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

BILL DE BLASIO
MAYOR

MAYA D. WILEY, ESQ.
CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report

July 2017

(Statistics for June 2017)

Contents

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. Video evidence is playing a crucial role in the outcome of cases. Data for June 2017 included the following highlights:

1) The CCRB continues to close its cases more efficiently. Of the cases that remain in the CCRB active docket, 89% have been open for four months or less, and 98% have been open for seven months or less (page 10). In June, the CCRB opened 427 new cases (page 4), and currently has a docket of 1,193 cases (page 11).

2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 14% of its fully investigated cases (page 15).

3) The CCRB fully investigated 36% of the cases it closed in June (page 12) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 47% of the cases it closed in June (page 12). The Agency's truncation rate is 52% (page 12). This is primarily driven by complainant/victim/witness uncooperative.

4) For June, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 24% of cases - compared to 9% of substantiated cases in which video was not available (page 19-20).

5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6).

6) In June the PC finalized penalty decisions against 7 officers: 2 were guilty verdicts won by the APU (page 31). The APU has conducted trials against 27 respondent officers year to date, and trials against 2 respondent officers in June. The CCRB's Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct.

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

Glossary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Truncation: If a case is not fully investigated due to the victim's lack of interest or availability, the case is closed and is considered "truncated."

Complaints Received

The CCRB's Intake team processes misconduct complaints from the public and referrals from the NYPD. Under the New York City Charter, the CCRB's jurisdiction is limited to allegations of misconduct related to Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy and Offensive Language. All other complaints are referred to the appropriate agency. Figure 1 refers to all complaints that the CCRB receives and Figures 2 and 3 refer to new cases that remain with the Agency. In June 2017, the CCRB initiated 427 new complaints.

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



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



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



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Of the five boroughs, the largest number of misconduct complaints stemmed from incidents occurring in Brooklyn, followed by Manhattan. A leading 15 incidents took place in the 75th Precinct.

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



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



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

NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	1
5	5
6	7
7	7
9	3
10	4
13	6
14	6
17	2
18	7
19	4
20	2
23	8
24	5
25	5
26	1
28	5
30	4
32	8
33	3
34	4
40	10
41	6
42	11
43	5
44	10
45	5
46	7
47	8
48	12
49	1
50	4
52	13
60	3
61	7
62	4
63	2
66	5

NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
67	11
68	4
69	4
70	8
71	5
72	4
73	7
75	15
76	7
77	6
78	4
79	6
81	2
83	8
84	8
88	3
90	5
94	1
100	4
101	7
102	6
103	5
104	6
105	8
106	5
107	1
108	2
110	3
111	2
112	4
113	10
114	6
115	3
120	14
121	5
122	4
123	1
Unknown	13

*These figures track where an incident occurred, not necessarily the Command of the officer. For example, a complaint filed against officers assigned to a Narcotics unit working in East New York would be counted as occurring in the 75th Precinct. Please review Figures 62A-62Q for Command Level data for cases closed in 2017.

Allegations Received

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

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



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

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

	June 2016		June 2017			
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints	Change	% Change
Force (F)	169	40%	152	36%	-17	-10%
Abuse of Authority (A)	299	71%	305	71%	6	2%
Discourtesy (D)	124	29%	134	31%	10	8%
Offensive Language (O)	37	9%	28	7%	-9	-24%
Total FADO Allegations	629		619		-10	-2%
Total Complaints	423		427		4	1%

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

Figure 9: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (YTD 2016 vs. YTD 2017)



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

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

	YTD 2016		YTD 2017			
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints	Change	% Change
Force (F)	998	43%	875	39%	-123	-12%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1644	70%	1618	71%	-26	-2%
Discourtesy (D)	726	31%	761	34%	35	5%
Offensive Language (O)	168	7%	204	9%	36	21%
Total FADO Allegations	3536		3458		-78	-2%
Total Complaints	2339		2268		-71	-3%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	June 2016		June 2017			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	360	28%	256	22%	-104	-29%
Abuse of Authority (A)	706	55%	713	61%	7	1%
Discourtesy (D)	184	14%	170	14%	-14	-8%
Offensive Language (O)	41	3%	38	3%	-3	-7%
Total Allegations	1291		1177		-114	-9%
Total Complaints	423		427		4	1%

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

	YTD 2016		YTD 2017			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	1963	27%	1827	23%	-136	-7%
Abuse of Authority (A)	4113	56%	4671	59%	558	14%
Discourtesy (D)	1025	14%	1101	14%	76	7%
Offensive Language (O)	200	3%	283	4%	83	42%
Total Allegations	7301		7882		581	8%
Total Complaints	2339		2268		-71	-3%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of June 2017, 89% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 98% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

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

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1053	89.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	95	8.1%
Cases 8-11 Months	14	1.2%
Cases 12-18 Months*	7	0.6%
Cases Over 18 Months**	8	0.7%
Total	**1177**	**100%**

* 12-18 Months: 4 cases that were reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.
** Over 18 Months: 3 cases that were reopened; 5 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	981	83.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	131	11.1%
Cases 8-11 Months	32	2.7%
Cases 12-18 Months	18	1.5%
Cases Over 18 Months	15	1.3%
Total	**1177**	**100%**

An active case is specifically an investigation; cases in mediation are excluded.

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



Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis



Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	May 2017		June 2017			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Investigations	690	62%	741	62%	51	7%
Pending Board Review	298	27%	317	27%	19	6%
Mediation	115	10%	119	10%	4	3%
On DA Hold	16	1%	16	1%	0	0%
Total	1119		1193		74	7%

Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In June 2017, the CCRB fully investigated 36% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 47% of the cases it closed.

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



Dispositions

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

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

Additionally, a case might be **mediated**, with the subject officer and complainant discussing the incident in the presence of a neutral third-party moderator. Finally, a case that cannot be fully investigated due to victim/complainant unavailability or lack of cooperation is **truncated**.

Case Abstracts

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

1. Substantiated

An officer used discourteous language and made a discourteous gesture while driving. The woman said the officer was blocking the flow of traffic with his marked police vehicle and almost struck her vehicle when attempting to drive around her. When both vehicles stopped side-by-side at the next stop light, the woman saw the officer mouth a curse word but could not hear what he said because both of their windows were rolled up. The woman followed the police vehicle to record the license plate, and stated the officer conducted a u-turn and "blew a raspberry" at her as he drove the opposite direction. The officer stated the woman cut him off and was the reason he was blocking the flow of traffic. When the officer maneuvered his vehicle next to the woman, she began yelling at the officer. Although the officer could not hear what the woman was saying, he admitted to mouthing a curse word under his breath. The officer saw the woman had followed his vehicle and admitted to sticking his tongue at the woman with the intention to convey he was done interacting with the woman. The investigation determined the officer made a discourteous statement and gesture directed at the woman. As a result, the Board Substantiated the allegations.

2. Unsubstantiated

An officer issued a man a traffic summons and used discourteous language when he returned to the scene. The man admitted he refused to provide his identification after the officer pulled him over for speeding. After the officer took the man's license from his pocket and issued him a speeding ticket, the man said he left the scene but returned because he wanted to ask the officer a question. When the man returned to the incident location, he said the officer cursed at him, ordered him to show his hands, and the officer placed their head inside the front and back window of his car. The officer confirmed the man had left the scene after being issued a traffic summons. However, the man returned to the scene at a high speed and pulled between the officer's car and the motorist she had recently stopped. Unaware why the man returned to the

scene, the officer said she feared the man may have returned with a gun because of how upset he was with getting pulled over and being issued a summons. The officer denied cursing at the man and does not remember looking inside of the vehicle. Without of additional evidence, the investigation was not able to determine if the officer did or did not cursed at the man or look inside his vehicle and the Board Unsubstantiated the allegations.

3. Unfounded
Officers allegedly acted discourteously to a man after they issued him a vehicle summons. The man said officers returned to his vehicle with his driver's license wrapped in a summons, throwing both object into the man's vehicle. A witness sitting in the passenger's seat of the man's vehicle said the officer returned to the man's car, explained to the man why he was being issued a summons, and handed the man his driver's license and summons through the window. The witness further testified the officer acted courteously throughout the interaction. The officer said he handed the man his driver's license and summons through the window and denied throwing either objects at the man. The investigation determined the officer did not act in a discourteous manner towards the man and the Board Unfounded the allegation.

4. Exonerated
Officers stopped a vehicle for a moving violation. The man said he was driving at the speed limit of 25 mph and was not aware of committing any vehicle infractions when officers pulled up behind him driving around 90 mph and pulled him over. Recognizing the officers from around 10 minutes prior from his apartment parking lot, the man felt he was being profiled by the officers and began recorded the incident. In the video, the officers told the man he had ran a red light. The man left the scene without receiving a summons after asking the officers if he was free to go, and the officers told him he was not being detained. All the officers testified they were following the man when he drove through a red light, which the officers consistently stated in the video and recorded in their memo books. As a result, the Board Exonerated the stop allegation.

5. Officer Unidentified
Plainclothes Officers stopped, frisked and searched a man. The man said he was walking on the sidewalk when an unmarked sedan driving in the opposite direction crossed over the double yellow line, impeding the flow of traffic and the man from walking down the sidewalk. Three officers emerged from the vehicle and told the man to put his hands up as the officers patted him down and searched his pockets. The incident took place within the jurisdiction of seven commands, and the officers left the scene without arresting or issuing the man a summons. Although the man could provide a detailed description of the primary officer and a description of the other officers, the investigation was not able to identify the officers based of the composition of the team the man described. Because the investigation could not identify any officers responsible for the stop, frisk and search, the complaint was closed Officers Unidentified.

Dispositions - Full Investigations

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



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

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



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

Dispositions - All CCRB Cases

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

Figure 21: Disposition of Cases (2016 vs 2017)

	Jun 2016		Jun 2017		YTD 2016		YTD 2017	
Full Investigations	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Substantiated	39	21%	18	14%	210	26%	131	20%
Exonerated	36	20%	25	19%	125	15%	116	17%
Unfounded	15	8%	5	4%	85	10%	42	6%
Unsubstantiated	83	45%	67	52%	351	43%	317	48%
MOS Unidentified	10	5%	15	12%	48	6%	59	9%
Total - Full Investigations	183		130		819		665	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	22	63%	22	56%	112	48%	91	53%
Mediation Attempted	13	37%	17	44%	120	52%	82	47%
Total - ADR Closures	35		39		232		173	
Resolved Case Total	218	41%	169	47%	1051	44%	838	42%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	60	19%	42	22%	247	19%	293	26%
Complainant/Victim/Witness uncooperative	205	64%	110	59%	804	61%	624	55%
Complainant/Victim/Witness unavailable	41	13%	30	16%	211	16%	184	16%
Victim unidentified	7	2%	3	2%	23	2%	17	1%
Miscellaneous	2	1%	1	1%	3	0%	3	0%
Administrative closure*	3	1%	2	1%	29	2%	14	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	318		188		1317		1135	
Total - Closed Cases	536		357		2368		1973	

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

Dispositions - 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 13% for the month of June 2017, and the allegation substantiation rate is 12% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is Abuse of Authority – substantiating 18% of such allegations during June 2017, and 16% for the year.

Figure 22: Disposition of Allegations (2016 vs 2017)

	Jun 2016		Jun 2017		YTD 2016		YTD 2017	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	113	14%	71	13%	542	15%	335	12%
Unsubstantiated	334	41%	224	40%	1419	38%	1107	39%
Unfounded	65	8%	24	4%	382	10%	223	8%
Exonerated	224	27%	172	30%	994	27%	828	29%
MOS Unidentified	88	11%	74	13%	350	9%	377	13%
Total - Full Investigations	824		565		3687		2870	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	58	72%	57	54%	277	51%	205	54%
MediationAttempted	23	28%	48	46%	262	49%	173	46%
Total - ADR Closures	81		105		539		378	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	107	14%	83	17%	474	15%	631	22%
Complainant/Victim/Witness uncooperative	514	70%	349	70%	2088	66%	1751	62%
Complainant/Victim/Witness unavailable	96	13%	58	12%	473	15%	364	13%
Victim unidentified	11	1%	6	1%	50	2%	37	1%
Miscellaneous	6	1%	1	0%	18	1%	9	0%
Administrative closure	5	1%	5	1%	42	1%	24	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	739		502		3145		2816	
Total - Closed Allegations	1644		1172		7372		6064	

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	2	40	56	15	11	124
	2%	32%	45%	12%	9%	100%
Abuse of Authority	61	116	114	4	47	342
	18%	34%	33%	1%	14%	100%
Discourtesy	7	52	2	4	11	76
	9%	68%	3%	5%	14%	100%
Offensive Language	1	16	0	1	1	19
	5%	84%	0%	5%	5%	100%
	71	224	172	24	70	561
Total	13%	40%	31%	4%	12%	100%

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	35	235	260	101	78	709
	5%	33%	37%	14%	11%	100%
Abuse of Authority	257	532	555	68	211	1623
	16%	33%	34%	4%	13%	100%
Discourtesy	36	282	13	40	62	433
	8%	65%	3%	9%	14%	100%
Offensive Language	7	58	0	14	15	94
	7%	62%	0%	15%	16%	100%
	335	1107	828	223	366	2859
Total	12%	39%	29%	8%	13%	100%

Substantiation Rates

The June 2017 case substantiation rate was 14%.

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



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



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

Figure 27: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2017 - Jun 2017) (% 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 or not to substantiate the allegation and make a disciplinary recommendation.

- "Charges and Specifications" are the most severe form of discipline. Charges commence 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 more problematic than poor training, but does not rise to the level of Charges. An officer can lose up to ten vacation days as a result of a Command Discipline.
- When the Board has recommended Instructions, Formalized Training or Command Discipline, the case is sent to the NYPD Commissioner to impose training and/or other penalties, while cases where the Board recommends charges are prosecuted by the CCRB's Administrative Prosecution Unit.

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

	June 2016		June 2017		YTD 2016		YTD 2017	
Disposition	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	3	8%	5	28%	26	12%	11	8%
Command Discipline	20	51%	11	61%	102	49%	73	56%
Formalized Training	15	38%	1	6%	78	37%	32	24%
Instructions	1	3%	1	6%	4	2%	15	11%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	39		18		210		131	

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



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 30: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations* (Jun 2016, Jun 2017, YTD 2016, YTD 2017)

	June 2016		June 2017		YTD 2016		YTD 2017	
Disposition	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	6	10%	10	32.3%	38	11.9%	16	8.4%
Command Discipline	29	48.3%	19	61.3%	152	47.6%	109	57.4%
Formalized Training	24	40%	1	3.2%	123	38.6%	45	23.7%
Instructions	1	1.7%	1	3.2%	6	1.9%	20	10.5%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	60		31		319		190	

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 31: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (June 2017)

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of summons	10	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	19	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Gun Pointed	19	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Gun as club	19	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory summons	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory summons	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Other	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Other	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Other	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Offensive Language	Race	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	45	Bronx

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Action	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Action	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Action	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name/shield number	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	109	Queens

Truncations

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

Figure 32: Truncated Allegations (June 2017)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Force	21	14	9	2	46
Abuse of Authority	53	28	14	3	98
Discourtesy	8	7	2	1	18
Offensive Language	1	1	0	0	2
Total	83	50	25	6	164

Figure 33: Truncated CCRB Complaints (June 2017)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	42	12	8	3	65

Figure 34: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2017)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Force	162	80	34	13	289
Abuse of Authority	354	111	46	16	527
Discourtesy	100	23	5	4	132
Offensive Language	15	8	1	4	28
Total	631	222	86	37	976

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2017)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	293	53	31	17	394

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 36: PSA Complaints Closed as % of Total Complaints Closed

	Jun 2016	Jun 2017	YTD 2016	YTD 2017
PSA Complaints	22	15	90	76
Total Complaints	536	357	2368	1973
PSA Complaints as % of Total	4.1%	4.2%	3.8%	3.9%

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 37: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

	Jun 2016	Jun 2017	YTD 2016	YTD 2017
PSA 1	4	3	20	8
PSA 2	4	3	19	16
PSA 3	2	0	12	20
PSA 4	2	0	24	5
PSA 5	2	1	9	21
PSA 6	7	2	18	16
PSA 7	10	15	23	34
PSA 8	2	6	10	10
PSA 9	3	2	12	7
Total	36	32	147	137

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

	Jun 2016		Jun 2017		YTD 2016		YTD 2017	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	23	52%	8	19%	76	37%	37	20%
Abuse of Authority (A)	16	36%	25	58%	87	43%	103	57%
Discourtesy (D)	4	9%	8	19%	33	16%	32	18%
Offensive Language (O)	1	2%	2	5%	8	4%	10	5%
Total	44	99%	43	101%	204	100%	182	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 39: Disposition of PSA Officers (2016 vs 2017)

	Jun 2016		Jun 2017		YTD 2016		YTD 2017	
Full Investigations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	4	36%	6	26%	14	19%	26	31%
Exonerated	3	27%	11	48%	22	30%	28	33%
Unfounded	1	9%	1	4%	7	9%	1	1%
Unsubstantiated	3	27%	5	22%	31	42%	29	35%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	11		23		74		84	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	4	80%	3	20%	7	47%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	1	20%	12	80%	8	53%
Total - ADR Closures	0		5		15		15	
Resolved Case Total	11	31%	28	88%	89	61%	99	72%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	2	8%	2	50%	6	10%	9	24%
Complainant/Victim/Witness uncooperative	20	80%	2	50%	44	76%	24	63%
Complainant/Victim/Witness unavailable	2	8%	0	0%	4	7%	5	13%
Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Miscellaneous	1	4%	0	0%	2	3%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	25		4		58		38	
Total - Closed Cases	36		32		147		137	

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

Mediation Unit

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

Figure 40: Mediated Complaints Closed

	June 2017			YTD 2017		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	22	17	39	91	82	173

Figure 41: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	June 2017			YTD 2017		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	3	3	6	12	8	20
Abuse of Authority	42	30	72	141	107	248
Discourtesy	10	13	23	45	47	92
Offensive Language	2	2	4	7	11	18
Total	57	48	105	205	173	378

Figure 42: Mediated Complaints By Borough (June 2017)

	Mediations
Bronx	1
Brooklyn	6
Manhattan	10
Queens	5
Staten Island	0

Figure 43: Mediated Allegations By Borough (June 2017)

	Mediations
Bronx	2
Brooklyn	19
Manhattan	24
Queens	12
Staten Island	0

Figure 44: Mediated Complaints By Precinct (Jun 2017 - YTD 2017)

Precinct	Jun 2017	YTD 2017	Precinct	Jun 2017	YTD 2017
1	0	1	70	0	1
6	0	1	71	1	1
7	0	1	72	0	2
13	0	1	73	1	3
14	0	1	75	0	3
18	2	4	77	0	1
19	2	2	79	0	2
25	1	2	81	0	4
26	1	1	83	0	1
28	1	3	84	0	1
30	0	2	88	0	1
32	2	3	94	1	2
33	0	1	100	0	1
34	1	1	101	0	1
41	0	1	102	1	2
42	0	1	103	0	1
43	1	2	104	0	1
44	0	3	105	1	3
45	0	3	107	0	1
47	0	2	112	1	1
48	0	1	113	1	1
50	0	3	114	1	1
52	0	3	115	0	2
62	1	1	120	0	1
66	0	3	121	0	2
67	2	3	122	0	1

Figure 45: Mediated Allegations By Precinct (Jun 2017 - YTD 2017)

Precinct	Jun 2017	YTD 2017	Precinct	Jun 2017	YTD 2017
1	0	2	70	0	4
6	0	2	71	5	5
7	0	7	72	0	3
13	0	1	73	2	6
14	0	3	75	0	10
18	9	14	77	0	3
19	3	3	79	0	6
25	1	2	81	0	4
26	2	2	83	0	2
28	1	4	84	0	1
30	0	3	88	0	1
32	3	5	94	1	3
33	0	3	100	0	1
34	5	5	101	0	1
41	0	2	102	2	4
42	0	1	103	0	1
43	2	6	104	0	4
44	0	3	105	2	6
45	0	11	107	0	3
47	0	3	112	2	2
48	0	2	113	1	1
50	0	8	114	5	5
52	0	11	115	0	2
62	4	4	120	0	1
66	0	4	121	0	6
67	7	8	122	0	1

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 46: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Jun 2017	YTD 2017
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	2	14
	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	1	16
	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	1
	*Retained, with discipline	0	1
	Disciplinary Action Total	**3**	**32**
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	3	19
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	0
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	1	3
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total	**4**	**22**
Not Adjudicated	Charges not filed	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	1	3
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total	**1**	**3**
	Total Closures	**8**	**57**

*Retained cases are those where the Department kept jurisdiction pursuant to Section 2 of the April 2, 2012 Memorandum of Understanding between the NYPD and the CCRB.
** When the Department keeps jurisdiction pursuant to Section 2 and does not impose any discipline on the officer, it is the equivalent of a category referred to as DUP.
*** In some case, the Department conducts their own investigation and prosecution prior to the completion of the CCRB's investigation. In those cases, the APU does not conduct a second prosecution.
† Under the Board's reconsideration process, an officer who has charges recommended as the penalty for a substantiated allegation may have the recommended penalty changed to something other than charges or have the allegation disposition changed to something other than substantiated. In those cases, the APU ceases its prosecution.

NYPD Discipline

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

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

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

Figure 47: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	June 2017	YTD 2017
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	2
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	7
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	3	20
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	0
Formalized Training**	0	1
Instructions***	0	1
Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	1
Disciplinary Action† Total	**3**	**32**
No Disciplinary Action†	4	22
Adjudicated Total	**7**	**54**
Discipline Rate	**43%**	**59%**
Not Adjudicated† Total	1	3
Total Closures	**8**	**57**

*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 48: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	Disposition Type*	June 2017	YTD 2017
Disciplinary Action	Terminated	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	1
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	0
	Command Discipline B	3	12
	Command Discipline A	8	61
	Formalized Training**	4	58
	Instructions***	1	17
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total	**16**	**149**
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	2	6
	SOL Expired	0	0
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	8	41
	Total	**10**	**47**
	Discipline Rate	**62%**	**76%**
	DUP Rate	**31%**	**21%**

*Where the respondent is found guilty of charges, and the penalty imposed would fall into more than one of the above listed categories, it is reported under the more severe penalty.
** Formalized training is conducted by the Police Academy, the NYPD Legal Bureau, or other NYPD Unit.
*** Instructions are conducted at the command level.
† This verdict relates to a trial conducted by DAO on a case decided by the Board prior to the activation of the APU.
†† "Filed" is a term used when the police department is not required to take action against the subject officer because the officer has resigned or retired from the department, or has been terminated.
††† When the department decides that it will not discipline an officer against whom the Board recommended discipline other than charges, those cases are referred to as "Department Unable to Prosecute," or DUP.

Figure 49: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (June 2017)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Strip-searched	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	26	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	26	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	26	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	26	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Question	26	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Question	26	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Gun Pointed	32	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Gun Drawn	32	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Chokehold	32	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	32	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Other	32	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	32	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Retaliatory arrest	32	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	32	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Retaliatory summons	34	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	40	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	40	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	42	Bronx	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Other	42	Bronx	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	42	Bronx	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	52	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	52	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	52	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	52	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	62	Brooklyn	No Discipline

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	62	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	62	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	62	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	67	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	67	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Property damaged	67	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	67	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle stop	73	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle stop	73	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle stop	73	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Other	84	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	114	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Threat to damage/seize property	120	Staten Island	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	120	Staten Island	No Discipline

Figure 50: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (June 2017)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Vehicle stop	17	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Frisk	34	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 2 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Search (of person)	34	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 2 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Gun Pointed	60	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	60	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	D	Word	60	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	81	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	81	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	81	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Threat to damage/seize property	81	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Vehicle search	115	Queens	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	115	Queens	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Frisk	115	Queens	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)

Appendix

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

Figure 51: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	June 2017		May 2017			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	981	83.3%	916	83.0%	65	7.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	131	11.1%	124	11.2%	7	5.6%
Cases 8 Months	14	1.2%	13	1.2%	1	7.7%
Cases 9 Months	7	0.6%	8	0.7%	-1	-12.5%
Cases 10 Months	6	0.5%	6	0.5%	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	5	0.4%	5	0.5%	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	5	0.4%	3	0.3%	2	66.7%
Cases 13 Months	2	0.2%	4	0.4%	-2	-50.0%
Cases 14 Months	4	0.3%	5	0.5%	-1	-20.0%
Cases 15 Months	2	0.2%	1	0.1%	1	100.0%
Cases 16 Months	2	0.2%	4	0.4%	-2	-50.0%
Cases 17 Months	2	0.2%	1	0.1%	1	100.0%
Cases 18 Months	1	0.1%	3	0.3%	-2	-66.7%
Cases Over 18 Months	15	1.3%	10	0.9%	5	50.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**1177**	**100.0%**	**1103**	**100.0%**	**74**	**6.7%**

Figure 52: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On CCRB Received Date

	June 2017		May 2017			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	1053	89.5%	986	89.4%	67	6.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	95	8.1%	86	7.8%	9	10.5%
Cases 8 Months	5	0.4%	8	0.7%	-3	-37.5%
Cases 9 Months	5	0.4%	6	0.5%	-1	-16.7%
Cases 10 Months	4	0.3%	1	0.1%	3	300.0%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	-2	NA
Cases 12 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	-1	-50.0%
Cases 14 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 15 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	-2	NA
Cases 18 Months	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	8	0.7%	8	0.7%	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**1177**	**100.0%**	**1103**	**100.0%**	**74**	**6.7%**

Figure 53: CCRB Investigations Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	June 2017		May 2017			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	663	89.5%	618	89.6%	45	7.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	46	6.2%	37	5.4%	9	24.3%
Cases 8 Months	4	0.5%	4	0.6%	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	3	0.4%	4	0.6%	-1	-25.0%
Cases 10 Months	5	0.7%	5	0.7%	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	2	0.3%	2	0.3%	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	3	0.4%	2	0.3%	1	50.0%
Cases 13 Months	2	0.3%	1	0.1%	1	100.0%
Cases 14 Months	1	0.1%	3	0.4%	-2	-66.7%
Cases 15 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	2	0.3%	3	0.4%	-1	-33.3%
Cases 17 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	7	0.9%	8	1.2%	-1	-12.5%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**741**	**100.0%**	**690**	**100.0%**	**51**	**7.4%**

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

	June 2017	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	6	37.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	4	25.0%
Cases 8 Months	1	6.3%
Cases 9 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 10 Months	1	6.3%
Cases 11 Months	1	6.3%
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	3	18.8%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	**16**	**100.0%**

Figure 55: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2017)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	4	8.5%	21	44.7%	11	23.4%	3	6.4%	8	17%	0	0%
Gun fired	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	2	20%	2	20%	1	10%	1	10%	4	40%	0	0%
Gun as club	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%
Radio as club	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	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%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	0	0%	5	18.5%	15	55.6%	3	11.1%	4	14.8%	0	0%
Chokehold	4	12.5%	0	0%	15	46.9%	9	28.1%	4	12.5%	0	0%
Pepper spray	1	6.7%	7	46.7%	2	13.3%	1	6.7%	4	26.7%	0	0%
Physical force	17	3.4%	212	42.7%	154	31%	68	13.7%	45	9.1%	1	0.2%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	0	0%	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	0	0%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	0	0%	8	72.7%	1	9.1%	2	18.2%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	4	8.9%	4	8.9%	25	55.6%	6	13.3%	6	13.3%	0	0%
Total	35	4.9%	260	36.6%	235	33.1%	101	14.2%	78	11%	1	0.1%

Figure 56: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2017)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	1	5.9%	8	47.1%	4	23.5%	0	0%	4	23.5%	0	0%
Strip-searched	3	9.4%	5	15.6%	14	43.8%	4	12.5%	6	18.8%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	7	7.8%	43	47.8%	30	33.3%	0	0%	10	11.1%	0	0%
Vehicle search	12	14.1%	31	36.5%	26	30.6%	3	3.5%	13	15.3%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	30	10%	200	66.7%	47	15.7%	4	1.3%	19	6.3%	0	0%
Threat of summons	1	7.1%	7	50%	4	28.6%	0	0%	2	14.3%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	8	5.6%	57	39.9%	63	44.1%	4	2.8%	11	7.7%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	0	0%	2	33.3%	3	50%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	7	7.7%	15	16.5%	42	46.2%	8	8.8%	19	20.9%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	1	4.2%	11	45.8%	7	29.2%	1	4.2%	4	16.7%	0	0%
Property damaged	3	7.1%	11	26.2%	14	33.3%	0	0%	14	33.3%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	10	35.7%	0	0%	14	50%	0	0%	4	14.3%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	17	11%	0	0%	92	59.7%	23	14.9%	22	14.3%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	8	72.7%	2	18.2%	1	9.1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	2	3.6%	0	0%	36	64.3%	12	21.4%	6	10.7%	0	0%
Improper dissemination of medical info	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	21	38.9%	24	44.4%	5	9.3%	0	0%	4	7.4%	0	0%
Seizure of property	1	6.7%	8	53.3%	5	33.3%	0	0%	1	6.7%	0	0%
Failure to show search warrant	2	15.4%	0	0%	8	61.5%	1	7.7%	2	15.4%	0	0%
Frisk	40	40%	18	18%	21	21%	1	1%	20	20%	0	0%
Search (of person)	30	25.4%	25	21.2%	39	33.1%	1	0.8%	23	19.5%	0	0%
Stop	39	23.2%	77	45.8%	29	17.3%	0	0%	23	13.7%	0	0%
Question	4	14.8%	8	29.6%	8	29.6%	0	0%	7	25.9%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Interference with recording	1	4.2%	3	12.5%	11	45.8%	5	20.8%	4	16.7%	0	0%
Search of recording device	0	0%	0	0%	6	85.7%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0%	0	0%	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%

Total	257	15.7%	555	34%	532	32.6%	68	4.2%	222	13.6%	0	0%

Figure 57: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2017)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	30	7.9%	13	3.4%	246	64.9%	34	9%	56	14.8%	0	0%
Gesture	0	0%	0	0%	10	76.9%	1	7.7%	2	15.4%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Action	5	12.5%	0	0%	26	65%	5	12.5%	4	10%	0	0%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	36	8.3%	13	3%	282	65.1%	40	9.2%	62	14.3%	0	0%

Figure 58: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2017)

Offensive Language Allegation	**Substantiated**		**Exonerated**		**Unsubstantiated**		**Unfounded**		**Officer Unidentified**		**Miscellaneous**	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	2	5.9%	0	0%	20	58.8%	8	23.5%	4	11.8%	0	0%
Ethnicity	1	6.2%	0	0%	10	62.5%	1	6.2%	4	25%	0	0%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender	1	4.5%	0	0%	13	59.1%	3	13.6%	5	22.7%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	8	88.9%	1	11.1%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical disability	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	3	30%	0	0%	4	40%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%
Total	7	7.4%	0	0%	58	61.7%	14	14.9%	15	16%	0	0%

Figure 59: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (June 2017)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	12	23%
Charges filed, awaiting service	7	13%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	6	11%
Calendered for court appearance	5	9%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	3	6%
Trial scheduled	3	6%
Trial commenced	1	2%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	16	30%
Total	**53**	**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 60: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (June 2017)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	3	4%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	29	41%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	23	33%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	9	13%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	6	9%
Total	**70**	**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 61: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	1	7	28	130
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	4	23	41	227
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	4	27	44	280
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	0	8	50	219
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	8	42	55	275
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	0	14	30	182
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	1	7	26	81
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	2	6	84
Special Operations Division Total	0	2	5	29
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	0
Total	**18**	**132**	**285**	**1507**
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	3	2	20
Transit Bureau Total	0	0	35	99
Housing Bureau Total	5	26	33	139
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	2	10	15	123
Detective Bureau Total	1	4	11	61
Other Bureaus Total	2	12	14	69
Total	**10**	**55**	**110**	**511**
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	1	1	6	19
Undetermined	2	2	6	17
Total	**31**	**190**	**407**	**2054**

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

Figure 62A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
001 Precinct	0	0	0	7
005 Precinct	0	0	3	10
006 Precinct	0	1	7	15
007 Precinct	0	1	0	9
009 Precinct	0	2	2	13
010 Precinct	1	1	1	10
013 Precinct	0	0	2	10
Midtown South Precinct	0	0	5	19
017 Precinct	0	0	0	6
Midtown North Precinct	0	1	6	24
Precincts Total	**1**	**6**	**26**	**123**
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	1	2	6
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	**1**	**7**	**28**	**130**

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

Figure 62B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
019 Precinct	0	0	7	26
020 Precinct	0	2	1	12
023 Precinct	2	2	3	19
024 Precinct	0	3	0	13
025 Precinct	0	1	2	14
026 Precinct	0	0	0	5
Central Park Precinct	0	0	0	1
028 Precinct	0	0	4	23
030 Precinct	0	4	5	30
032 Precinct	0	7	5	31
033 Precinct	0	1	8	25
034 Precinct	2	3	6	22
Precincts Total	**4**	**23**	**41**	**221**
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	5
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	**4**	**23**	**41**	**227**

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

Figure 62C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
040 Precinct	0	0	4	17
041 Precinct	1	3	7	26
042 Precinct	0	3	0	18
043 Precinct	1	1	6	18
044 Precinct	2	8	4	27
045 Precinct	0	3	0	15
046 Precinct	0	2	5	25
047 Precinct	0	3	9	53
048 Precinct	0	0	4	13
049 Precinct	0	1	1	12
050 Precinct	0	2	2	21
052 Precinct	0	0	1	30
Precincts Total	**4**	**26**	**43**	**275**
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	1	1	2
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	**4**	**27**	**44**	**280**

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

Figure 62D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
060 Precinct	0	1	6	13
061 Precinct	0	0	3	14
062 Precinct	0	1	1	16
063 Precinct	0	0	0	5
066 Precinct	0	1	1	12
067 Precinct	0	2	8	38
068 Precinct	0	0	5	18
069 Precinct	0	0	4	18
070 Precinct	0	0	7	26
071 Precinct	0	2	3	22
072 Precinct	0	1	8	21
076 Precinct	0	0	2	7
078 Precinct	0	0	2	6
Precincts Total	**0**	**8**	**50**	**216**
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	0	0	2
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	**0**	**8**	**50**	**219**

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

Figure 62E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
073 Precinct	0	4	6	31
075 Precinct	4	18	21	89
077 Precinct	2	3	6	20
079 Precinct	0	3	3	16
081 Precinct	1	3	2	25
083 Precinct	0	1	0	21
084 Precinct	0	2	2	10
088 Precinct	1	2	8	18
090 Precinct	0	2	2	24
094 Precinct	0	1	5	13
Precincts Total	**8**	**39**	**55**	**267**
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	3	0	5
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	**8**	**42**	**55**	**275**

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

Figure 62F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
100 Precinct	0	2	0	19
101 Precinct	0	3	6	33
102 Precinct	0	0	3	13
103 Precinct	0	0	5	16
105 Precinct	0	2	7	27
106 Precinct	0	0	1	15
107 Precinct	0	2	2	15
113 Precinct	0	4	5	32
Precincts Total	**0**	**13**	**29**	**170**
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	1	7
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	0	5
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	**0**	**14**	**30**	**182**

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

Figure 62G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
104 Precinct	0	0	3	6
108 Precinct	0	0	2	7
109 Precinct	1	2	4	6
110 Precinct	0	4	1	14
111 Precinct	0	0	1	9
112 Precinct	0	0	5	7
114 Precinct	0	1	5	18
115 Precinct	0	0	5	14
Precincts Total	**1**	**7**	**26**	**81**
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	**1**	**7**	**26**	**81**

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

Figure 62H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
120 Precinct	0	0	1	31
122 Precinct	0	1	3	16
123 Precinct	0	1	1	7
121 Precinct	0	0	1	27
Precincts Total	**0**	**2**	**6**	**81**
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	0	3
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**	**2**	**6**	**84**

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

Figure 62I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	1	4	24
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	1	1	5
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	**0**	**2**	**5**	**29**

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

Figure 62J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

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

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

Figure 62K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	1
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	1
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	1	0	7
Highway Unit #2	0	1	0	5
Highway Unit #3	0	1	2	3
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	3
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Division Total	**0**	**3**	**2**	**20**

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

Figure 62L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Authority Liaison	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Inspections	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Spec. Invest. Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Crime Analysis	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Patrol Operations	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	0	0	3	4
TB DT02	0	0	0	2
TB DT03	0	0	5	21
TB DT04	0	0	5	11
TB DT11	0	0	0	6
TB DT12	0	0	3	10
TB DT20	0	0	0	5
TB DT23	0	0	0	1
TB DT30	0	0	2	2
TB DT32	0	0	0	1
TB DT33	0	0	2	11
TB DT34	0	0	1	1
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	2	5
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	5	6
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	1
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	6	6
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	0	1	6
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	**0**	**0**	**35**	**99**

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

Figure 62M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	0	2	3	8
PSA 2	2	2	2	15
PSA 3	0	3	0	20
PSA 4	0	0	0	5
PSA 5	0	3	1	20
PSA 6	0	3	2	16
PSA 7	2	9	15	33
PSA 8	1	2	6	9
PSA 9	0	0	2	8
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Bronx/Queens	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Investigations	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Elevator Vandalism Unit	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Operations and Misc. Commands	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	**5**	**26**	**33**	**139**
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	1	2	4
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	1	0	1
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	**5**	**26**	**33**	**139**

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

Figure 62N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Queens Narcotics	0	0	0	15
Manhattan North Narcotics	2	3	4	16
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	2	0	6
Bronx Narcotics	0	3	1	24
Staten Island Narcotics	0	1	1	5
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	3	38
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	1	6	16
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	0
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	1
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	**2**	**10**	**15**	**123**

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

Figure 62O: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	1	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	2	6
Detective Borough Bronx	0	1	5	14
Detective Borough Manhattan	1	2	1	12
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	1	1	16
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	0	8
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	1	1
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	2
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	**1**	**4**	**11**	**61**

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

Figure 62P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	2	12	14	69
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	0
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	0
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Other Bureaus Total	**2**	**12**	**14**	**69**

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

Figure 62Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2017 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Jun 2017	Substantiated MOS YTD 2017	Total MOS Jun 2017	Total MOS YTD 2017
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - Legal Bureau	0	0	0	0
DC Training	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy Training	0	0	1	2
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	1	1	1	2
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	0	0	0	0
Police Commissioner Office	0	0	0	1
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	1
Office of Equal Employment	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Operations	0	0	0	0
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	0	4	12
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**	**19**

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