



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
May 2021
(Statistics for April 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
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints	23
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Allegations	25
Truncations	27
Complaints by PSA	28
Mediation Unit	30
Administrative Prosecution Unit	32
NYPD Discipline	33
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 April 2021 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 40% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 53% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In April, the CCRB opened 253 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 3,205 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 21% of its fully investigated cases (page 16).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 17% of the cases it closed in April (page 13) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 18% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency's truncation rate was 67% (page 13). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.
- 4) For April, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 23% of cases - compared to 9% of cases in which video was not available (page 21-22).
- 5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6, 26).
- 6) In April the Police Commissioner did not finalize any decisions against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases (page 32). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 13 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 7 trials were conducted against respondent officers in April.

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

Glossary

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

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

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

Board Panel: The “Board” of the CCRB has 13 members. Of the 13 members, five are chosen by the Mayor, five are chosen by the City Council, and three are chosen by the Police Commissioner. Following a completed investigation by the CCRB staff, three Board members, sitting as a Board Panel, will make a finding on whether misconduct occurred and will make a recommendation on what level of penalty should follow.

Case/Complaint: For the purposes of CCRB data, a “case” or “complaint” is defined as any incident within the Agency’s jurisdiction, brought to resolution by the CCRB. Cases/Complaints thus include truncations, fully investigated or ongoing cases, mediations, and completed investigations pending Board Panel review.

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

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

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

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

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

Truncation: When a complaint is withdrawn or there is no complainant/alleged victim available for an interview, the investigation is “truncated.”

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." Prior to January 2021, "Closed Pending Litigation" complaints were counted as truncations in CCRB reporting. In January 2021 the CCRB Board decided that "Closed Pending Litigation" complaints should no longer be counted as truncations.

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 April 2021, the CCRB initiated 253 new complaints.

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




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2020 - April 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 43rd Precinct and 75th Precinct had the highest number at 9 incidents.

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




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




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


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	3	67	4
5	6	68	1
6	3	69	4
7	3	70	3
9	3	71	4
10	1	72	2
13	3	73	6
14	3	75	9
17	1	77	5
18	3	78	2
19	3	79	8
20	1	81	6
23	1	83	3
24	5	84	2
25	4	88	1
26	1	90	5
28	2	94	1
30	4	100	1
32	3	101	5
33	3	102	3
34	2	103	4
40	5	104	1
41	3	105	2
42	3	106	1
43	9	107	1
44	4	110	2
46	4	111	4
47	5	112	2
48	7	113	5
49	3	114	8
50	4	115	3
52	7	120	3
60	4	121	3
61	4	122	2
63	2	Unknown	12
66	3		

*These figures track where an incident occurred, not necessarily the Command of the officer. Please review Figures 62A-62Q for Command Level data for cases closed in 2017.

Allegations Received

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

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




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

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

	April 2020		April 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	119	39%	107	42%	-12	-10%
Abuse of Authority (A)	246	80%	189	75%	-57	-23%
Discourtesy (D)	93	30%	38	15%	-55	-59%
Offensive Language (O)	26	8%	16	6%	-10	-38%
Total FADO Allegations	484		350		-134	-28%
Total Complaints	306		253		-53	-17%

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)	558	41%	533	43%	-25	-4%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1071	78%	952	77%	-119	-11%
Discourtesy (D)	384	28%	259	21%	-125	-33%
Offensive Language (O)	94	7%	86	7%	-8	-9%
Total FADO Allegations	2107		1830		-277	-13%
Total Complaints	1365		1241		-124	-9%

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 2020		April 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	320	21%	215	27%	-105	-33%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1020	67%	516	65%	-504	-49%
Discourtesy (D)	155	10%	50	6%	-105	-68%
Offensive Language (O)	36	2%	17	2%	-19	-53%
Total Allegations	1531		798		-733	-48%
Total Complaints	306		253		-53	-17%

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

	YTD 2020		YTD 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	1318	22%	1222	26%	-96	-7%
Abuse of Authority (A)	4095	67%	3027	64%	-1068	-26%
Discourtesy (D)	576	9%	361	8%	-215	-37%
Offensive Language (O)	141	2%	104	2%	-37	-26%
Total Allegations	6130		4714		-1416	-23%
Total Complaints	1365		1241		-124	-9%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of April 2021, 40% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 53% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

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

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1111	40.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	362	13.1%
Cases 8-11 Months	590	21.3%
Cases 12-18 Months*	586	21.2%
Cases Over 18 Months**	116	4.2%
Total	2765	100%

*12-18 Months: 17 cases that were reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 17 cases that were reopened; 5 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	964	34.9%
Cases 5-7 Months	372	13.5%
Cases 8-11 Months	598	21.6%
Cases 12-18 Months*	655	23.7%
Cases Over 18 Months**	176	6.4%
Total	2765	100%

*12-18 Months: 17 cases that were reopened; 0 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 17 cases that were reopened; 6 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

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




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	March 2021		April 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	2059	62%	2059	64%	0	0%
Pending Board Review	822	25%	706	22%	-116	-14%
Mediation	455	14%	433	14%	-22	-5%
On DA Hold	7	0%	7	0%	0	0%
Total	3343		3205		-138	-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	73	74.5%
30 <= Days < 60	9	9.2%
60 <= Days < 90	1	1.0%
90 <= Days	15	15.3%
Total	98	100%

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




Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In April 2021, the CCRB fully investigated 17% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 18% of the cases it closed.

Figure 20: Case Resolutions (January 2020 - April 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 **substantiated**.
- If there is not enough evidence to determine whether or not the alleged misconduct occurred, the allegation is **unsubstantiated**.
- If the preponderance of the evidence suggests that the event or alleged act did not occur, the allegation is **unfounded**.
- If the event did occur, but was not improper by a preponderance of evidence, the allegation is **exonerated**.
- If the CCRB was unable to identify any of the officers accused of misconduct, the case is closed as **officer unidentified**.

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

Case Abstracts

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

1. Substantiated

An individual was walking to a subway station when he saw an unmarked SUV. He crossed the street and the vehicle pulled up to him and two officers exited the vehicle. They approached him and stopped him. Another officer arrived on the scene and was frisked the individual. The officer found a dime bag of marijuana in the left pants pocket of the individual. The officers asked for the individual's name and he refused to give it because the officers refused to tell him why he was stopped. The individual was handcuffed and transported to the precinct. At the precinct the individual was searched and eventually gave his name to the officers. It was discovered that he had an open I-card for a robbery. The senior officer told the other officers to take the individual to a holding cell and strip-search him. Once inside the holding cell, the officers try to undress the individual and the individual stiffened up his body. Two of the officers punched the individual. The individual laid curled on the floor in a fetal position. The officers continued to punch the individual and placed their knees on various parts of the individual's. The officers alleged that the individual verbally refused to be searched and would stiffen his body, so they used force to gain the individual's compliance. The individual requested medical attention and was diagnosed with pain, a hematoma, abrasions to his face and body and sustained swelling to his face.

Patrol Guide Procedure 208-03 states that a strip search may only be conducted when there is a reasonable suspicion that weapons, contraband or evidence may be concealed upon the person or in their clothing in such a manner that they may not be discovered by the previous search. Patrol Guide Procedure 221-02 states that officers may use only the reasonable force necessary to gain control or custody of a subject.

Video cameras at the precinct showed that the individual did not stiffen/pose his body in a manner that was consistent with him attempting to conceal contraband in his buttocks. The video cameras also showed the force used on the individual once he was in the holding cell. The investigation determined that the officers use of force was not reasonable given the circumstances and that strip search of the individual was also unreasonable given the circumstances. The Board substantiated the Use of Force and Abuse of Authority allegations.

2. Unsubstantiated

An individual was walking down a street with a woman and their children when he yelled “look at these faggots” at a passing police vehicle. The vehicle stopped and the driver of the vehicle spoke to the individual through the window and allegedly stated, “oh really, with your fucking kids?” in response to the individual. The woman who had been walking several feet behind the individual came close after the officers exited their vehicle and approached the individual. The woman denied hearing any profane statements from the individual or from the officers. The officer denied making the comment and their BWC footage does not begin until after they exited their vehicle to approach the individual.

The investigation was unable to reach a conclusive finding without an independent witness to the statements. The Board unsubstantiated the Discourteous allegation.

3. Unfounded

An individual was driving with her fiancé when she was pulled over for speeding by an officer. The individual rolled down the passenger side window where her fiancé was sitting and told the officer that she was not speeding. She handed over her vehicle’s registration and driver’s license through the passenger window. After a few minutes, the officer returned to the passenger side of the vehicle with a summons. The individual stated that the officer said that she had 14 days to respond to the ticket and when she said that the ticket could ruin her career as a 911 EMT, the officer allegedly responded “well, fight it, we need one less of you anyways.” The individual alleged that the officer reached over the fiancé and tossed the summons, and her documents at her like a frisbee and walked away. The officer denied making the statement and tossing the documents at the individual. The officer had BWC footage which showed him holding the documents his left hand and reaching into the window of the passenger side which appeared to be completely lowered. The footage shows him dropping the documents inside the passenger side window and the officer did not make the alleged statement. The Board unfounded the Discourteous allegation.

4. Exonerated


An individual was drinking coffee inside a McDonald’s when he was approached by two officers. The officers told the individual that he had to leave because he had been yelling and irate when he first entered the store and the store manager requested that the individual leave the store. The individual yelled at one of the officers and the officer repeatedly told the individual that he had to leave the store. The individual kept refusing to leave and one of the officers grabbed the individual by his arm and led him out of his seat and out of the McDonald’s. As they got to the door, one of the officers pushed the individual with the back of his left hand - the individual did not stumble or fall. The individual turned around and the officer handed the individual his coffee. The individual alleged that the officer used force against him. The McDonald’s employees who witnessed the incident stated that the individual had been a constant source of harassment to the employees and in this instance, they called the police because they had agreed to no longer serve the individual. They witnessed the officers approach the individual, and the individual yelling that he would not leave. Surveillance footage from inside the McDonald’s showed the officer approaching the individual and showed them escorting him out of the establishment. The investigation determined that the officers acted appropriately in using reasonable and minimal force to pull the individual out of his seat and escorting him out of the store. The Board exonerated the Use of Force allegation.

5. Officer Unidentified

An individual stated that his father called to inform him that one of his tenants heard police banging on the front door of the individual’s home. Neither the individual’s father nor the tenant could provide a description of the officers. The individual arrived home several hours later and saw that the area around the lock of the front door was broken and misaligned, and that the mailbox had also sustained damage. The individual did not provide any photographs of the damage and the tenant who heard the banging at the door refused to participate in the investigation. Police records indicate that there was no search warrant issued for the individual’s home or any record of officers responding to the individual’s home. Without any other witnesses or documentation of the incident, the investigation was unable to identify any subject officer in this case. The Board closed the Abuse of Authority allegation as officer unidentified.


Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 21: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (April 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

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

Figure 23: Disposition of Cases (2020 vs 2021)

	Apr 2020		Apr 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Full Investigations								
Substantiated	28	49%	14	21%	95	28%	33	29%
Exonerated	6	11%	11	16%	75	22%	16	14%
Unfounded	6	11%	7	10%	31	9%	11	10%
Unsubstantiated	13	23%	24	36%	117	35%	38	33%
MOS Unidentified	4	7%	11	16%	21	6%	17	15%
Total - Full Investigations	57		67		339		115	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	0	0%	2	100%	29	100%	11	100%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - ADR Closures	0		2		29		11	
Resolved Case Total	57	27%	69	18%	368	37%	126	15%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	31	20%	61	19%	123	20%	134	18%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	70	46%	130	40%	316	50%	274	37%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	32	21%	69	21%	108	17%	173	24%
Alleged Victim unidentified	3	2%	4	1%	9	1%	15	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	17	11%	60	18%	68	11%	137	19%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%	1	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	3	0%	1	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	153		325		629		735	
Total - Closed Cases	210		394		997		861	

*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 16% for the month of April 2021, and the allegation substantiation rate is 20% year-to-date.

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2020 vs 2021)

	Apr 2020		Apr 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	65	23%	42	16%	217	14%	86	20%
Unsubstantiated	79	29%	75	29%	497	31%	118	27%
Unfounded	28	10%	20	8%	165	10%	33	8%
Exonerated	82	30%	86	33%	552	35%	140	32%
MOS Unidentified	23	8%	35	14%	161	10%	55	13%
Total - Full Investigations	277		258		1592		432	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	4	100%	76	100%	20	100%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - ADR Closures	0		4		76		20	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	94	21%	171	17%	330	19%	353	17%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	217	48%	392	40%	937	53%	769	36%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	86	19%	175	18%	260	15%	429	20%
Alleged Victim unidentified	7	2%	12	1%	21	1%	42	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	49	11%	224	23%	187	11%	525	25%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	5	1%	15	1%	17	1%
Administrative closure	0	0%	0	0%	7	0%	3	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	453		979		1757		2138	
Total - Closed Allegations	730		1242		3425		2591	

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	9 12%	22 28%	20 26%	6 8%	21 27%	78 100%
Abuse of Authority	24 17%	37 27%	59 42%	11 8%	8 6%	139 100%
Discourtesy	6 18%	12 36%	6 18%	3 9%	6 18%	33 100%
Offensive Language	3 38%	4 50%	1 13%	0 0%	0 0%	8 100%
Total	42 16%	75 29%	86 33%	20 8%	35 14%	258 100%

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	15 12%	30 24%	38 31%	10 8%	31 25%	124 100%
Abuse of Authority	44 19%	65 28%	95 40%	18 8%	14 6%	236 100%
Discourtesy	19 33%	18 32%	6 11%	4 7%	10 18%	57 100%
Offensive Language	7 50%	5 36%	1 7%	1 7%	0 0%	14 100%
Total	85 20%	118 27%	140 32%	33 8%	55 13%	431 100%

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 (April 2021)

Untruthful Statement Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Administrative Closure		Other	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
False official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Misleading official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	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	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%


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

Untruthful Statement Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Administrative Closure		Other	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
False official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Misleading official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inaccurate official statement	1	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	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Substantiation Rates

The April 2021 case substantiation rate was 21%.

Figure 29: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2020 - April 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 - Apr 2021) (% substantiated shown)



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

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



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

Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints

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

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


Figure 32: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints*
(Apr 2020, Apr 2021, YTD 2020, YTD 2021)

Disposition	April 2020		April 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	5	18%	11	79%	8	8%	15	45%
Command Discipline	9	32%	2	14%	25	26%	9	27%
Formalized Training	8	29%	1	7%	25	26%	5	15%
Instructions	6	21%	0	0%	37	39%	4	12%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	28		14		95		33	

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

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

Figure 33: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints* (2021)



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

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

Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations

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

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

**Figure 34: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations*
(Apr 2020, Apr 2021, YTD 2020, YTD 2021)**

Disposition	April 2020		April 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	7	17.9%	9	40.9%	12	8.8%	13	27.7%
Command Discipline	17	43.6%	13	59.1%	37	27%	22	46.8%
Formalized Training	8	20.5%	0	0%	34	24.8%	6	12.8%
Instructions	7	17.9%	0	0%	54	39.4%	6	12.8%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	39		22		137		47	

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

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

Figure 35: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (April 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)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	14	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	14	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	14	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Action	14	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	14	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	14	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	17	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	17	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	17	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Gender	17	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Other	24	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Religion	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Body Cavity Searches	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Restricted Breathing	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Race	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Police shield	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn

Truncations

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

Figure 36: Truncated Allegations (April 2021)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Force	44	89	61	4	198
Abuse of Authority	114	263	94	7	478
Discourtesy	12	29	11	1	53
Offensive Language	1	11	9	0	21
Total	171	392	175	12	750

Figure 37: Truncated CCRB Complaints (April 2021)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	61	130	69	4	264

Figure 38: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2021)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0
Force	82	186	169	17	454
Abuse of Authority	233	504	207	22	966
Discourtesy	36	59	33	3	131
Offensive Language	2	20	20	0	42
Total	353	769	429	42	1593

Figure 39: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2021)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	134	274	173	15	596

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 40: PSA Complaints Closed as % of Total Complaints Closed

	Apr 2020	Apr 2021	YTD 2020	YTD 2021
PSA Complaints	10	19	61	37
Total Complaints	210	394	997	861
PSA Complaints as % of Total	4.8%	4.8%	6.1%	4.3%

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

Figure 41: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

	Apr 2020	Apr 2021	YTD 2020	YTD 2021
PSA 1	5	2	7	6
PSA 2	0	14	9	20
PSA 3	4	0	15	2
PSA 4	2	1	8	3
PSA 5	4	4	13	8
PSA 6	0	0	15	1
PSA 7	6	9	32	22
PSA 8	0	1	8	11
PSA 9	0	2	9	2
Total	21	33	116	75

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

	Apr 2020		Apr 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	12	44%	19	48%	50	33%	45	52%
Abuse of Authority (A)	14	52%	19	48%	80	53%	38	44%
Discourtesy (D)	1	4%	0	0%	17	11%	2	2%
Offensive Language (O)	0	0%	2	5%	4	3%	2	2%
Total	27	100%	40	101%	151	100%	87	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 43: Disposition of PSA Officers (2020 vs 2021)

Full Investigations	Apr 2020		Apr 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	4	50%	2	50%	11	21%	2	25%
Exonerated	2	25%	2	50%	20	38%	5	62%
Unfounded	1	12%	0	0%	9	17%	0	0%
Unsubstantiated	1	12%	0	0%	9	17%	1	12%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	3	6%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	8		4		52		8	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - ADR Closures	0		0		2		0	
Resolved Case Total	8	38%	4	12%	54	46%	8	11%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	0	0%	2	7%	9	14%	6	9%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	11	85%	16	55%	43	68%	25	37%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	0	0%	6	21%	4	6%	24	36%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Closed - Pending Litigation	2	15%	4	14%	7	11%	11	16%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	1	1%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	13		29		63		67	
Total - Closed Cases	21		33		117		75	

*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 April and this year.

Figure 44: Mediated Complaints Closed

	April 2021			YTD 2021		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	2	0	2	11	0	11

Figure 45: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	April 2021			YTD 2021		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	1	0	1	3	0	3
Abuse of Authority	1	0	1	13	0	13
Discourtesy	2	0	2	4	0	4
Offensive Language	0	0	0	0	0	0
Untruthful Statement				0	0	0
Total	4	0	4	20	0	20

Figure 46: Mediated Complaints By Borough (April 2021)

	Mediations
	0
Bronx	0
Brooklyn	0
Manhattan	1
Queens	1
Staten Island	0

Figure 47: Mediated Allegations By Borough (April 2021)

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

**Figure 48: Mediated Complaints By Precinct
(Apr 2021 - YTD 2021)**

Precinct	Apr 2021	YTD 2021	Precinct	Apr 2021	YTD 2021
10	0	1	45	0	1
14	1	1	62	0	1
17	0	1	75	0	1
18	0	1	84	0	1
25	0	1	90	0	1
			103	1	1

**Figure 49: Mediated Allegations By Precinct
(Apr 2021 - YTD 2021)**

Precinct	Apr 2021	YTD 2021	Precinct	Apr 2021	YTD 2021
10	0	1	45	0	1
14	2	2	62	0	1
17	0	5	75	0	1
18	0	3	84	0	2
25	0	1	90	0	1
			103	2	2

Administrative Prosecution Unit

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

Figure 50: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Apr 2021	YTD 2021
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	0	4
	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	1
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	0
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	0	0
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total		0
Not Adjudicated	Charges not served	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	2
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	0	0
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total		0
Total Closures		0	7

*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 51: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	April 2021	YTD 2021
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	1
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	3
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	4
No Disciplinary Action†	0	1
Adjudicated Total	0	5
Discipline Rate	0%	80%
Not Adjudicated† Total	0	2
Total Closures	0	7

*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 52: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	Disposition Type*	April 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	0	6
	Command Discipline B	0	1
	Command Discipline A	3	16
	Formalized Training**	6	20
	Instructions***	5	37
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total		14
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	0	3
	SOL Expired	0	1
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	0	0
	No Finding ††††	0	9
	Total	0	13
	Discipline Rate	100%	86%
	DUP Rate	0%	0%

*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 53: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (April 2021)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Physical force	17	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Physical force	17	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	17	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	17	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	17	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	17	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	34	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Physical force	40	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	40	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	F	Gun Pointed	41	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	41	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	41	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Entry of Premises	42	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Threat to damage/seize property	42	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	42	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	42	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	47	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Frisk	78	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	78	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Retaliatory arrest	94	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	114	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	114	Queens	Formalized Training

Figure 54: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (April 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 55: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	April 2021		March 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1028	32.1%	1171	35.1%	-143	-12.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	429	13.4%	432	12.9%	-3	-0.7%
Cases 8 Months	118	3.7%	92	2.8%	26	28.3%
Cases 9 Months	86	2.7%	245	7.3%	-159	-64.9%
Cases 10 Months	228	7.1%	284	8.5%	-56	-19.7%
Cases 11 Months	266	8.3%	178	5.3%	88	49.4%
Cases 12 Months	171	5.3%	178	5.3%	-7	-3.9%
Cases 13 Months	175	5.5%	152	4.6%	23	15.1%
Cases 14 Months	147	4.6%	137	4.1%	10	7.3%
Cases 15 Months	125	3.9%	94	2.8%	31	33.0%
Cases 16 Months	82	2.6%	84	2.5%	-2	-2.4%
Cases 17 Months	75	2.3%	68	2.0%	7	10.3%
Cases 18 Months	66	2.1%	54	1.6%	12	22.2%
Cases Over 18 Months	202	6.3%	167	5.0%	35	21.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	3198	100.0%	3336	100.0%	-138	-4.1%

Figure 56: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On CCRB Received Date

	April 2021		March 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1180	36.9%	1323	39.7%	-143	-10.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	423	13.2%	427	12.8%	-4	-0.9%
Cases 8 Months	115	3.6%	116	3.5%	-1	-0.9%
Cases 9 Months	108	3.4%	273	8.2%	-165	-60.4%
Cases 10 Months	252	7.9%	232	7.0%	20	8.6%
Cases 11 Months	223	7.0%	168	5.0%	55	32.7%
Cases 12 Months	159	5.0%	164	4.9%	-5	-3.0%
Cases 13 Months	162	5.1%	164	4.9%	-2	-1.2%
Cases 14 Months	152	4.8%	104	3.1%	48	46.2%
Cases 15 Months	96	3.0%	92	2.8%	4	4.3%
Cases 16 Months	79	2.5%	76	2.3%	3	3.9%
Cases 17 Months	72	2.3%	49	1.5%	23	46.9%
Cases 18 Months	48	1.5%	34	1.0%	14	41.2%
Cases Over 18 Months	129	4.0%	114	3.4%	15	13.2%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	3198	100.0%	3336	100.0%	-138	-4.1%

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

	April 2021		March 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	782	38.0%	807	39.2%	-25	-3.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	307	14.9%	292	14.2%	15	5.1%
Cases 8 Months	76	3.7%	57	2.8%	19	33.3%
Cases 9 Months	52	2.5%	155	7.5%	-103	-66.5%
Cases 10 Months	146	7.1%	181	8.8%	-35	-19.3%
Cases 11 Months	172	8.4%	110	5.3%	62	56.4%
Cases 12 Months	101	4.9%	91	4.4%	10	11.0%
Cases 13 Months	83	4.0%	76	3.7%	7	9.2%
Cases 14 Months	70	3.4%	66	3.2%	4	6.1%
Cases 15 Months	60	2.9%	35	1.7%	25	71.4%
Cases 16 Months	31	1.5%	36	1.7%	-5	-13.9%
Cases 17 Months	36	1.7%	39	1.9%	-3	-7.7%
Cases 18 Months	32	1.6%	23	1.1%	9	39.1%
Cases Over 18 Months	111	5.4%	91	4.4%	20	22.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	2059	100.0%	2059	100.0%	0	0.0%

Figure 58: CCRB DA Hold Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	April 2021	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	2	28.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 10 Months	1	14.3%
Cases 11 Months	1	14.3%
Cases 12 Months	1	14.3%
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	1	14.3%
Cases 16 Months	1	14.3%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	7	100.0%

Figure 59: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2021)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	0	0%	3	42.9%	3	42.9%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%
Gun fired	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	1	12.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	87.5%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Radio as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Flashlight as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Police shield	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Vehicle	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Chokehold	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Pepper spray	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical force	11	13.4%	32	39%	14	17.1%	5	6.1%	20	24.4%	0	0%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nonlethal restraining device	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	1	12.5%	0	0%	4	50%	1	12.5%	2	25%	0	0%
Total	15	12.1%	38	30.6%	30	24.2%	10	8.1%	31	25%	0	0%

Figure 60: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2021)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	5	20.8%	12	50%	7	29.2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Strip-searched	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle search	0	0%	12	92.3%	1	7.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of summons	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	2	9.1%	13	59.1%	4	18.2%	2	9.1%	1	4.5%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	2	14.3%	4	28.6%	0	0%	4	28.6%	4	28.6%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Property damaged	1	16.7%	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%	2	33.3%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	2	66.7%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	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	0	0%	1	14.3%	4	57.1%	0	0%	2	28.6%	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	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Seizure of property	1	16.7%	3	50%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Frisk	0	0%	7	77.8%	2	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Search (of person)	0	0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Stop	0	0%	7	50%	5	35.7%	0	0%	2	14.3%	0	0%
Question	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Interference with recording	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Search of recording device	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Forcible Removal to Hospital	5	20%	13	52%	1	4%	4	16%	2	8%	0	0%
Threat re: removal to hospital	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Threat re: immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Disseminated immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Questioned immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Search of Premises	6	35.3%	7	41.2%	4	23.5%	0	0%	0	0%	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	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	0	0%	1	14.3%	4	57.1%	2	28.6%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	2	16.7%	0	0%	9	75%	1	8.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	6	28.6%	0	0%	14	66.7%	1	4.8%	0	0%	0	0%
Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	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	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	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%
Total	44	18.6%	95	40.3%	65	27.5%	18	7.6%	14	5.9%	0	0%

Figure 61: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2021)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	13	31.7%	6	14.6%	11	26.8%	3	7.3%	8	19.5%	0	0%
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	6	46.2%	0	0%	5	38.5%	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	0	0%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	19	33.3%	6	10.5%	18	31.6%	4	7%	10	17.5%	0	0%

Figure 62: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2021)

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Ethnicity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Religion	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical disability	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gender	4	66.7%	0	0%	2	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	7	50%	1	7.1%	5	35.7%	1	7.1%	0	0%	0	0%

Figure 63: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (April 2021)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Previously adjudicated	0	0%
Trial commenced	0	0%
Trial scheduled	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	7	8%
Charges filed, awaiting service	10	11%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	58	64%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	3	3%
Calendared for court appearance	1	1%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	11	12%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	1	1%
Total	91	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 64: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (April 2021)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	2	7%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	9	33%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	8	30%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	1	4%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	7	26%
Total	27	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 65: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	5	7	26	46
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	2	6	33	50
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	2	7	58	124
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	1	2	41	79
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	3	6	59	134
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	0	1	55	92
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	0	18	36
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	1	7	23
Special Operations Division Total	0	1	2	10
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	0
Total	13	31	299	594
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	7	13
Transit Bureau Total	1	2	20	38
Housing Bureau Total	2	2	27	62
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	1	6	19
Detective Bureau Total	1	6	7	22
Other Bureaus Total	4	4	8	14
Total	8	15	75	168
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	1	1	6	9
Undetermined	0	0	2	7
Total	22	47	382	778

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

Figure 66A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
001 Precinct	0	0	2	5
005 Precinct	0	0	0	0
006 Precinct	0	0	0	0
007 Precinct	0	0	5	5
009 Precinct	0	0	0	2
010 Precinct	0	0	2	2
013 Precinct	1	1	5	7
Midtown South Precinct	1	1	5	8
017 Precinct	1	3	1	6
Midtown North Precinct	0	0	1	5
Precincts Total	3	5	21	40
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	1	1	1	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	1	1	4	5
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	5	7	26	46

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

Figure 66B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
019 Precinct	0	0	0	0
020 Precinct	0	0	0	2
023 Precinct	0	0	8	8
024 Precinct	0	0	1	4
025 Precinct	0	0	5	8
026 Precinct	0	1	0	2
Central Park Precinct	1	1	2	2
028 Precinct	0	3	3	8
030 Precinct	0	0	2	3
032 Precinct	0	0	3	3
033 Precinct	0	0	4	5
034 Precinct	0	0	4	4
Precincts Total	1	5	32	49
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	1	1	1	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	2	6	33	50

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

Figure 66C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
040 Precinct	0	0	9	12
041 Precinct	0	0	2	5
042 Precinct	0	2	5	21
043 Precinct	0	0	0	4
044 Precinct	1	2	14	24
045 Precinct	0	0	1	5
046 Precinct	0	0	7	11
047 Precinct	0	0	7	11
048 Precinct	0	1	3	8
049 Precinct	0	0	1	3
050 Precinct	0	0	0	0
052 Precinct	1	2	8	14
Precincts Total	2	7	57	118
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	0	1	6
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	2	7	58	124

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

Figure 66D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
060 Precinct	0	1	4	9
061 Precinct	0	0	0	7
062 Precinct	0	0	1	2
063 Precinct	0	0	1	3
066 Precinct	0	0	2	4
067 Precinct	0	0	7	13
068 Precinct	0	0	4	7
069 Precinct	0	0	1	3
070 Precinct	0	0	2	3
071 Precinct	0	0	3	3
072 Precinct	0	0	6	6
076 Precinct	0	0	7	7
078 Precinct	0	0	0	7
Precincts Total	0	1	38	74
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	1	1	3	5
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
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	1	2	41	79

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

Figure 66E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
073 Precinct	0	0	5	8
075 Precinct	1	1	31	88
077 Precinct	0	0	4	5
079 Precinct	2	2	2	3
081 Precinct	0	0	6	7
083 Precinct	0	1	7	12
084 Precinct	0	1	1	4
088 Precinct	0	0	2	3
090 Precinct	0	0	0	2
094 Precinct	0	1	1	2
Precincts Total	3	6	59	134
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	3	6	59	134

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

Figure 66F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
100 Precinct	0	0	2	6
101 Precinct	0	0	14	15
102 Precinct	0	0	1	10
103 Precinct	0	0	13	23
105 Precinct	0	0	9	12
106 Precinct	0	0	11	13
107 Precinct	0	1	0	4
113 Precinct	0	0	5	9
Precincts Total	0	1	55	92
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	0	1	55	92

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

Figure 66G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
104 Precinct	0	0	2	5
108 Precinct	0	0	2	2
109 Precinct	0	0	1	6
110 Precinct	0	0	4	4
111 Precinct	0	0	0	7
112 Precinct	0	0	1	1
114 Precinct	0	0	7	8
115 Precinct	0	0	1	3
Precincts Total	0	0	18	36
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	0	18	36

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

Figure 66H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
120 Precinct	0	1	2	10
122 Precinct	0	0	0	4
123 Precinct	0	0	1	2
121 Precinct	0	0	2	5
Precincts Total	0	1	5	21
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	2	2
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	1	7	23

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

Figure 66I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	1	2	4
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	0
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	0	0	0
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	0
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	0	0	6
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	0	1	2	10

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

Figure 66J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

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

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

Figure 66K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	1	6
Brooklyn Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Bronx Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Queens Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Surface Transportation Enforcement Division (STED)	0	0	0	0
Bus Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Parking Enforcement District	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Tow Units	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Summons Enforcement	0	0	0	0
Traffic Command Intersection Control	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Intelligence Unit	0	0	0	0
Highway District	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #1	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #2	0	0	1	1
Highway Unit #3	0	0	5	5
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	1
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	7	13

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

Figure 66L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Authority Liaison	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Inspections	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Spec. Invest. Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Crime Analysis	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Patrol Operations	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	0	0	0	0
TB DT02	0	0	4	9
TB DT03	1	1	3	5
TB DT04	0	1	3	5
TB DT11	0	0	2	2
TB DT12	0	0	0	1
TB DT20	0	0	3	4
TB DT23	0	0	0	0
TB DT30	0	0	1	2
TB DT32	0	0	1	2
TB DT33	0	0	2	5
TB DT34	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	1	2
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	0
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	0	0	0
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	1	2	20	38

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

Figure 66M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 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	0	0	3
PSA 2	0	0	13	17
PSA 3	0	0	0	2
PSA 4	0	0	1	3
PSA 5	0	0	3	7
PSA 6	0	0	0	0
PSA 7	2	2	6	16
PSA 8	0	0	1	11
PSA 9	0	0	2	2
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	2	2	27	62
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	1	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	2	2	27	62

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

Figure 66N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Queens Narcotics	0	0	3	6
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	1	0	5
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Bronx Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	1	3
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	0	1	4
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	0
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	1	1
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	1	6	19

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

Figure 660: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 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	0
Special Victims Division	0	0	0	0
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	0	0	0
Detective Borough Bronx	0	2	1	7
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	0	2	5
Detective Borough Brooklyn	1	4	2	5
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	2	5
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	0	0
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	1	6	7	22

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

Figure 66P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	4	4	7	13
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	1	1
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	0
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Other Bureaus Total	4	4	8	14

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

Figure 66Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Apr 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Apr 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - Legal Bureau	0	0	0	0
DC Training	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy Training	0	0	0	1
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	0	0	0	0
Police Commissioner Office	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Division	0	0	0	0
Chief of Community Affairs	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Juvenile Section	0	0	0	0
School Safety Bronx/Manhattan	0	0	0	0
School Safety Queens/Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
Office of Equal Employment	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Operations	0	0	0	0
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	1	1	6	7
Chief of Department	0	0	0	1
Department Advocate	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Public Information	0	0	0	0
Crime Prevention	0	0	0	0
First Deputy Commissioner	0	0	0	0
Office of Management, Analysis and Planning	0	0	0	0
Quality Assurance Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Counterterrorism	0	0	0	0
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	1	1	6	9

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