



BILL DE BLASIO
MAYOR

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



FREDERICK DAVIE
CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report
October 2021
(Statistics for September 2021)

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Glossary	3
Complaints Received	4
CCRB Cases Received By Borough and Precinct	5
Allegations Received	7
CCRB Docket	10
Body Worn Camera Footage Requests	12
Closed Cases	13
Resolving Cases	13
Dispositions / Case Abstracts	14
Dispositions - Full Investigations	16
Dispositions - All CCRB Cases	17
Dispositions - Allegations	18
Substantiation Rates	21
Substantiation Rates and Video	22
Disposition for Substantiated Complaints	23
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Officers	24
Unable to Investigate / Withdrawn	26
Complaints by PSA	27
Mediation Unit	29
Administrative Prosecution Unit	31
NYPD Discipline	32
Appendix	37

Executive Summary

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

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 36% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 50% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In September, the CCRB opened 295 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 3,455 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 35% of its fully investigated cases (page 16).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 19% of the cases it closed in September (page 13) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 36% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency was unable to investigate /withdrawn 45% of the cases received (page 13).
- 4) For September, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 34% of cases - compared to 50% of cases in which video was not available (page 21-22).
- 5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6, 25).
- 6) In September the Police Commissioner did not finalize any decisions against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases (page 31). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 15 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 2 trials were conducted against respondent officers in September.

Finally, the Monthly Report contains a Table of Contents, Glossary, and Appendix, all meant to assist readers in navigating this report. The CCRB is committed to producing monthly reports that are valuable to the public, and welcomes feedback on how to make its data more accessible.

Glossary

In this glossary we have included a list of terms that regularly appear in our reports.

Allegation: An allegation is a specific act of misconduct. The same “complaint” can have multiple allegations – excessive force and discourteous language, for example. Each allegation is reviewed separately during an investigation.

APU: The Administrative Prosecution Unit is the division of the CCRB that has prosecuted “charges” cases since April 2013, after the signing of a 2012 Memorandum of Understanding between the CCRB and NYPD.

Board Panel: The “Board” of the CCRB has 15 members. Following a completed investigation by the CCRB staff, three Board members, sitting as a Board Panel, will make a finding on whether misconduct occurred and will make a recommendation on what level of penalty should follow.

Case/Complaint: For the purposes of CCRB data, a “case” or “complaint” is defined as any incident within the Agency’s jurisdiction, brought to resolution by the CCRB.

Disposition: The Board’s finding as to the outcome of a case (i.e. if misconduct occurred).

FADO: Under the City Charter, the CCRB has jurisdiction to investigate the following categories of police misconduct: Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy, and Offensive Language, collectively known as “FADO”.

Intake: CCRB’s intake team initially handles complaints from the public. Intake takes complaints that come via live phone calls, voicemails, an online complaint form, or in-person.

Investigation: CCRB investigators gather evidence and interview witnesses to prepare reports on misconduct allegations. An investigation ends when a closing report is prepared detailing the evidence and legal analysis, and the case is given to the Board for disposition.

Mediation: A complainant may mediate his or her case with the subject officer, in lieu of an investigation, with the CCRB providing a neutral, third-party mediator.

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

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

Complaints Received

The CCRB’s Intake team processes misconduct complaints from the public and referrals from the NYPD. Under the New York City Charter, the CCRB’s jurisdiction is limited to allegations of misconduct related to Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy and Offensive Language. All other complaints are referred to the appropriate agency. Figure 1 refers to all complaints that the CCRB receives and Figures 2 and 3 refer to new cases that remain with the Agency. In September 2021, the CCRB initiated 295 new complaints.

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




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





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



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

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

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




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




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


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	5	67	8
5	6	68	2
6	2	69	3
7	2	70	4
9	2	71	4
10	1	72	1
13	2	73	6
14	4	75	11
17	1	76	2
18	1	77	3
19	5	78	4
20	5	79	4
23	2	81	5
24	3	83	3
25	10	84	2
26	2	88	2
28	5	90	2
30	3	94	2
32	2	101	3
33	2	102	4
34	1	103	3
40	6	105	2
41	3	106	3
42	1	107	2
43	6	108	3
44	5	109	9
45	3	110	2
46	9	112	1
47	7	113	7
48	1	114	5
49	4	115	4
50	6	120	6
52	7	121	5
60	3	122	3
61	6	Unknown	25
62	1		
63	5		
66	1		

*These figures track where an incident occurred, not necessarily the Command of the officer. Please review Figures 65A-65Q for Command Level data for cases closed in 2021.

Allegations Received

As described in the previous section, the CCRB has jurisdiction over four categories of NYPD misconduct. In comparing September 2020 to September 2021, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is up, Abuse of Authority complaints are up, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down. Figures for the year-to-date comparison show that in 2021, complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down.

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




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

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

	September 2020		September 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	102	40%	124	42%	22	22%
Abuse of Authority (A)	197	77%	214	73%	17	9%
Discourtesy (D)	76	30%	73	25%	-3	-4%
Offensive Language (O)	24	9%	19	6%	-5	-21%
Total FADO Allegations	399		430		31	8%
Total Complaints	255		295		40	16%

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

Figure 9: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (YTD 2020 vs. YTD 2021)



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

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

	YTD 2020		YTD 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	1291	42%	1066	41%	-225	-17%
Abuse of Authority (A)	2256	74%	2006	78%	-250	-11%
Discourtesy (D)	881	29%	615	24%	-266	-30%
Offensive Language (O)	250	8%	179	7%	-71	-28%
Total FADO Allegations	4678		3866		-812	-17%
Total Complaints	3058		2576		-482	-16%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	September 2020		September 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	273	25%	292	29%	19	7%
Abuse of Authority (A)	677	62%	585	58%	-92	-14%
Discourtesy (D)	124	11%	104	10%	-20	-16%
Offensive Language (O)	26	2%	25	2%	-1	-4%
Total Allegations	1100		1006		-94	-9%
Total Complaints	255		295		40	16%

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

	YTD 2020		YTD 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	3659	27%	2533	25%	-1126	-31%
Abuse of Authority (A)	8155	60%	6498	64%	-1657	-20%
Discourtesy (D)	1452	11%	888	9%	-564	-39%
Offensive Language (O)	331	2%	236	2%	-95	-29%
Total Allegations	13597		10155		-3442	-25%
Total Complaints	3058		2576		-482	-16%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of September 2021, 36% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 50% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

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

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1174	36.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	471	14.5%
Cases 8-11 Months	490	15.0%
Cases 12-18 Months*	856	26.3%
Cases Over 18 Months**	268	8.2%
Total	3259	100%

*12-18 Months: 21 cases that were reopened; 6 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 19 cases that were reopened; 3 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1032	31.7%
Cases 5-7 Months	432	13.3%
Cases 8-11 Months	523	16.0%
Cases 12-18 Months*	910	27.9%
Cases Over 18 Months**	362	11.1%
Total	3259	100%

*12-18 Months: 20 cases that were reopened; 6 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 23 cases that were reopened; 3 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

Figure 15: Number of Active Investigations (January 2020 - September 2021)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	August 2021		September 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	1998	60%	2003	58%	5	0%
Pending Board Review	1103	33%	1256	36%	153	14%
Mediation	227	7%	191	6%	-36	-16%
On DA Hold	4	0%	5	0%	1	25%
Total	3332		3455		123	4%

Body Worn Camera Footage Requests


Since the widespread roll out of body worn cameras in 2018, the collection of footage from these cameras has become an integral part of CCRB investigations.

The timeliness of the response to BWC footage requests has a direct impact on the length of time it takes to complete an investigation. The longer it takes to fulfill BWC requests, the longer CCRB investigations remain on the open docket.

Figure 18: Pending Requests for BWC Footage

Days Pending	BWC Requests	% of Total
00 <= Days < 30	63	61.2%
30 <= Days < 60	6	5.8%
60 <= Days < 90	6	5.8%
90 >= Days	28	27.2%
Total	103	100%

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




Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In September 2021, the CCRB fully investigated 19% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 36% of the cases it closed.

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



Dispositions

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

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

Additionally, a case might be **mediated**, with the subject officer and complainant discussing the incident in the presence of a neutral third-party moderator, or closed as **mediation attempted**, the designation for a case in which both the officer and the civilian agree to mediate, but the civilian fails to appear twice for the scheduled mediation session or fails to respond to attempts to schedule a mediation session. Finally, a case that cannot be fully investigated because the CCRB was unable to obtain a sworn statement from the complainant/victim is closed as **unable to investigate**.

Case Abstracts

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

1. Substantiated

Three individuals were marching in a protest and were followed by officers who urged protestors to move to the sidewalks. The first subject officer used the butt of his baton to push the first individual multiple times causing her to push back against the officer. The subject officer then pushed on different parts of the individual's arms and shoulders and thrust forward with enough force that the individual fell to the ground. The second individual encountered the second subject officer as she and other protestors were trying to move to the sidewalk to comply with a general "move" order. They were blocked by a construction barricade. The subject officer told her to move back or get on the sidewalk. The individual responded that she was trying to move. The subject officer used his baton to push her around her shoulders causing her to fall backward onto other protestors. The individual stated that the subject officer's badge number was covered up with a black band and asked him why his badge number was covered – he did not respond. A third individual was holding a skateboard against his chest when the third subject officer ran towards him and swung his baton at the individual's upper body twice, making contact on the first swing.

NYPD Patrol Guide 221-01 states that officer may use force when it is reasonable to ensure the safety of an individual. Officer will only use the reasonable force necessary to gain control of a subject while considering a number of factors. NYPD Patrol Guide 204-17 states that members of service who choose to wear a black elastic mourning band on their shields are required to leave their shield numbers or rank designation visible. NYPD Patrol Guide 208-08 states that an officer is prohibited from making a false statement and that an officer found to have made such a statement is subject to disciplinary action.

The first subject officer stated that he used his baton to guide protestors. BWC footage showed the officer shoving his baton at the first individual multiple times who had her phone in hand, and thus did not pose a safety threat to the officer. The second subject officer stated that he recalled telling the second individual to move back and that he gave her one minute to comply with his order. He denied pushing the individual. BWC footage showed the subject officer using his baton to push the individual against the construction barricade, who was already walking to the sidewalk. Since the individual was already complying with the order to move, the officer's force was unnecessary. The subject officer recalled the individual asked why she couldn't see his shield and stated that he did not respond to her question. The third subject officer denied making contact with the third individual. He was shown BWC footage that showed him making contact with his baton on the individual who was not being aggressive with the

officer in any manner. The subject officer upon viewing the video denied making contact with the individual. The Board substantiated the Use of Force, Abuse of Authority, and Untruthful Statement allegations.

2. Unable to Determine

An individual owned a member's only club where patrons paid a \$30 monthly fee. The club was in operation when the three subject officers entered the club. The individual alleged that the subject officers opened a locked storage room and seized a digital video recorder. The subject officers stated that they entered the room for the sole purpose of retrieving the DVR which had footage of undercover officers that had entered the club a few minutes prior to verify that alcohol was being sold at the establishment. The subject officers could not recall whether the door to the storage room was locked, or whether they got keys from the individual to open the door. The investigation was unable to determine how the subject officers accessed the storage room. The Board closed the Abuse of Authority allegation as Unable to Determine.

3. Unfounded

Police officers arrived after a 911 call was placed and encountered two individuals, a mother, and a daughter and approximately three other individuals in an apartment lobby. The mother alleged that the subject officers swung her daughter's arms around to handcuff her and allegedly said "bitch, you're doing down tonight", "bitch, you're going to jail" and, "step aside, bitch. You can be arrested too." The daughter stated that officers told her that she was identified as person who tased another individual, and that she was handcuffed right away. She did not recall any officers using profanity. BWC footage corroborated the daughter's statement that none of the officers used profanity either towards her or her mother. The footage also showed the mother clinging to the daughter when she was informed of her daughter's arrest. It showed the subject officers pull the mother away from the daughter and the daughter getting handcuffed. The investigation concluded that the officers used minimal force to put the daughter's hands behind her back to handcuff her and that the mother tried to interfere with her daughter being arrested and was told that she could be arrested for interfering which was a factual statement. The Board closed the Abuse of Authority and Discourteous Word allegations as Unfounded.

4. Within NYPD Guidelines

An individual was on the phone with the subject officer discussing a wellness check that the individual requested on his minor child. The individual alleged that the subject officer threatened him with arrest. The investigation found that both the individual and the subject officer at the time of the conversation believed that the order of protection was still in effect and the subject officer discussed what actions were not permissible with such an order in effect, including arrest being a consequence of violating the order of protection. The subject officer relaying such information were factual statements in accordance with the law. The Board found the subject officer's conduct to be within the Department's guidelines and closed the Abuse of Authority allegation as being Within NYPD Guidelines.

5. Officer Unidentified


An individual was walking home from a check cashing store when he noticed a black sedan whose occupants were watching him. He noticed that they were wearing bulletproof vests and assumed that they were police officers. One of the officers inside the car ordered the individual to stop and the individual complied. Four officers exited the car, approached him, and asked what he was doing. The individual had his MTA bus operator identification card in his hand as they searched his coat pocket and the outside of his pants. The officers left and did not explain why they had stopped the individual. The individual was able to give a general physical description of the officers and that they were also all in plainclothes. BWC footage was requested for the incident date and location and negative results were returned, no stop report logs mentioned the incident, and the individual's officer description didn't match those of the four anti-crime officers that were listed with the local precinct. The Board closed the Abuse of Authority allegations as Officer Unidentified.

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

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


Dispositions - Full Investigations

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



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

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



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

Dispositions - All CCRB Cases

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

Figure 23: Disposition of Cases (2020 vs 2021)

	Sep 2020		Sep 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Full Investigations								
Substantiated	6	17%	12	35%	242	30%	137	34%
Within NYPD Guidelines	5	14%	3	9%	176	22%	59	14%
Unfounded	4	11%	2	6%	71	9%	28	7%
Unable to Determine	7	20%	15	44%	248	30%	118	29%
MOS Unidentified	13	37%	2	6%	81	10%	66	16%
Total - Full Investigations	35		34		818		408	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	0	0%	14	48%	29	0%	85	51%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	15	52%	0	0%	83	0%
Total - ADR Closures	0		29		29		168	
Resolved Case Total	35	11%	63	36%	847	33%	576	29%
Unable to Investigate / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	39	14%	12	11%	328	19%	277	20%
Unable to Investigate	141	50%	68	60%	1093	63%	804	58%
Closed - Pending Litigation	37	13%	26	23%	241	14%	241	17%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	1	1%	6	0%	12	1%
Administrative closure*	67	24%	7	6%	70	4%	46	3%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	284		114		1738		1380	
Total - Closed Cases	319		177		2585		1956	

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

Dispositions - FADO Allegations

“Allegations” are different than “cases.” A case or complaint is based on an incident and may contain one or more allegations of police misconduct. The allegation substantiation rate is 12% for the month of September 2021, and the allegation substantiation rate is 21% year-to-date.

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2020 vs 2021)

	Sep 2020		Sep 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Fully Investigated Allegations								
Substantiated	42	25%	34	12%	615	14%	456	21%
Unable to Determine	36	21%	98	33%	1282	30%	586	26%
Unfounded	15	9%	23	8%	442	10%	161	7%
Within NYPD Guidelines	36	21%	58	20%	1426	33%	602	27%
MOS Unidentified	41	24%	81	28%	505	12%	419	19%
Total - Full Investigations	170		294		4270		2224	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	31	43%	76	100%	217	47%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	41	57%	0	0%	248	0%
Total - ADR Closures	0		72		76		465	
Unable to Investigate / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	94	14%	31	9%	889	18%	717	17%
Unable to Investigate	368	53%	183	53%	3109	63%	2237	54%
Closed - Pending Litigation	161	23%	97	28%	818	16%	935	23%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	9	3%	74	1%	94	2%
Administrative closure	67	10%	24	7%	74	1%	122	3%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	690		344		4964		4105	
Total - Closed Allegations	860		710		9310		6795	

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

	Substantiated	Unable to Determine	Within NYPD Guidelines	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	5 5%	26 25%	20 19%	8 8%	44 43%	103 100%
Abuse of Authority	17 14%	50 40%	26 21%	5 4%	27 22%	125 100%
Discourtesy	7 13%	18 33%	12 22%	8 15%	10 18%	55 100%
Offensive Language	3 60%	0 0%	0 0%	2 40%	0 0%	5 100%
Total	32 11%	94 33%	58 20%	23 8%	81 28%	288 100%

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

	Substantiated	Unable to Determine	Within NYPD Guidelines	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	89 12%	177 24%	204 28%	52 7%	217 29%	739 100%
Abuse of Authority	241 23%	290 27%	337 32%	69 6%	130 12%	1067 100%
Discourtesy	80 25%	94 29%	60 19%	31 10%	58 18%	323 100%
Offensive Language	29 40%	20 27%	1 1%	9 12%	14 19%	73 100%
Total	439 20%	581 26%	602 27%	161 7%	419 19%	2202 100%

Dispositions - Untruthful Statement Allegations

Following the 2019 passage of Ballot Question #2 and the subsequent City Charter Revision, CCRB’s jurisdiction was expanded to include untruthful material statements made by police officers. As a result, CCRB added a new “Untruthful Statement” category of allegations.

There are four specific allegations in the new “Untruthful Statement” category: 1) False official statement, 2) Misleading official statement, 3) Inaccurate official statement and 4) Impeding an investigation.

Figure 27: Disposition of Untruthful Statement Allegations (September 2021)

Untruthful Statement Allegation	Substantiated		Within NYPD Guidelines		Unable to Determine		Unfounded		Administrative Closure		Other	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
False official statement	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Misleading official statement	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Inaccurate official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Impeding an investigation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	2	33.3%	0	0%	4	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%


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

Untruthful Statement Allegation	Substantiated		Within NYPD Guidelines		Unable to Determine		Unfounded		Administrative Closure		Other	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
False official statement	10	83.3%	0	0%	2	16.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Misleading official statement	5	62.5%	0	0%	3	37.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Inaccurate official statement	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Impeding an investigation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	17	77.3%	0	0%	5	22.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Substantiation Rates

The September 2021 case substantiation rate was 35%.

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




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

Substantiation Rates and Video


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

Figure 30: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations without Video (Jan 2021 - Sep 2021) (% substantiated shown)




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

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



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

Figure 32: Disposition of Substantiated Complaints* (2021)



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

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

Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Officers

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

- “Charges and Specifications” are the most severe form of discipline. A decision to assign Charges commences a process that may result in an administrative trial in the NYPD Trial Room. An officer may lose vacation days, be suspended, or be terminated if the officer is found guilty.
- “Command Discipline B” and "Command Discipline A" are recommended for misconduct that is moderately serious. An officer can lose up to ten vacation days as a result of Command Discipline B and up to five vacation days as a result of Command Discipline A.
- “Formalized Training” and “Instructions*” are the least severe discipline, often recommended for officers who misunderstand a policy. This determination results in training at the Police Academy or NYPD Legal Bureau (Formalized Training) or training at the command level (Instructions*).
- When the Board has recommended Instructions*, Formalized Training or Command Discipline, the case is sent to the NYPD Commissioner to impose training and/or other penalties. Cases where the Board recommends charges are prosecuted by the CCRB’s Administrative Prosecution Unit.

Figure 33: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations
(Sep 2020, Sep 2021, YTD 2020, YTD 2021)**

Disposition	September 2020		September 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Charges	1	9%	10	50%	29	8%	119	51%
Command Discipline B	1	9%	5	25%	41	11%	34	15%
Command Discipline A	7	64%	5	25%	76	21%	57	24%
Formalized Training	0	0%	0	0%	88	24%	17	7%
Instructions	2	18%	0	0%	133	36%	6	3%
Total	11		20		367		233	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Gender	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Untruthful Statement	Misleading official statement	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Physical force	19	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Action	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Untruthful Statement	False official statement	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	72	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	72	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	72	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Question	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Action	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Action	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Gender	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Other	115	Queens

Unable to Investigate and Withdrawn Complaints

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

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

	Withdrawn	Unable to Investigate	Total
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0
Force	8	44	52
Abuse of Authority	18	112	130
Discourtesy	5	21	26
Offensive Language	0	6	6
Total	31	183	214

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

	Withdrawn	Unable to Investigate	Total
Total	12	68	80

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

	Withdrawn	Unable to Investigate	Total
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0
Force	135	652	787
Abuse of Authority	486	1339	1825
Discourtesy	81	181	262
Offensive Language	15	65	80
Total	717	2237	2954

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

	Withdrawn	Unable to Investigate	Total
Total	277	804	1081

Complaints Against Officers Assigned to Police Service Areas

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

Figure 39: PSA Complaints Closed as % of Total Complaints Closed

	Sep 2020	Sep 2021	YTD 2020	YTD 2021
PSA Complaints	12	13	124	88
Total Complaints	319	177	2585	1956
PSA Complaints as % of Total	3.8%	7.3%	4.8%	4.5%

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

Figure 40: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

	Sep 2020	Sep 2021	YTD 2020	YTD 2021
PSA 1	4	1	17	15
PSA 2	0	3	30	33
PSA 3	0	8	29	16
PSA 4	5	1	24	6
PSA 5	1	7	20	20
PSA 6	3	0	23	6
PSA 7	4	1	65	35
PSA 8	0	3	14	21
PSA 9	1	4	13	8
Total	18	28	235	160

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

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

	Sep 2020		Sep 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	% of Total						
Force (F)	3	12%	16	42%	92	30%	86	43%
Abuse of Authority (A)	15	60%	16	42%	164	53%	91	45%
Discourtesy (D)	6	24%	5	13%	41	13%	20	10%
Offensive Language (O)	1	4%	1	3%	11	4%	5	2%
Total	25	100%	38	100%	308	100%	202	100%

Dispositions of Officers Assigned to PSAs

The following tables show the Board disposition of officers assigned to a PSA with a FADO allegation made against them.

Figure 42: Disposition of PSA Officers (2020 vs 2021)

	Sep 2020		Sep 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Full Investigations								
Substantiated	1	17%	1	17%	19	19%	4	21%
Within NYPD Guidelines	1	17%	0	0%	35	35%	7	37%
Unfounded	1	17%	1	17%	15	15%	1	5%
Unable to Determine	2	33%	4	67%	28	28%	7	37%
MOS Unidentified	1	17%	0	0%	4	4%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	6		6		101		19	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2	18%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	9	82%
Total - ADR Closures	0		4		2		11	
Resolved Case Total	6	33%	10	36%	103	44%	30	19%
Unable to Investigate / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	0	0%	5	28%	24	18%	16	12%
Unable to Investigate	7	58%	3	17%	89	67%	87	67%
Closed - Pending Litigation	5	42%	9	50%	20	15%	23	18%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	3	2%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	12		18		133		130	
Total - Closed Cases	18		28		236		160	

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

Mediation Unit

Whenever mediation between a complainant/alleged victim and subject officer is suitable, it is offered by CCRB investigators. If the complainant/alleged victim and subject officer both agree to participate, a neutral, third-party mediator facilitates a conversation between the parties. “Mediation Attempted” refers to a situation in which an officer agrees to mediate and the complainant becomes unavailable (after the complainant initially agreed to mediation). The chart below indicates the number of mediations and attempted mediations in September and this year.

Figure 43: Mediated Complaints Closed

	September 2021			YTD 2021		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	14	15	29	85	83	168

Figure 44: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	September 2021			YTD 2021		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	0	0	0	11	18	29
Abuse of Authority	28	34	62	164	191	355
Discourtesy	2	6	8	32	32	64
Offensive Language	1	1	2	10	7	17
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	31	41	72	217	248	465

Figure 45: Mediated Complaints By Borough (September 2021)

	Mediations
	0
Bronx	2
Brooklyn	7
Manhattan	3
Queens	2
Staten Island	0

Figure 46: Mediated Allegations By Borough (September 2021)

	Mediations
	0
Bronx	2
Brooklyn	21
Manhattan	5
Queens	3
Staten Island	0

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

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

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

Precinct	Sep 2021	YTD 2021	Precinct	Sep 2021	YTD 2021
5	2	5	62	0	1
9	0	7	63	0	2
10	0	2	68	0	3
14	0	9	70	3	6
17	0	5	71	11	16
18	2	9	72	0	4
19	0	4	73	0	6
23	1	1	75	0	4
25	0	3	76	0	3
28	0	4	77	0	14
32	0	2	79	4	16
34	0	1	81	0	7
40	1	1	84	2	6
41	0	10	88	1	1
42	0	3	90	0	1
44	0	6	102	0	9
45	0	1	103	3	5
47	0	1	104	0	2
48	0	5	105	0	3
50	0	2	113	0	14
52	1	5	115	0	4
61	0	1	120	0	1
			122	0	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 49: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Sep 2021	YTD 2021
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	0	12
	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		0
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	0	2
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	0
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	0	1
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total		0
Not Adjudicated	Charges not served	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	1
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	3
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	0	0
	Retired	0	4
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total		0
Total Closures		0	23

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

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

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

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

NYPD Discipline

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

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

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

Figure 50: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	September 2021	YTD 2021
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	2
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	1
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	9
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	0
Formalized Training**	0	0
Instructions***	0	0
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	0	12
No Disciplinary Action†	0	3
Adjudicated Total	0	15
Discipline Rate	0%	80%
Not Adjudicated† Total	0	8
Total Closures	0	23

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

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

*** Instructions are conducted at the command level.

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

Figure 51: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	Disposition Type*	August 2021	YTD 2021
Disciplinary Action	Terminated	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	1
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	2	13
	Command Discipline B	1	11
	Command Discipline A	8	43
	Formalized Training**	13	58
	Instructions***	0	39
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total	24	165
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	0	5
	SOL Expired	0	1
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	0	4
	No Finding ††††	0	9
	Total	0	19
	Discipline Rate	100%	90%
	DUP Rate	0%	2%

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

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

*** Instructions are conducted at the command level.

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

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

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

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

Figure 52: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (August 2021)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to provide name	1	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	9	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	9	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	E	Ethnicity	14	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Refusal to provide name	14	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Refusal to provide shield number	14	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	23	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Property damaged	24	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Action	24	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	33	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Entry of Premises	34	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	43	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	52	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	52	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	52	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	52	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	F	Physical force	61	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search of Premises	81	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Retaliatory summons	83	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	83	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	83	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle stop	84	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	84	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	U	Inaccurate official statement	84	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle search	113	Queens	Formalized Training

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	113	Queens	Formalized Training

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

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
-------------------	-----------	------------	----------	---------	-----------------

Appendix

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

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

	September 2021		August 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1032	29.9%	962	28.9%	70	7.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	452	13.1%	535	16.1%	-83	-15.5%
Cases 8 Months	179	5.2%	134	4.0%	45	33.6%
Cases 9 Months	132	3.8%	129	3.9%	3	2.3%
Cases 10 Months	124	3.6%	140	4.2%	-16	-11.4%
Cases 11 Months	140	4.1%	121	3.6%	19	15.7%
Cases 12 Months	116	3.4%	101	3.0%	15	14.9%
Cases 13 Months	103	3.0%	80	2.4%	23	28.8%
Cases 14 Months	80	2.3%	178	5.3%	-98	-55.1%
Cases 15 Months	177	5.1%	226	6.8%	-49	-21.7%
Cases 16 Months	222	6.4%	157	4.7%	65	41.4%
Cases 17 Months	154	4.5%	143	4.3%	11	7.7%
Cases 18 Months	144	4.2%	118	3.5%	26	22.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	395	11.4%	304	9.1%	91	29.9%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	3450	100.0%	3328	100.0%	122	3.7%

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

	September 2021		August 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1174	34.0%	1115	33.5%	59	5.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	498	14.4%	536	16.1%	-38	-7.1%
Cases 8 Months	158	4.6%	139	4.2%	19	13.7%
Cases 9 Months	137	4.0%	126	3.8%	11	8.7%
Cases 10 Months	122	3.5%	126	3.8%	-4	-3.2%
Cases 11 Months	124	3.6%	122	3.7%	2	1.6%
Cases 12 Months	117	3.4%	93	2.8%	24	25.8%
Cases 13 Months	92	2.7%	94	2.8%	-2	-2.1%
Cases 14 Months	93	2.7%	190	5.7%	-97	-51.1%
Cases 15 Months	186	5.4%	186	5.6%	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	181	5.2%	136	4.1%	45	33.1%
Cases 17 Months	135	3.9%	136	4.1%	-1	-0.7%
Cases 18 Months	136	3.9%	118	3.5%	18	15.3%
Cases Over 18 Months	297	8.6%	211	6.3%	86	40.8%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	3450	100.0%	3328	100.0%	122	3.7%

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

	September 2021		August 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	775	38.7%	735	36.8%	40	5.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	320	16.0%	370	18.5%	-50	-13.5%
Cases 8 Months	118	5.9%	79	4.0%	39	49.4%
Cases 9 Months	73	3.6%	84	4.2%	-11	-13.1%
Cases 10 Months	77	3.8%	82	4.1%	-5	-6.1%
Cases 11 Months	80	4.0%	60	3.0%	20	33.3%
Cases 12 Months	52	2.6%	50	2.5%	2	4.0%
Cases 13 Months	48	2.4%	37	1.9%	11	29.7%
Cases 14 Months	36	1.8%	92	4.6%	-56	-60.9%
Cases 15 Months	70	3.5%	118	5.9%	-48	-40.7%
Cases 16 Months	107	5.3%	71	3.6%	36	50.7%
Cases 17 Months	58	2.9%	53	2.7%	5	9.4%
Cases 18 Months	47	2.3%	47	2.4%	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	142	7.1%	120	6.0%	22	18.3%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	2003	100.0%	1998	100.0%	5	0.3%

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

	September 2021	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1	20.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	2	40.0%
Cases 16 Months	1	20.0%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	1	20.0%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	5	100.0%

Figure 58: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2021)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Within NYPD Guidelines		Unable to Determine		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	3	6.4%	10	21.3%	16	34%	9	19.1%	9	19.1%	0	0%
Gun fired	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	6	10%	7	11.7%	3	5%	1	1.7%	43	71.7%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Radio as club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Flashlight as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Police shield	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	4	80%	0	0%
Vehicle	1	11.1%	0	0%	7	77.8%	0	0%	1	11.1%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	3	20%	3	20%	5	33.3%	2	13.3%	2	13.3%	0	0%
Chokehold	4	17.4%	0	0%	13	56.5%	2	8.7%	4	17.4%	0	0%
Pepper spray	10	30.3%	2	6.1%	2	6.1%	1	3%	18	54.5%	0	0%
Physical force	49	10.3%	167	35.2%	98	20.7%	29	6.1%	125	26.4%	6	1.3%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	5	21.7%	7	30.4%	10	43.5%	1	4.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	5	55.6%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	5	16.1%	0	0%	16	51.6%	4	12.9%	6	19.4%	0	0%
Total	89	11.9%	204	27.4%	177	23.8%	52	7%	217	29.1%	6	0.8%

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

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Within NYPD Guidelines		Unable to Determine		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	0	0%	5	35.7%	3	21.4%	1	7.1%	5	35.7%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	29	20.3%	68	47.6%	34	23.8%	1	0.7%	9	6.3%	2	1.4%
Strip-searched	3	33.3%	0	0%	4	44.4%	2	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	1	5.6%	10	55.6%	4	22.2%	0	0%	3	16.7%	0	0%
Vehicle search	8	21.1%	22	57.9%	7	18.4%	0	0%	1	2.6%	0	0%
Threat of summons	2	28.6%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	12	11.5%	47	45.2%	23	22.1%	10	9.6%	8	7.7%	4	3.8%
Threat to notify ACS	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	11	15.1%	24	32.9%	16	21.9%	11	15.1%	11	15.1%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	3	23.1%	5	38.5%	2	15.4%	1	7.7%	2	15.4%	0	0%
Property damaged	4	8.3%	7	14.6%	19	39.6%	7	14.6%	11	22.9%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	8	44.4%	1	5.6%	5	27.8%	0	0%	4	22.2%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	8	80%	0	0%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	4	20%	1	5%	10	50%	0	0%	5	25%	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	6	54.5%	4	36.4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	9.1%	0	0%
Seizure of property	4	21.1%	11	57.9%	1	5.3%	1	5.3%	2	10.5%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	3	33.3%	0	0%	4	44.4%	2	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%
Frisk	15	35.7%	12	28.6%	11	26.2%	0	0%	4	9.5%	0	0%
Search (of person)	17	34.7%	10	20.4%	17	34.7%	0	0%	5	10.2%	0	0%
Stop	21	29.2%	25	34.7%	18	25%	0	0%	8	11.1%	0	0%
Question	5	25%	5	25%	5	25%	0	0%	5	25%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Interference with recording	8	32%	4	16%	6	24%	2	8%	5	20%	0	0%
Search of recording device	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Forcible Removal to Hospital	7	11.7%	32	53.3%	11	18.3%	4	6.7%	5	8.3%	1	1.7%
Threat re: removal to hospital	2	22.2%	2	22.2%	3	33.3%	2	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%

Threat re: immigration status	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Disseminated immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Questioned immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Search of Premises	16	23.2%	26	37.7%	20	29%	1	1.4%	6	8.7%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Arrest)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Frisk)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Strip-Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Vehicle Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Photo/Video)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Summons)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Photography/Videography	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	0	0%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	2	5.9%	1	2.9%	16	47.1%	8	23.5%	7	20.6%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	8	14.5%	0	0%	26	47.3%	10	18.2%	11	20%	0	0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	25	41.7%	7	11.7%	18	30%	4	6.7%	6	10%	0	0%
Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Question)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Obstructed Shield Number	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	0	0%
Obstructed Rank Designation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Sex Miscon (Humiliation: fail to cover)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Untruthful Statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Inappropriate Touching)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Forcible Touching)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Rape)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Sexual Assault)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (On- duty Sexual Activity)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Penetrative Sex. Contact)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	241	22.4%	337	31.4%	290	27%	69	6.4%	130	12.1%	7	0.7%

Figure 60: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2021)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Within NYPD Guidelines		Unable to Determine		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	68	24.2%	58	20.6%	80	28.5%	22	7.8%	52	18.5%	1	0.4%
Gesture	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Action	12	30.8%	2	5.1%	12	30.8%	8	20.5%	5	12.8%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	80	24.7%	60	18.5%	94	29%	31	9.6%	58	17.9%	1	0.3%

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

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Within NYPD Guidelines		Unable to Determine		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	3	30%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	4	40%	0	0%
Ethnicity	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%
Religion	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	3	50%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%	2	33.3%	0	0%
Physical disability	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	8	40%	0	0%	6	30%	3	15%	3	15%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender	14	50%	0	0%	8	28.6%	4	14.3%	2	7.1%	0	0%
Total	29	39.7%	1	1.4%	20	27.4%	9	12.3%	14	19.2%	0	0%

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

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Trial commenced	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	21	11%
Charges filed, awaiting service	32	17%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	111	60%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	3	2%
Calendared for court appearance	3	2%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	7	4%
Trial scheduled	5	3%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	1	1%
Previously adjudicated	2	1%
Total	185	100%

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

Figure 63: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (September 2021)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	0	0%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	9	50%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	7	39%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	0	0%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	2	11%
Total	18	100%

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

Figure 64: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	1	17	16	124
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	1	18	21	153
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	2	55	29	359
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	5	21	24	246
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	5	52	25	359
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	0	2	21	181
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	5	9	111
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	6	7	80
Special Operations Division Total	0	2	0	21
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	1
Total	14	178	152	1635
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	1	2	2	29
Transit Bureau Total	0	6	4	94
Housing Bureau Total	1	4	24	141
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	2	1	53
Detective Bureau Total	0	10	8	63
Other Bureaus Total	2	14	11	62
Total	4	38	50	442
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	10	4	47
Undetermined	2	7	9	27
Total	20	233	215	2151

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

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

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
001 Precinct	1	2	3	14
005 Precinct	0	0	1	4
006 Precinct	0	0	2	4
007 Precinct	0	3	3	22
009 Precinct	0	0	2	8
010 Precinct	0	1	0	6
013 Precinct	0	1	0	10
Midtown South Precinct	0	2	3	14
017 Precinct	0	5	0	15
Midtown North Precinct	0	0	2	10
Precincts Total	1	14	16	107
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	1	0	7
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	2	0	9
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	1	17	16	124

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

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

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
019 Precinct	1	2	4	9
020 Precinct	0	1	0	6
023 Precinct	0	3	2	20
024 Precinct	0	1	2	11
025 Precinct	0	0	5	19
026 Precinct	0	1	1	4
Central Park Precinct	0	0	0	2
028 Precinct	0	3	1	18
030 Precinct	0	0	1	10
032 Precinct	0	2	3	14
033 Precinct	0	1	0	14
034 Precinct	0	2	2	21
Precincts Total	1	16	21	148
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	1	0	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	0	4
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	1	18	21	153

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

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

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
040 Precinct	0	0	5	25
041 Precinct	0	9	0	35
042 Precinct	0	3	1	32
043 Precinct	0	1	3	13
044 Precinct	1	8	5	58
045 Precinct	0	2	3	13
046 Precinct	0	6	4	41
047 Precinct	1	4	1	32
048 Precinct	0	2	1	19
049 Precinct	0	1	0	13
050 Precinct	0	2	0	15
052 Precinct	0	15	3	44
Precincts Total	2	53	26	340
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	2	0	12
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	3	7
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	2	55	29	359

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

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

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
060 Precinct	0	1	3	20
061 Precinct	0	0	0	16
062 Precinct	0	0	0	2
063 Precinct	0	0	1	13
066 Precinct	0	0	0	9
067 Precinct	0	5	0	33
068 Precinct	0	1	1	15
069 Precinct	0	0	1	26
070 Precinct	2	2	6	20
071 Precinct	0	4	2	30
072 Precinct	2	2	7	19
076 Precinct	0	0	0	14
078 Precinct	0	1	2	12
Precincts Total	4	16	23	229
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	1	5	1	16
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	5	21	24	246

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

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

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
073 Precinct	0	8	1	41
075 Precinct	5	15	10	152
077 Precinct	0	3	4	33
079 Precinct	0	8	6	35
081 Precinct	0	2	0	19
083 Precinct	0	2	1	24
084 Precinct	0	5	0	16
088 Precinct	0	1	1	11
090 Precinct	0	5	1	17
094 Precinct	0	2	0	7
Precincts Total	5	51	24	355
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	1	0	3
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	1	1
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	5	52	25	359

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

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

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
100 Precinct	0	0	1	9
101 Precinct	0	0	5	22
102 Precinct	0	0	0	23
103 Precinct	0	0	8	45
105 Precinct	0	1	0	28
106 Precinct	0	0	0	17
107 Precinct	0	1	0	6
113 Precinct	0	0	6	25
Precincts Total	0	2	20	175
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	1	4
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	0	2	21	181

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

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

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
104 Precinct	0	0	0	18
108 Precinct	0	0	1	9
109 Precinct	0	1	1	15
110 Precinct	0	1	0	11
111 Precinct	0	1	0	10
112 Precinct	0	0	4	12
114 Precinct	0	0	3	20
115 Precinct	0	2	0	12
Precincts Total	0	5	9	107
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	5	9	111

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

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

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
120 Precinct	0	3	3	35
122 Precinct	0	0	0	11
123 Precinct	0	0	2	7
121 Precinct	0	2	2	20
Precincts Total	0	5	7	73
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	1	0	6
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Housing Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Court Section	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	6	7	80

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

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

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	1	0	14
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	0
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	1	0	1
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	0
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	0	0	6
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Disorder control	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	0	2	0	21

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

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

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

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

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

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	15
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	2
Highway Unit #1	0	1	0	2
Highway Unit #2	0	0	0	2
Highway Unit #3	1	1	2	7
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	1
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Division Total	1	2	2	29

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

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

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	1	0	1
Transit Bureau Authority Liaison	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Inspections	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Spec. Invest. Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Crime Analysis	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Patrol Operations	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	0	0	0	1
TB DT02	0	1	0	10
TB DT03	0	1	0	6
TB DT04	0	1	1	13
TB DT11	0	0	0	5
TB DT12	0	0	0	9
TB DT20	0	0	0	5
TB DT23	0	0	0	1
TB DT30	0	0	0	9
TB DT32	0	0	1	8
TB DT33	0	0	2	14
TB DT34	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	2
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	2	0	4
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	0
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	0	0	1
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	0	6	4	94

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

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

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	0	1	1	12
PSA 2	0	0	3	30
PSA 3	1	1	5	13
PSA 4	0	0	1	6
PSA 5	0	0	6	17
PSA 6	0	0	0	5
PSA 7	0	2	1	29
PSA 8	0	0	3	21
PSA 9	0	0	4	7
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	1	4	24	141
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	0	1
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	1	4	24	141

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

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

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Queens Narcotics	0	0	0	12
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	1	0	10
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Bronx Narcotics	0	1	0	3
Staten Island Narcotics	0	0	1	6
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	0	8
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	0	0	8
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	2
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	4
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	2	1	53

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

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

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	0	1
Special Victims Division	0	0	0	0
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	1
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	0	0	0
Detective Borough Bronx	0	3	2	17
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	2	1	12
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	5	4	18
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	1	11
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	0	3
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	0	10	8	63

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

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

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	3
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	2	14	9	53
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	1
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	1
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	1	1
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	1	3
Other Bureaus Total	2	14	11	62

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

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

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Sep 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Sep 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - Legal Bureau	0	0	0	3
DC Training	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy Training	0	0	1	4
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	2	0	4
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	1
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	7	2	25
Chief of Department	0	1	1	7
Department Advocate	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Public Information	0	0	0	0
Crime Prevention	0	0	0	0
First Deputy Commissioner	0	0	0	2
Office of Management, Analysis and Planning	0	0	0	0
Quality Assurance Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Counterterrorism	0	0	0	1
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	10	4	47

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