 5 cases that were reopened.

** Over 18 Months: 1 case that was reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (January 2017)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	780	80.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	129	13.4%
Cases 8-11 Months	34	3.5%
Cases 12-18 Months	16	1.7%
Cases Over 18 Months	6	0.6%
Total	965	100%

An active case is specifically one in which the facts are still being investigated.

Figure 15: Number of Active Investigations (January 2016 - January 2017)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change


	December 2016		January 2017		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	504	57%	573	59%	69	14%
Pending Board Review	269	30%	284	29%	15	6%
Mediation	98	11%	108	11%	10	10%
On DA Hold	14	2%	14	1%	0	0%
Total	885		979		94	11%

Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In January 2017, the CCRB fully investigated 34% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 40% of the cases it closed.

Figure 18: Case Resolutions (January 2016 - January 2017) (%)



Dispositions

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

- If the allegations of misconduct are found to be improper, based on the preponderance of the evidence, the allegation is **substantiated**.
- If there is not enough evidence to determine whether or not 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. Finally, a case that cannot be fully investigated due to victim/complainant 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 refused to accept a complaint from a man over the phone. The man stated that when he confronted officers in a marked car who were improperly parked, the officers replied they were ordered to park in that location by their commander, who could be reached by telephone at the precinct stationhouse. When the man called the stationhouse to complain about officers parking, he testified the officer who answered the phone refused to take his complaint. The officer on the phone asserted what the officers in the squad car had done was minor and did not constitute a formal complaint, telling the man no action would be taken regarding this issue. Instead of taking the man's information in a written report and forwarding to the appropriate agency, the officer acknowledged to not consulting with any other officers, including supervisors, and ignoring the man's complaint. As a result, the Board "Substantiated" the allegation.

2. Unsubstantiated

A man alleged that officers treated him discourteously and did not write a report when responding to his 911 call. The man stated an unknown person robbed him while he slept at a shelter and that officers responding to his 911 call said they would not take his complaint, calling it "bullshit". The officers testified that when they responded to the robbery report, the man smelled of alcohol, appeared intoxicated and acted "belligerent". The officers believed the man's testimony lacked credibility because his description of the robbery varied under questioning. While the officers decided not to make a report of the man's complaint due to these inconsistencies, the officers maintain they acted professionally with the man throughout the incident. Due to the officers and the man providing contradicting accounts of the incident, the Board could not determine by a preponderance of evidence if the officers had made discourteous statements. As a result, the Board "Unsubstantiated" the discourtesy allegation.

3. Unfounded

A woman alleged that officers did not provide their names and shield numbers when they removed her from her residence. The court had deemed the woman an “incapacitated person” and placed her under a legal guardianship. When someone authorized by the legal guardian arrived to execute a “deep clean” of the woman’s apartment, she called the police out of concern that her possessions would be thrown away. The woman testified that officers arrived and told her they were going to take her to the hospital, shoved her out of the apartment, and failed to provide their name and shield numbers on request. The legal guardian testified the court had authorized a cleaning of the woman’s apartment and EMS was instructed to remove the woman to a hospital when she refused to allow her apartment to be cleaned. Officers arrived to assist removing the woman from the apartment and stated they treated the woman professionally and did not refuse to provide their names and shield numbers, which was confirmed by the legal guardian. Since independent verification confirmed the officer’s testimonies, the Board recommended to “Unfound” the allegations.

4. Exonerated

An officer stopped a man who he suspected of jumping a turnstile. The man swiped his MetroCard at a turnstile, but the many backpacks he was carrying got caught in the turnstile several times and caused him to maneuver through the turnstile. The officer testified he did not witness the man swipe his MetroCard, and instead saw the man squeeze past the bar into the station. Suspecting the man had jumped the turnstile, the officer stopped the man and demanded his MetroCard. The man gave his MetroCard to the officer, who in turn provided it to the MTA clerk to verify its use. The officer allowed the man back into the station on confirmation of his fare payment. The officer believed he had witnessed a violation and was justified stopping the man until he had confirmed the man had not committed an infraction. Therefore, the Board “Exonerated” the stop allegation.

5. Officer Unidentified

A woman testified that two plainclothes males identified themselves as police officers to her daughter and searched their residence. During the incident, an officer drew his firearm and told the daughter, who was the only one present at the time, that if she talked, he would shoot her. Based on the descriptions provided by the daughter, a review of the plainclothes officers’ photographs and demographic information at the time of incident did not match the descriptions. Without any additional information, the CCRB was unable to identify the subject officers. As a result, the allegations were recommended as “Officers Unknown”.

Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 19: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (January 2017)





Figure 20: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2017)



Dispositions - All CCRB Cases

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

Figure 21: Disposition of Cases (2016 vs 2017)

	Jan 2016		Jan 2017		YTD 2016		YTD 2017	
Full Investigations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	36	27%	18	20%	36	27%	18	20%
Exonerated	14	10%	14	15%	14	10%	14	15%
Unfounded	22	16%	10	11%	22	16%	10	11%
Unsubstantiated	57	43%	39	42%	57	43%	39	42%
MOS Unidentified	5	4%	11	12%	5	4%	11	12%
Total - Full Investigations	134		92		134		92	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	21	100%	16	100%	21	100%	16	100%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - ADR Closures	21		16		21		16	
Resolved Case Total	155	42%	108	40%	155	42%	108	40%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	40	18%	41	26%	40	18%	41	26%
Complainant/Victim/Witness uncooperative	120	55%	89	56%	120	55%	89	56%
Complainant/Victim/Witness unavailable	46	21%	29	18%	46	21%	29	18%
Victim unidentified	5	2%	1	1%	5	2%	1	1%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	6	3%	0	0%	6	3%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	217		160		217		160	
Total - Closed Cases	372		268		372		268	

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

Dispositions - 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 9% for the month of January 2017, and the allegation substantiation rate is 9% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is Abuse of Authority – substantiating 13% of such allegations during January 2017, and 13% for the year.

Figure 22: Disposition of Allegations (2016 vs 2017)

	Jan 2016		Jan 2017		YTD 2016		YTD 2017	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Fully Investigated Allegations								
Substantiated	94	16%	40	9%	94	16%	40	9%
Unsubstantiated	224	37%	143	33%	224	37%	143	33%
Unfounded	77	13%	52	12%	77	13%	52	12%
Exonerated	152	25%	135	31%	152	25%	135	31%
MOS Unidentified	55	9%	60	14%	55	9%	60	14%
Total - Full Investigations	602		430		602		430	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	64	100%	46	100%	64	100%	46	100%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - ADR Closures	64		46		64		46	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	80	15%	77	20%	80	15%	77	20%
Complainant/Victim/Witness uncooperative	315	59%	259	67%	315	59%	259	67%
Complainant/Victim/Witness unavailable	111	21%	45	12%	111	21%	45	12%
Victim unidentified	17	3%	3	1%	17	3%	3	1%
Miscellaneous	3	1%	1	0%	3	1%	1	0%
Administrative closure	7	1%	0	0%	7	1%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	533		385		533		385	
Total - Closed Allegations	1256		890		1256		890	

Figure 23: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (January 2017)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	8 7%	24 21%	51 46%	20 18%	9 8%	112 100%
Abuse of Authority	30 13%	71 30%	79 33%	15 6%	41 17%	236 100%
Discourtesy	2 3%	40 62%	5 8%	11 17%	7 11%	65 100%
Offensive Language	0 0%	8 47%	0 0%	6 35%	3 18%	17 100%
Total	40 9%	143 33%	135 31%	52 12%	60 14%	430 100%


Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (YTD 2017)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	8 7%	24 21%	51 46%	20 18%	9 8%	112 100%
Abuse of Authority	30 13%	71 30%	79 33%	15 6%	41 17%	236 100%
Discourtesy	2 3%	40 62%	5 8%	11 17%	7 11%	65 100%
Offensive Language	0 0%	8 47%	0 0%	6 35%	3 18%	17 100%
Total	40 9%	143 33%	135 31%	52 12%	60 14%	430 100%

Substantiation Rates

The January 2017 case substantiation rate was 20%.

Figure 25: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2016 - January 2017)



Substantiation Rates and Video

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

Figure 26: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations without Video (Jan 2017 - Jan 2017) (% substantiated shown)





Figure 27: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2017 - Jan 2017) (% substantiated shown)



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 or not to substantiate the allegation and make a disciplinary recommendation.


- “Charges and Specifications” are recommended for the most serious allegations of misconduct. Charges launch an administrative trial in the NYPD Trial Room. An officer may lose vacation days, be suspended, or terminated if he 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 more problematic than poor training, but does not rise to the level of 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, while cases where the Board recommends charges are prosecuted by the CCRB’s Administrative Prosecution Unit.

Figure 28: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints*
(Jan 2016, Jan 2017, YTD 2016, YTD 2017)

Disposition	January 2016		January 2017		YTD 2016		YTD 2017	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	5	14%	0	0%	5	14%	0	0%
Command Discipline	14	39%	14	78%	14	39%	14	78%
Formalized Training	17	47%	3	17%	17	47%	3	17%
Instructions	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	36		18		36		18	

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

Figure 29: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints* (2017)



* 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 Substantiated Allegations

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

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

Figure 30: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Allegations*
(Jan 2016, Jan 2017, YTD 2016, YTD 2017)

Disposition	January 2016		January 2017		YTD 2016		YTD 2017	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	11	19%	0	0%	11	19%	0	0%
Command Discipline	21	36.2%	23	85.2%	21	36.2%	23	85.2%
Formalized Training	26	44.8%	3	11.1%	26	44.8%	3	11.1%
Instructions	0	0%	1	3.7%	0	0%	1	3.7%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	58		27		58		27	

* The counts in this table reflect the number of distinct MOS.

Figure 31: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (January2017)

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Gun Drawn	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Gun Pointed	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Chokehold	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Other	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat to damage/seize property	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Pepper spray	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Physical force	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Question	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Vehicle	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle stop	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Other	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory summons	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	105	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	105	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	105	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	105	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle stop	113	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory summons	113	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	113	Queens

Truncations

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

Figure 32: Truncated Allegations (January 2017)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Force	16	66	21	2	105
Abuse of Authority	45	153	16	1	215
Discourtesy	16	36	4	0	56
Offensive Language	0	4	4	0	8
Total	77	259	45	3	384

Figure 33: Truncated CCRB Complaints (January 2017)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	41	89	29	1	160

Figure 34: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2017)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Force	16	66	21	2	105
Abuse of Authority	45	153	16	1	215
Discourtesy	16	36	4	0	56
Offensive Language	0	4	4	0	8
Total	77	259	45	3	384

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2017)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	41	89	29	1	160

Mediation Unit

Whenever mediation between a complainant/victim and subject officer is suitable, it is offered by CCRB investigators. If the complainant/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 January and this year.

Figure 36: Mediated Complaints Closed

	January 2017			YTD 2017		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	16	0	16	16	0	16

Figure 37: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	January 2017			YTD 2017		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	1	0	1	1	0	1
Abuse of Authority	30	0	30	30	0	30
Discourtesy	14	0	14	14	0	14
Offensive Language	1	0	1	1	0	1
Total	46	0	46	46	0	46

Figure 38: Mediated Complaints By Borough (January 2017)

	Mediations
Bronx	7
Brooklyn	4
Manhattan	5
Queens	0
Staten Island	0

Figure 39: Mediated Allegations By Borough (January 2017)

	Mediations
Bronx	22
Brooklyn	15
Manhattan	9
Queens	0
Staten Island	0

**Figure 40: Mediated Complaints By Precinct
(Jan 2017 - YTD 2017)**

Precinct	Jan 2017	YTD 2017
1	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
28	2	2
42	1	1
45	2	2

Precinct	Jan 2017	YTD 2017
47	1	1
50	1	1
52	2	2
66	1	1
70	1	1
75	1	1
94	1	1

**Figure 41: Mediated Allegations By Precinct
(Jan 2017 - YTD 2017)**

Precinct	Jan 2017	YTD 2017
1	2	2
13	1	1
14	3	3
28	3	3
42	1	1
45	10	10

Precinct	Jan 2017	YTD 2017
47	1	1
50	2	2
52	8	8
66	1	1
70	4	4
75	8	8
94	2	2

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 42: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Jan 2017	YTD 2017
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	1	1
	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	0
	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	0
	Disciplinary Action Total		1
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	4	4
	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		4
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	0	0
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total		0
Total Closures		5	5

*Retained cases are those where 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 DUP.

*** In some case, the Department conducts their 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 allegation 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 43: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	January 2017	YTD 2017
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	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	0
Formalized Training**	0	0
Instructions***	0	0
Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	1	1
No Disciplinary Action†	4	4
Adjudicated Total	5	5
Discipline Rate	20%	20%
Not Adjudicated† Total	0	0
Total Closures	5	5

*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 42 on the previous page.

Figure 44: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	Disposition Type*	January 2017	YTD 2017
Disciplinary Action	Terminated	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	0
	Command Discipline B	2	2
	Command Discipline A	9	9
	Formalized Training**	5	5
	Instructions***	0	0
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total	16	16
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	0	0
	SOL Expired	0	0
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	9	9
	Total	9	9
	Discipline Rate	64%	64%
	DUP Rate	36%	36%

*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.

† This verdict relates to a trial conducted by DAO on a case decided by the Board prior to the activation of the APU.

†† "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.

Figure 45: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (January 2017)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	14	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	14	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	19	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Other	19	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	19	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	25	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle stop	47	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle stop	47	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle stop	47	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle stop	47	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle search	47	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle search	47	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle search	47	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	48	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	48	Bronx	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	48	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	75	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	75	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	76	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	76	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	76	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Question	76	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	77	Brooklyn	Formalized Training

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle search	103	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle search	103	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	103	Queens	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	103	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	103	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	106	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	106	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	115	Queens	Command Discipline A

Figure 46: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (January 2017)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	75	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	105	Queens	Forfeit vacation 20 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	105	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	105	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	105	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Property damaged	105	Queens	Forfeit vacation 20 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Retaliatory arrest	105	Queens	Forfeit vacation 20 day(s)

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

	January 2017		December 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	780	80.8%	716	82.2%	64	8.9%
Cases 5-7 Months	129	13.4%	100	11.5%	29	29.0%
Cases 8 Months	10	1.0%	9	1.0%	1	11.1%
Cases 9 Months	11	1.1%	9	1.0%	2	22.2%
Cases 10 Months	8	0.8%	8	0.9%	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	5	0.5%	6	0.7%	-1	-16.7%
Cases 12 Months	4	0.4%	4	0.5%	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	4	0.4%	3	0.3%	1	33.3%
Cases 14 Months	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%	4	0.5%	-4	NA
Cases 16 Months	2	0.2%	6	0.7%	-4	-66.7%
Cases 17 Months	4	0.4%	1	0.1%	3	300.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	-2	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	6	0.6%	3	0.3%	3	100.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	965	100.0%	871	100.0%	94	10.8%

Figure 48: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On CCRB Received Date

	January 2017		December 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	834	86.4%	775	89.0%	59	7.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	108	11.2%	79	9.1%	29	36.7%
Cases 8 Months	9	0.9%	6	0.7%	3	50.0%
Cases 9 Months	6	0.6%	0	0.0%	6	NA
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	-2	NA
Cases 12 Months	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases 13 Months	1	0.1%	3	0.3%	-2	-66.7%
Cases 14 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	-2	NA
Cases 16 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	3	0.3%	3	0.3%	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	965	100.0%	871	100.0%	94	10.8%

Figure 49: CCRB Investigations Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	January 2017		December 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	519	90.6%	448	88.9%	71	15.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	32	5.6%	26	5.2%	6	23.1%
Cases 8 Months	3	0.5%	4	0.8%	-1	-25.0%
Cases 9 Months	6	1.0%	5	1.0%	1	20.0%
Cases 10 Months	3	0.5%	3	0.6%	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%	3	0.6%	-3	NA
Cases 12 Months	1	0.2%	4	0.8%	-3	-75.0%
Cases 13 Months	2	0.3%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases 14 Months	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.4%	-2	NA
Cases 16 Months	1	0.2%	5	1.0%	-4	-80.0%
Cases 17 Months	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.4%	-2	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	4	0.7%	2	0.4%	2	100.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	573	100.0%	504	100.0%	69	13.7%

Figure 50: CCRB DA Hold Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	January 2017	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	5	35.7%
Cases 5-7 Months	1	7.1%
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	1	7.1%
Cases 15 Months	1	7.1%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	1	7.1%
Cases 18 Months	2	14.3%
Cases Over 18 Months	3	21.4%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	14	100.0%

Figure 51: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2017)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	0	0%	1	14.3%	3	42.9%	0	0%
Gun fired	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	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%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Flashlight as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Police shield	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Vehicle	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	0	0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Chokehold	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%
Pepper spray	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0%
Physical force	3	3.7%	43	53.1%	20	24.7%	12	14.8%	3	3.7%	0	0%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nonlethal restraining device	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	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	20%	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	8	7.1%	51	45.5%	24	21.4%	20	17.9%	9	8%	0	0%

Figure 52: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2017)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Strip-searched	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	2	16.7%	5	41.7%	4	33.3%	0	0%	1	8.3%	0	0%
Vehicle search	1	5.9%	6	35.3%	8	47.1%	0	0%	2	11.8%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	7	22.6%	17	54.8%	4	12.9%	0	0%	3	9.7%	0	0%
Threat of summons	0	0%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	1	3.8%	17	65.4%	5	19.2%	0	0%	3	11.5%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	1	5%	4	20%	8	40%	5	25%	2	10%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Property damaged	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	3	37.5%	0	0%	3	37.5%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	6	60%	0	0%	3	30%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	0	0%	0	0%	11	47.8%	8	34.8%	4	17.4%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	0	0%	0	0%	6	85.7%	0	0%	1	14.3%	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	1	16.7%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2	33.3%	0	0%
Seizure of property	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Failure to show search warrant	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Frisk	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	0	0%	5	62.5%	0	0%
Search (of person)	1	7.1%	5	35.7%	3	21.4%	0	0%	5	35.7%	0	0%
Stop	0	0%	14	58.3%	6	25%	0	0%	4	16.7%	0	0%
Question	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Interference with recording	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Search of recording device	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Total	30	12.7%	79	33.5%	71	30.1%	15	6.4%	41	17.4%	0	0%
--------------	----	-------	----	-------	----	-------	----	------	----	-------	---	----

Figure 53: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2017)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	2	3.3%	5	8.2%	38	62.3%	9	14.8%	7	11.5%	0	0%
Gesture	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Action	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	2	3.1%	5	7.7%	40	61.5%	11	16.9%	7	10.8%	0	0%

Figure 54: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2017)

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	4	80%	0	0%	0	0%
Ethnicity	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%
Religion	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gender	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical disability	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	0	0%	0	0%	8	47.1%	6	35.3%	3	17.6%	0	0%

Figure 55: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (January 2017)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Awaiting filing of charges	0	0%
Charges filed, awaiting service	8	11%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	11	16%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	1	1%
Calendered for court appearance	21	30%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	3	4%
Trial scheduled	24	34%
Trial commenced	1	1%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	1	1%
Total	70	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 56: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (January 2017)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	3	3%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	48	51%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	27	29%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	5	5%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	11	12%
Total	94	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 57: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	0	0	24	24
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	3	3	50	50
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	4	4	47	47
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	0	0	22	22
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	9	9	52	52
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	2	2	17	17
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	0	8	8
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	0	10	10
Special Operations Division Total	0	0	3	3
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	0
Total	18	18	233	233
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	1	1
Transit Bureau Total	0	0	11	11
Housing Bureau Total	5	5	16	16
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	1	1	22	22
Detective Bureau Total	0	0	3	3
Other Bureaus Total	3	3	5	5
Total	9	9	58	58
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	0	2	2
Undetermined	0	0	2	2
Total	27	27	295	295

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

Figure 58A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
001 Precinct	0	0	2	2
005 Precinct	0	0	0	0
006 Precinct	0	0	0	0
007 Precinct	0	0	5	5
009 Precinct	0	0	1	1
010 Precinct	0	0	0	0
013 Precinct	0	0	2	2
Midtown South Precinct	0	0	6	6
017 Precinct	0	0	1	1
Midtown North Precinct	0	0	5	5
Precincts Total	0	0	22	22
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	0	2	2
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	0	0	24	24

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

Figure 58B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
019 Precinct	0	0	9	9
020 Precinct	0	0	0	0
023 Precinct	0	0	3	3
024 Precinct	0	0	4	4
025 Precinct	0	0	0	0
026 Precinct	0	0	0	0
Central Park Precinct	0	0	0	0
028 Precinct	0	0	5	5
030 Precinct	1	1	11	11
032 Precinct	1	1	7	7
033 Precinct	0	0	7	7
034 Precinct	1	1	4	4
Precincts Total	3	3	50	50
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	3	3	50	50

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

Figure 58C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
040 Precinct	0	0	0	0
041 Precinct	1	1	6	6
042 Precinct	0	0	3	3
043 Precinct	0	0	0	0
044 Precinct	2	2	5	5
045 Precinct	0	0	3	3
046 Precinct	0	0	7	7
047 Precinct	1	1	8	8
048 Precinct	0	0	4	4
049 Precinct	0	0	1	1
050 Precinct	0	0	4	4
052 Precinct	0	0	5	5
Precincts Total	4	4	46	46
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	0	1	1
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	4	4	47	47

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

Figure 58D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
060 Precinct	0	0	0	0
061 Precinct	0	0	3	3
062 Precinct	0	0	0	0
063 Precinct	0	0	2	2
066 Precinct	0	0	4	4
067 Precinct	0	0	0	0
068 Precinct	0	0	0	0
069 Precinct	0	0	2	2
070 Precinct	0	0	4	4
071 Precinct	0	0	1	1
072 Precinct	0	0	3	3
076 Precinct	0	0	1	1
078 Precinct	0	0	1	1
Precincts Total	0	0	21	21
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	1	1
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	0	0	22	22

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

Figure 58E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
073 Precinct	0	0	4	4
075 Precinct	8	8	23	23
077 Precinct	0	0	0	0
079 Precinct	0	0	0	0
081 Precinct	0	0	8	8
083 Precinct	1	1	4	4
084 Precinct	0	0	0	0
088 Precinct	0	0	0	0
090 Precinct	0	0	11	11
094 Precinct	0	0	1	1
Precincts Total	9	9	51	51
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	0	1	1
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	9	9	52	52

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

Figure 58F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Sustantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
100 Precinct	0	0	0	0
101 Precinct	0	0	3	3
102 Precinct	0	0	0	0
103 Precinct	0	0	2	2
105 Precinct	0	0	0	0
106 Precinct	0	0	1	1
107 Precinct	0	0	1	1
113 Precinct	1	1	7	7
Precincts Total	1	1	14	14
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	1	1	3	3
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	2	2	17	17

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

Figure 58G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Sustantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
104 Precinct	0	0	0	0
108 Precinct	0	0	0	0
109 Precinct	0	0	0	0
110 Precinct	0	0	0	0
111 Precinct	0	0	1	1
112 Precinct	0	0	1	1
114 Precinct	0	0	6	6
115 Precinct	0	0	0	0
Precincts Total	0	0	8	8
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	0	8	8

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

Figure 58H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
120 Precinct	0	0	3	3
122 Precinct	0	0	2	2
123 Precinct	0	0	0	0
121 Precinct	0	0	5	5
Precincts Total	0	0	10	10
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	0	0
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	0	0	10	10

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

Figure 58I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	0	3	3
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	0
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	0	0	0
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	0
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	0	0	3	3

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

Figure 58J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Chiefs Office	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	0

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

Figure 58K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
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	0
Highway Unit #1	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #2	0	0	1	1
Highway Unit #3	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	0
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	1	1

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

Figure 58L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Authority Liaison	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Inspections	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Spec. Invest. Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Crime Analysis	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Patrol Operations	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	0	0	0	0
TB DT02	0	0	0	0
TB DT03	0	0	1	1
TB DT04	0	0	2	2
TB DT11	0	0	2	2
TB DT12	0	0	0	0
TB DT20	0	0	1	1
TB DT23	0	0	0	0
TB DT30	0	0	0	0
TB DT32	0	0	0	0
TB DT33	0	0	3	3
TB DT34	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	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	0
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	0	1	1
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	0	0	11	11

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

Figure 58M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	0	0	0	0
PSA 2	0	0	2	2
PSA 3	1	1	2	2
PSA 4	0	0	0	0
PSA 5	0	0	0	0
PSA 6	0	0	2	2
PSA 7	3	3	7	7
PSA 8	0	0	0	0
PSA 9	0	0	1	1
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Bronx/Queens	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Investigations	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Elevator Vandalism Unit	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Operations and Misc. Commands	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	5	5	16	16
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	1	1	2	2
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	5	5	16	16

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

Figure 58N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Queens Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	0	3	3
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	1	1
Bronx Narcotics	1	1	5	5
Staten Island Narcotics	0	0	3	3
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	10	10
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	0
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	1	1	22	22

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

Figure 580: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Special Victims Division	0	0	0	0
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	0	0	0
Detective Borough Bronx	0	0	0	0
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	0	1	1
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	2	2
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	0	0
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	0	0	3	3

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

Figure 58P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Substantiate d MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	3	3	5	5
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	0
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	0
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Other Bureaus Total	3	3	5	5

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

Figure 58Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Sustantiated MOS Jan 2017	Sustantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jan 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - Legal Bureau	0	0	0	0
DC Training	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy Training	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	0	0	0	0
Police Commissioner Office	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Division	0	0	0	0
Chief of Community Affairs	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Juvenile Section	0	0	0	0
School Safety Bronx/Manhattan	0	0	0	0
School Safety Queens/Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
Office of Equal Employment	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Operations	0	0	0	0
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	0	2	2
Chief of Department	0	0	0	0
Department Advocate	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Public Information	0	0	0	0
Crime Prevention	0	0	0	0
First Deputy Commissioner	0	0	0	0
Office of Management, Analysis and Planning	0	0	0	0
Quality Assurance Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Counterterrorism	0	0	0	0
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	0	2	2

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