



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

DEBORAH N. ARCHER, ESQ.
ACTING CHAIR

MINA Q. MALIK, ESQ.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Executive Director's Monthly Report
May 2016
(Statistics for April 2016)

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	13
Dispositions - Full Investigations	14
Dispositions - All CCRB Cases	15
Dispositions - Allegations	16
Substantiation Rates	18
Substantiation Rates and Video	18
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints	19
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Allegations	21
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. Investigations are being conducted more efficiently than 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 April 2016 included the following highlights:

- 1) The CCRB continues to close its cases more efficiently. Of the cases that remain in the CCRB active docket, 95% have been open for four months or less, and 99% have been open for seven months or less (page 10). In April, the CCRB opened 381 new cases (page 4), and currently has a docket of 1,080 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 29% of its fully investigated cases which marks the thirteenth straight month the CCRB has substantiated at least 20% of its cases (page 18).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 37% of the cases it closed in April (page 12) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 50% of the cases it closed in April (page 12). The Agency's truncation rate is 48% (page 12). This is primarily driven by complainant/victim/witness uncooperative which the CCRB is currently focused on examining.
- 4) For April, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 36% of cases - compared to 26% of substantiated cases in which video was not available (page 18).
- 5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6).
- 6) In April the PC finalized penalty decisions against 7 officers: 2 of these were guilty verdicts won by the APU (page 27). The APU has conducted trial against 54 respondent officers year to date, and trials against 6 respondent officers in April. 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 CCRB receives and Figures 2 and 3 refer to new cases that remain with the Agency. In April 2016, the CCRB initiated 381 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2015 - April 2016)




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2015 - April 2016)





Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (2010 - YTD 2016)



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Of the five boroughs, the largest number of misconduct complaints stemmed from incidents occurring in Brooklyn, followed closely by Manhattan. A leading 21 incidents took place in the 75th Precinct, which is located in Cypress Hills and covers East New York.

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (April 2016)




Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2016)




Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (April 2016)


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	4	67	10
5	1	68	3
6	4	69	4
7	4	70	4
9	3	71	5
10	4	72	2
14	7	73	15
17	4	75	18
18	7	76	4
19	6	77	5
20	4	78	2
23	9	79	6
24	3	81	9
25	7	83	3
26	1	84	6
28	4	88	3
30	2	90	7
32	12	94	1
33	2	100	2
34	2	101	7
40	10	102	1
41	6	103	8
42	7	104	1
43	10	105	7
44	7	106	3
45	2	107	5
46	5	108	2
47	9	109	4
48	11	110	1
49	5	113	3
50	3	114	5
52	9	115	3
60	6	120	6
61	5	121	9
62	2	122	2
63	1	123	1
		Unknown	11

*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 the month of April 2015 to April 2016, the number of complaints received of all allegation types are down. However, figures for the year to date comparison show that complaints with at least one of the indicated FADO allegations are up in all four categories from 2015.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (April 2015 vs. April 2016)




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

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

	April 2015		April 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	190	46%	176	47%	-14	-7%
Abuse of Authority (A)	249	61%	245	65%	-4	-2%
Discourtesy (D)	136	33%	88	23%	-48	-35%
Offensive Language (O)	34	8%	32	8%	-2	-6%
Total FADO Allegations	609		541		-68	-11%
Total Complaints	409		378		-31	-8%

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 2015 vs. YTD 2016)



*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 2015		YTD 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	618	48%	692	45%	74	12%
Abuse of Authority (A)	776	60%	1082	70%	306	39%
Discourtesy (D)	445	35%	472	31%	27	6%
Offensive Language (O)	92	7%	111	7%	19	21%
Total FADO Allegations	1931		2357		426	22%
Total Complaints	1284		1545		261	20%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	April 2015		April 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	%of Total Allegations	Count	%of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	312	29%	316	29%	4	1%
Abuse of Authority (A)	550	51%	595	54%	45	8%
Discourtesy (D)	177	16%	144	13%	-33	-19%
Offensive Language (O)	40	4%	46	4%	6	15%
Total Allegations	1079		1101		22	2%
Total Complaints	409		381		-28	-7%

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

	YTD 2015		YTD 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	%of Total Allegations	Count	%of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	1045	29%	1343	26%	298	29%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1826	51%	2991	58%	1165	64%
Discourtesy (D)	585	16%	703	14%	118	20%
Offensive Language (O)	103	3%	130	3%	27	26%
Total Allegations	3559		5167		1608	45%
Total Complaints	1284		1545		261	20%

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

CCRB Docket

Ninety-five percent of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 99% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months. This is an Agency record.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (April 2016)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1007	95.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	44	4.2%
Cases 8-11 Months	4	0.4%
Cases 12-18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months**	5	0.5%
Total	1060	100%

** Over 18 Months: 3 cases that were reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (April 2016)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	960	90.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	63	5.9%
Cases 8-11 Months	18	1.7%
Cases 12-18 Months	11	1.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	8	0.8%
Total	1060	100%

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

Figure 15: Number of Active Investigations (January 2015 - April 2016)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change


	March 2016		April 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	618	59%	652	60%	34	6%
Pending Board Review	284	27%	302	28%	18	6%
Mediation	130	12%	108	10%	-22	-17%
On DA Hold	14	1%	18	2%	4	29%
Total	1046		1080		34	3%

Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In April 2016, the CCRB fully investigated 37% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 50% of the cases it closed. The Agency continues to face the challenge of truncations.

Figure 18: Case Resolutions (January 2015 - April 2016) (%)



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**.

Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 19: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (April 2016)





Figure 20: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2016)



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 (2015 vs 2016)

	Apr 2015		Apr 2016		YTD 2015		YTD 2016	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Full Investigations								
Substantiated	27	22%	37	29%	139	20%	151	28%
Exonerated	13	10%	24	19%	92	13%	73	13%
Unfounded	7	6%	13	10%	46	6%	60	11%
Unsubstantiated	75	60%	47	37%	388	55%	224	41%
MOS Unidentified	2	2%	7	5%	45	6%	34	6%
Total - Full Investigations	124		128		710		542	
Mediation Closures								
Mediated	13	36%	22	49%	60	47%	79	54%
Mediation Attempted	23	64%	23	51%	68	53%	67	46%
Total - ADR Closures	36		45		128		146	
Resolved Case Total	160	68%	173	50%	838	56%	688	46%
Truncations / Other Closures								
Complaint withdrawn	0	0%	34	19%	4	1%	155	19%
Complainant/Victim/Witness uncooperative	60	79%	103	59%	471	73%	482	59%
Complainant/Victim/Witness unavailable	15	20%	30	17%	124	19%	140	17%
Victim unidentified	0	0%	1	1%	8	1%	13	2%
Miscellaneous	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	7	4%	39	6%	21	3%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	76		175		647		811	
Total - Closed Cases	236		348		1485		1499	

*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 16% for the month of April 2016, and the allegation substantiation rate is 16% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is Abuse of Authority – substantiating 21% of such allegations during April 2016, and 24% for the year.

Figure 22: Disposition of Allegations (2015 vs 2016)

	Apr 2015		Apr 2016		YTD 2015		YTD 2016	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	76	16%	83	16%	341	12%	385	16%
Unsubstantiated	227	48%	189	36%	1324	47%	932	39%
Unfounded	34	7%	59	11%	230	8%	266	11%
Exonerated	76	16%	148	28%	579	20%	586	24%
MOS Unidentified	57	12%	43	8%	364	13%	227	9%
Total - Full Investigations	470		522		2838		2396	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	21	30%	42	38%	116	47%	175	53%
Mediation Attempted	48	70%	69	62%	132	53%	153	47%
Total - ADR Closures	69		111		248		328	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	0	0%	71	18%	11	1%	316	16%
Complainant/Victim/Witness uncooperative	143	77%	245	62%	1175	80%	1263	65%
Complainant/Victim/Witness unavailable	29	16%	66	17%	199	13%	312	16%
Victim unidentified	0	0%	2	1%	18	1%	30	2%
Miscellaneous	13	7%	0	0%	19	1%	11	1%
Administrative closure	0	0%	11	3%	53	4%	26	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	185		395		1475		1958	
Total - Closed Allegations	784		1063		4834		4898	

Figure 23: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (April 2016)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	7 5%	50 35%	43 30%	28 20%	14 10%	142 100%
Abuse of Authority	65 21%	103 33%	102 33%	15 5%	24 8%	309 100%
Discourtesy	11 17%	33 51%	3 5%	14 22%	4 6%	65 100%
Offensive Language	0 0%	3 50%	0 0%	2 33%	1 17%	6 100%
Total	83 16%	189 36%	148 28%	59 11%	43 8%	522 100%


Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (YTD 2016)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	25 4%	195 33%	201 34%	113 19%	63 11%	597 100%
Abuse of Authority	321 24%	477 35%	375 28%	79 6%	110 8%	1362 100%
Discourtesy	36 10%	220 59%	10 3%	59 16%	49 13%	374 100%
Offensive Language	3 5%	39 63%	0 0%	15 24%	5 8%	62 100%
Total	385 16%	931 39%	586 24%	266 11%	227 9%	2395 100%

Substantiation Rates

The April 2016 case substantiation rate of 29% is close to the highest in CCRB history. April 2016 marks the thirteenth straight month that the CCRB has substantiated more than 20% of cases it fully investigates. Prior to 2015, substantiation rates rarely surpassed 20% for even a single month.

Figure 25: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2015 - April 2016)



Substantiation Rates and Video

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 2016 - Apr 2016) (% substantiated shown)





Figure 27: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2016 - Apr 2016) (% 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*
(Apr 2015, Apr 2016, YTD 2015, YTD 2016)

Disposition	April 2015		April 2016		YTD 2015		YTD 2016	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	6	22%	5	14%	34	25%	24	16%
Command Discipline	12	44%	17	46%	62	45%	73	48%
Formalized Training	8	30%	15	41%	32	23%	52	34%
Instructions	1	4%	0	0%	9	7%	2	1%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	27		37		137		151	

* 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* (2016)



* 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*
(Apr 2015, Apr 2016, YTD 2015, YTD 2016)

Disposition	April 2015		April 2016		YTD 2015		YTD 2016	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	12	30.8%	8	16%	64	31.1%	45	19.9%
Command Discipline	16	41%	21	42%	93	45.1%	104	46%
Formalized Training	10	25.6%	21	42%	40	19.4%	75	33.2%
Instructions	1	2.6%	0	0%	9	4.4%	2	0.9%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	39		50		206		226	

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

Figure 31: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (April 2016)

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Action	5	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Radio as club	5	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Action	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	10	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to show search warrant	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Other	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Action	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	50	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	50	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	50	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Action	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	62	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	62	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	62	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Question	62	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	67	Brooklyn

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle stop	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle stop	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Other	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Question	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Chokehold	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Other	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	94	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	103	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	103	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	103	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	103	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	106	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	110	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	110	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Gun Pointed	110	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	114	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	114	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat to damage/seize property	120	Staten Island
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	120	Staten Island

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 (April 2016)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Force	21	86	38	0	145
Abuse of Authority	41	122	22	2	187
Discourtesy	8	30	4	0	42
Offensive Language	1	7	2	0	10
Total	71	245	66	2	384

Figure 33: Truncated CCRB Complaints (April 2016)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	34	103	30	1	168

Figure 34: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2016)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Force	85	396	129	4	614
Abuse of Authority	174	647	140	22	983
Discourtesy	48	187	33	3	271
Offensive Language	9	33	10	1	53
Total	316	1263	312	30	1921

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2016)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	155	482	140	13	790

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 April and this year.

Figure 36: Mediated Complaints Closed

	April 2016			YTD 2016		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	22	23	45	79	67	146

Figure 37: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	April 2016			YTD 2016		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	2	3	5	12	12	24
Abuse of Authority	27	53	80	119	104	223
Discourtesy	10	12	22	35	30	65
Offensive Language	3	1	4	9	7	16
Total	42	69	111	175	153	328

Figure 38: Mediated Complaints By Borough (April 2016)

	Mediations
Bronx	1
Brooklyn	6
Manhattan	10
Queens	4
Staten Island	1

Figure 39: Mediated Allegations By Borough (April 2016)

	Mediations
Bronx	1
Brooklyn	11
Manhattan	17
Queens	11
Staten Island	2

**Figure 40: Mediated Complaints By Precinct
(Apr 2016 - YTD 2016)**

Precinct	Apr 2016	YTD 2016	Precinct	Apr 2016	YTD 2016
1	0	2	50	0	1
5	0	1	52	1	2
6	0	2	60	1	2
7	1	1	61	1	1
9	0	2	67	1	2
10	1	3	69	0	1
13	1	2	70	2	2
14	1	1	71	0	1
17	1	2	73	0	3
19	1	2	75	0	2
23	1	3	78	0	1
25	0	1	79	0	1
26	0	1	81	1	1
28	0	1	88	0	2
30	0	1	90	0	1
32	1	2	100	0	1
33	1	2	102	1	2
34	1	2	105	0	2
40	0	2	106	1	1
41	0	1	108	1	2
42	0	1	109	0	1
45	0	1	110	0	1
46	0	2	111	0	1
47	0	1	113	0	1
49	0	1	115	1	1
			122	1	3

**Figure 41: Mediated Allegations By Precinct
(Apr 2016 - YTD 2016)**

Precinct	Apr 2016	YTD 2016	Precinct	Apr 2016	YTD 2016
1	0	3	50	0	1
5	0	1	52	1	2
6	0	4	60	3	4
7	1	1	61	1	1
9	0	2	67	1	3
10	4	8	69	0	1
13	2	6	70	4	4
14	2	2	71	0	2
17	1	2	73	0	11
19	1	2	75	0	7
23	1	4	78	0	5
25	0	6	79	0	1
26	0	7	81	2	2
28	0	2	88	0	3
30	0	1	90	0	3
32	1	3	100	0	1
33	1	4	102	4	5
34	3	4	105	0	5
40	0	3	106	2	2
41	0	13	108	3	5
42	0	1	109	0	3
45	0	1	110	0	2
46	0	7	111	0	4
47	0	2	113	0	1
49	0	2	115	2	2
			122	2	4

Administrative Prosecution Unit

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

Figure 42: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Apr 2016	YTD 2016
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	2	29
	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	1	1
	Resolved by plea	0	7
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. B	0	0
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. A	0	0
	Plea set aside, Formalized Training	0	3
	Plea set aside, Instructions	0	0
	*Retained, with discipline	0	1
	Disciplinary Action Total		3
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	3	14
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	1	1
	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	3
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total		0
Total Closures		7	59

*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*	April 2016	YTD 2016
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	1
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	5
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	2	23
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	0
Formalized Training**	0	3
Instructions***	0	3
Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	1	6
Disciplinary Action† Total	3	41
No Disciplinary Action†	4	15
Adjudicated Total	7	56
Discipline Rate	43%	73%
Not Adjudicated† Total	0	3
Total Closures	7	59

*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*	April 2016	YTD 2016
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	0	1
	Command Discipline A	9	48
	Formalized Training**	16	75
	Instructions***	3	27
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total		28
No Disciplinary Action	Not Guilty	1	2
	Filed ††	0	1
	SOL Expired	1	4
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	2	11
	Total	4	18
	Discipline Rate	88%	89%
	DUP Rate	6%	7%

*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 (April 2016)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search (of person)	9	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Pepper spray	25	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Instructions)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	25	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Physical force	26	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle search	30	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	30	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	30	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Question	30	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	42	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search (of person)	42	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Question	42	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	43	Bronx	No Penalty
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Threat of arrest	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	47	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Other	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	49	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	49	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	50	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	60	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	68	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	68	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	68	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	101	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Other	103	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	103	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	107	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Other	107	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle search	113	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	F	Hit against inanimate object	114	Queens	Formalized Training

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	F	Physical force	114	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	120	Staten Island	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	120	Staten Island	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	120	Staten Island	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	120	Staten Island	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	121	Staten Island	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	121	Staten Island	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	121	Staten Island	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	121	Staten Island	Command Discipline A

Figure 46: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Cases (April 2016)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	41	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 3 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	41	Bronx	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Frisk	41	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 3 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Search (of person)	41	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 3 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Stop	41	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 3 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	43	Bronx	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Gun Pointed	75	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	75	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 3 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Threat of arrest	75	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 3 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Threat to notify ACS	75	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 3 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Frisk	75	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Stop	75	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Stop	75	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Stop	75	Brooklyn	Reprimand

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

	April 2016		March 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	962	90.6%	909	88.1%	53	5.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	63	5.9%	82	7.9%	-19	-23.2%
Cases 8 Months	4	0.4%	7	0.7%	-3	-42.9%
Cases 9 Months	5	0.5%	5	0.5%	0	0.0%
Cases 10 Months	6	0.6%	4	0.4%	2	50.0%
Cases 11 Months	3	0.3%	3	0.3%	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	3	0.3%	2	0.2%	1	50.0%
Cases 13 Months	2	0.2%	4	0.4%	-2	-50.0%
Cases 14 Months	4	0.4%	2	0.2%	2	100.0%
Cases 15 Months	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	-2	NA
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	-2	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	-2	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	8	0.8%	8	0.8%	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1062	100.0%	1032	100.0%	30	2.9%

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

	April 2016		March 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1009	95.0%	972	94.2%	37	3.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	44	4.1%	49	4.7%	-5	-10.2%
Cases 8 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	-1	-50.0%
Cases 10 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	5	0.5%	6	0.6%	-1	-16.7%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1062	100.0%	1032	100.0%	30	2.9%

Figure 48: CCRB Investigations Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	April 2016		March 2016		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	609	93.4%	555	89.8%	54	9.7%
Cases 5-7 Months	20	3.1%	29	4.7%	-9	-31.0%
Cases 8 Months	1	0.2%	5	0.8%	-4	-80.0%
Cases 9 Months	2	0.3%	5	0.8%	-3	-60.0%
Cases 10 Months	5	0.8%	2	0.3%	3	150.0%
Cases 11 Months	3	0.5%	3	0.5%	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	2	0.3%	2	0.3%	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	1	0.2%	4	0.6%	-3	-75.0%
Cases 14 Months	3	0.5%	2	0.3%	1	50.0%
Cases 15 Months	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.3%	-2	NA
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.3%	-2	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	5	0.8%	7	1.1%	-2	-28.6%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	652	100.0%	618	100.0%	34	5.5%

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

	April 2016	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	4	22.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	3	16.7%
Cases 8 Months	1	5.6%
Cases 9 Months	2	11.1%
Cases 10 Months	1	5.6%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	1	5.6%
Cases 13 Months	1	5.6%
Cases 14 Months	1	5.6%
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	1	5.6%
Cases 17 Months	1	5.6%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	2	11.1%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	18	100.0%

Figure 50: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2016)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	2	6.1%	22	66.7%	6	18.2%	2	6.1%	1	3%	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)	2	9.5%	10	47.6%	2	9.5%	7	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Radio as club	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Flashlight as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Police shield	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Vehicle	0	0%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	2	13.3%	1	6.7%	5	33.3%	7	46.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Chokehold	2	6.1%	0	0%	16	48.5%	9	27.3%	6	18.2%	0	0%
Pepper spray	0	0%	8	57.1%	3	21.4%	1	7.1%	2	14.3%	0	0%
Physical force	13	3.2%	151	37.1%	133	32.7%	68	16.7%	40	9.8%	2	0.5%
Handcuffs too tight	1	9.1%	0	0%	6	54.5%	4	36.4%	0	0%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	0	0%	7	70%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	2	4.7%	0	0%	20	46.5%	7	16.3%	14	32.6%	0	0%
Total	25	4.2%	201	33.6%	195	32.6%	113	18.9%	63	10.5%	2	0.3%

Figure 51: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2016)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	0	0%	8	50%	7	43.8%	0	0%	1	6.2%	0	0%
Strip-searched	4	21.1%	4	21.1%	8	42.1%	1	5.3%	2	10.5%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	4	4.9%	49	60.5%	24	29.6%	0	0%	4	4.9%	0	0%
Vehicle search	17	24.3%	17	24.3%	28	40%	2	2.9%	6	8.6%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	33	17.6%	112	59.6%	36	19.1%	1	0.5%	6	3.2%	0	0%
Threat of summons	0	0%	5	33.3%	7	46.7%	1	6.7%	2	13.3%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	9	7.9%	42	36.8%	43	37.7%	7	6.1%	13	11.4%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	0	0%	2	28.6%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	5	6.6%	8	10.5%	42	55.3%	10	13.2%	11	14.5%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	1	7.1%	5	35.7%	6	42.9%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	0	0%
Property damaged	6	15.4%	9	23.1%	15	38.5%	4	10.3%	5	12.8%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	5	26.3%	0	0%	12	63.2%	0	0%	2	10.5%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	25	15.2%	0	0%	98	59.8%	29	17.7%	12	7.3%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	13	32.5%	0	0%	15	37.5%	9	22.5%	3	7.5%	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	27	46.6%	9	15.5%	16	27.6%	5	8.6%	1	1.7%	0	0%
Seizure of property	1	10%	5	50%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%
Failure to show search warrant	6	33.3%	0	0%	10	55.6%	2	11.1%	0	0%	0	0%
Frisk	44	47.8%	10	10.9%	23	25%	1	1.1%	14	15.2%	0	0%
Search (of person)	39	35.8%	13	11.9%	42	38.5%	2	1.8%	13	11.9%	0	0%
Stop	61	37.4%	60	36.8%	26	16%	2	1.2%	14	8.6%	0	0%
Question	9	25%	16	44.4%	11	30.6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	321	23.6%	375	27.5%	477	35%	79	5.8%	110	8.1%	0	0%

Figure 52: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2016)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	27	8.3%	9	2.8%	194	59.3%	49	15%	47	14.4%	1	0.3%
Gesture	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Action	9	20%	1	2.2%	24	53.3%	10	22.2%	1	2.2%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	36	9.6%	10	2.7%	220	58.7%	59	15.7%	49	13.1%	1	0.3%

Figure 53: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2016)

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	0	0%	0	0%	20	74.1%	5	18.5%	2	7.4%	0	0%
Ethnicity	0	0%	0	0%	6	66.7%	2	22.2%	1	11.1%	0	0%
Religion	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gender	1	7.1%	0	0%	7	50%	5	35.7%	1	7.1%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	1	12.5%	0	0%	5	62.5%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical disability	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0%
Total	3	4.8%	0	0%	39	62.9%	15	24.2%	5	8.1%	0	0%

Figure 54: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (April 2016)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Awaiting filing of charges	10	5%
Charges filed, awaiting service	60	32%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	9	5%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	8	4%
Calendered for court appearance	28	15%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	9	5%
Trial scheduled	42	22%
Trial commenced	1	1%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	20	11%
Total	187	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 55: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (April 2016)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	0	0%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	79	52%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	48	32%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	5	3%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	20	13%
Total	152	100%

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