



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 2019
(Statistics for April 2019)

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Glossary	3
Complaints Received	4
CCRB Cases Received By Borough and Precinct	5
Allegations Received	7
CCRB Docket	10
Closed Cases	12
Resolving Cases	12
Dispositions / Case Abstracts	13
Dispositions - Full Investigations	15
Dispositions - All CCRB Cases	16
Dispositions - Allegations	17
Substantiation Rates	19
Substantiation Rates and Video	19
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints	21
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Allegations	23
Truncations	26
Complaints by PSA	27
Mediation Unit	29
Administrative Prosecution Unit	31
NYPD Discipline	32
Appendix	37

Executive Summary

The Civilian Complaint Review Board (“CCRB”) is an independent municipal Agency that investigates complaints of NYPD misconduct. Every month, the CCRB prepares an Executive Director report for its public meeting. Data for April 2019 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 67% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 87% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In April, the CCRB opened 416 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 1,903 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 21% of its fully investigated cases (page 15).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 21% of the cases it closed in April (page 12) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 24% of the cases it closed (page 16). The Agency's truncation rate was 75% (page 12). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.
- 4) For April, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 29% of cases - compared to 10% of 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, 24-25).
- 6) In April the Police Commissioner finalized 6 decisions against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases (page 31). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 9 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 2 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.”

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 2019, the CCRB initiated 416 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2018 - April 2019)




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2018 - April 2019)





Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (YTD 2010 - YTD 2019)



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Of the five boroughs, the largest number of misconduct complaints stemmed from incidents occurring in Brooklyn, followed by Manhattan. The 75th Precinct had the highest number at 23 incidents.

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (April 2019)




Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2019)




Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (April 2019)


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	6	67	12
5	3	68	8
6	4	69	2
7	1	70	11
9	9	71	5
10	3	72	4
13	8	73	11
14	12	75	23
17	1	76	2
18	3	77	6
19	6	78	6
20	1	79	2
23	4	81	3
24	6	83	2
25	9	84	5
26	2	88	2
28	5	90	8
30	5	94	3
32	5	101	3
33	3	102	6
34	9	103	7
40	15	104	4
41	8	105	7
42	6	106	1
43	9	107	4
44	9	108	5
45	3	109	3
46	11	110	3
47	5	111	2
48	2	112	4
49	4	113	8
50	1	114	9
52	11	115	1
60	3	120	9
61	4	121	2
62	8	123	2
63	4	Unknown	8
66	5		

*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 2018 to April 2019, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is up, Abuse of Authority complaints are up, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down. Figures for the year-to-date comparison show that in 2019, complaints containing an allegation of Force are up, Abuse of Authority are up, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (April 2018 vs. April 2019)




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

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

	April 2018		April 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	123	37%	165	40%	42	34%
Abuse of Authority (A)	263	80%	322	77%	59	22%
Discourtesy (D)	109	33%	64	15%	-45	-41%
Offensive Language (O)	17	5%	7	2%	-10	-59%
Total FADO Allegations	512		558		46	9%
Total Complaints	329		416		87	26%

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 2018 vs. YTD 2019)



*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 2018		YTD 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	527	38%	645	38%	118	22%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1045	76%	1353	80%	308	29%
Discourtesy (D)	422	30%	344	20%	-78	-18%
Offensive Language (O)	101	7%	79	5%	-22	-22%
Total FADO Allegations	2095		2421		326	16%
Total Complaints	1384		1697		313	23%

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 2018		April 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	249	21%	322	23%	73	29%
Abuse of Authority (A)	773	64%	958	70%	185	24%
Discourtesy (D)	161	13%	84	6%	-77	-48%
Offensive Language (O)	27	2%	9	1%	-18	-67%
Total Allegations	1210		1373		163	13%
Total Complaints	329		416		87	26%

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

	YTD 2018		YTD 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	1103	23%	1351	21%	248	22%
Abuse of Authority (A)	2896	61%	4483	70%	1587	55%
Discourtesy (D)	597	13%	474	7%	-123	-21%
Offensive Language (O)	133	3%	104	2%	-29	-22%
Total Allegations	4729		6412		1683	36%
Total Complaints	1384		1697		313	23%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of April 2019, 67% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 87% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (April 2019)

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1121	67.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	328	19.6%
Cases 8-11 Months	182	10.9%
Cases 12-18 Months*	37	2.2%
Cases Over 18 Months**	3	0.2%
Total	1671	100%

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

**Over18 Months: 0 cases that were reopened; 3 cases that were on DA Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (April 2019)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	996	59.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	339	20.3%
Cases 8-11 Months	235	14.1%
Cases 12-18 Months*	84	5.0%
Cases Over 18 Months**	17	1.0%
Total	1671	100%

*12-18 Months: 15 cases that were reopened; 3 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 0 cases that were reopened; 5 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 2018 - April 2019)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change


	March 2019		April 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	1123	58%	1095	58%	-28	-2%
Pending Board Review	580	30%	576	30%	-4	-1%
Mediation	216	11%	224	12%	8	4%
On DA Hold	9	0%	8	0%	-1	-11%
Total	1928		1903		-25	-1%

Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In April 2019, the CCRB fully investigated 21% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 24% of the cases it closed.

Figure 18: Case Resolutions (January 2018 - April 2019) (%)



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

Two individuals were engaged in a playground dispute. Officers responded to the scene, and upon arrival, saw an individual assault the complainant. The complainant attempted to strike the individual back, but an officer restrained her. The complainant then broke free from the officer, who instructed her not to retaliate, and allegedly placed her in a chokehold, restricting her breathing. Video footage did not capture the allegations. In his statement, the officer denied placing the individual in a chokehold. In contrast, four witnesses, including one who had an adversarial relationship with the complainant, all consistently stated that they saw the officer place the individual in a chokehold. The investigator found by a preponderance of the evidence that the officer placed the complainant in a chokehold, restricting her breathing. The Board substantiated the allegation.

2. Unsubstantiated

Officers responded to a 911 call regarding a dispute. Upon arriving on scene, a witness approached an officer, who allegedly told him to, "Shut the fuck up." During his interview, the subject officer denied the allegation, as did the other officers on scene. Given the conflicting statements and lack of video footage or documentary evidence capturing the allegation, the investigation was unable to determine by a preponderance of evidence whether the officer spoke discourteously to the individual. The Board unsubstantiated the allegation.

3. Unfounded

An individual was standing in a parking lot when an unmarked four-door sedan, which the individual believed was a police vehicle, allegedly swerved towards him in an attempt to strike

him. Surveillance footage captured a dark-colored sedan driving towards the individual. However, in the video footage, the vehicle drove in a relatively straight line, within the one lane for moving traffic, and did not appear to serve toward the individual as it approached and then passed his position. The individual viewed the surveillance footage and identified the sedan as the vehicle that allegedly attempted to strike him. Given that the video contradicted his account of the vehicle “swerving” toward him, it was determined, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the driver of the vehicle did not attempt to strike him with the vehicle. The Board unfounded the allegation.

4. Exonerated


Officers responded to a 911 call for an assault. Based on the information provided by the 911 dispatcher, officers stopped an individual matching the description provided. Shortly thereafter, the victim arrived at the location and identified the individual as his assailant. When the officers attempted to arrest the individual, he resisted by pushing their arms away. In response, an officer unholstered his taser, and threatened the individual with taser use. The individual was subsequently handcuffed and the taser was not used. Civilian and police officer testimonies, as well as police documentation, verified that the individual actively resisted officer attempts to place him into custody. As such, an officer could have used his taser to overcome active resistance, and was therefore justified in pointing it at the individual. As a result, the Board exonerated the allegation.

5. Officer Unidentified

An individual was stopped by four plainclothes officers in an unmarked vehicle for a broken tail light. The officers asked the individual to exit his car and then searched him. Shortly thereafter, the officers left without issuing any summonses or taking any law enforcement action. The officer descriptions provided by the individual were general, and could not be used to identify a specific officer. The stop was undocumented, and did not result in any summons, a Stop, Question, and Frisk Report, or an event report. Video footage of the incident was not found, and police documentation proved inconclusive in determining the subject officers. The Board closed the allegation as officer unidentified.


Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 19: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (April 2019)



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

Figure 20: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2019)



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 21: Disposition of Cases (2018 vs 2019)

	Apr 2018		Apr 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Full Investigations								
Substantiated	31	23%	19	21%	84	19%	100	21%
Exonerated	18	14%	26	28%	70	15%	97	21%
Unfounded	12	9%	7	8%	39	9%	42	9%
Unsubstantiated	61	46%	32	35%	224	49%	191	41%
MOS Unidentified	11	8%	8	9%	36	8%	37	8%
Total - Full Investigations	133		92		453		467	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	22	38%	17	100%	85	49%	55	45%
Mediation Attempted	36	62%	0	0%	88	51%	68	55%
Total - ADR Closures	58		17		173		123	
Resolved Case Total	191	51%	109	24%	626	46%	590	32%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	38	21%	72	21%	130	18%	261	20%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	91	51%	163	48%	404	55%	623	49%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	14	8%	56	17%	91	12%	213	17%
Alleged Victim unidentified	3	2%	7	2%	8	1%	26	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	33	18%	35	10%	99	13%	143	11%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	2	1%	2	0%	4	0%
Administrative closure**	1	1%	2	1%	4	1%	5	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	180		337		738		1275	
Total - Closed Cases	371		446		1364		1865	

* Closed - Pending Litigation is a truncation category added in August 2017. It indicates that the complaint was truncated due to the complainant/alleged victim's attorney.

**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 10% for the month of April 2019, and the allegation substantiation rate is 12% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is Discourtesy – substantiating 17% of such allegations during April 2019, and 15% for the year.

Figure 22: Disposition of Allegations (2018 vs 2019)

	Apr 2018		Apr 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	68	12%	43	10%	226	11%	269	12%
Unsubstantiated	195	35%	133	30%	834	40%	693	32%
Unfounded	68	12%	27	6%	189	9%	206	9%
Exonerated	177	32%	173	39%	627	30%	764	35%
MOS Unidentified	52	9%	72	16%	218	10%	248	11%
Total - Full Investigations	560		448		2094		2180	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	46	32%	41	100%	182	44%	108	40%
Mediation Attempted	100	68%	0	0%	232	56%	162	60%
Total - ADR Closures	146		41		414		270	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	109	20%	212	20%	310	16%	690	18%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	242	45%	534	50%	1089	56%	1961	51%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	44	8%	139	13%	191	10%	513	13%
Alleged Victim unidentified	11	2%	14	1%	20	1%	82	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	128	24%	160	15%	311	16%	541	14%
Miscellaneous	6	1%	3	0%	16	1%	33	1%
Administrative closure	3	1%	2	0%	14	1%	8	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	543		1064		1951		3828	
Total - Closed Allegations	1249		1553		4459		6278	

Figure 23: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (April 2019)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	4 5%	20 25%	39 49%	11 14%	6 8%	80 100%
Abuse of Authority	32 10%	88 28%	129 41%	12 4%	53 17%	314 100%
Discourtesy	7 17%	20 48%	5 12%	2 5%	8 19%	42 100%
Offensive Language	0 0%	5 42%	0 0%	2 17%	5 42%	12 100%
Total	43 10%	133 30%	173 39%	27 6%	72 16%	448 100%


Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (YTD 2019)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	43 9%	138 29%	185 38%	80 17%	38 8%	484 100%
Abuse of Authority	185 13%	406 29%	566 40%	72 5%	171 12%	1400 100%
Discourtesy	37 15%	118 49%	12 5%	41 17%	31 13%	239 100%
Offensive Language	4 7%	31 54%	1 2%	13 23%	8 14%	57 100%
Total	269 12%	693 32%	764 35%	206 9%	248 11%	2180 100%

Substantiation Rates

The April 2019 case substantiation rate was 21%.

Figure 25: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2018 - April 2019)




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 2019 - Apr 2019) (% substantiated shown)



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

Figure 27: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2019 - Apr 2019)
 (% 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 28: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints*
(Apr 2018, Apr 2019, YTD 2018, YTD 2019)

Disposition	April 2018		April 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	8	26%	3	16%	24	29%	21	21%
Command Discipline	14	45%	10	53%	36	43%	47	47%
Formalized Training	6	19%	4	21%	11	13%	16	16%
Instructions	3	10%	2	11%	13	15%	16	16%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	31		19		84		100	

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* (2019)



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*
(Apr 2018, Apr 2019, YTD 2018, YTD 2019)**

Disposition	April 2018		April 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	13	28.3%	4	14.3%	39	29.5%	31	21.4%
Command Discipline	19	41.3%	13	46.4%	57	43.2%	68	46.9%
Formalized Training	8	17.4%	7	25%	17	12.9%	25	17.2%
Instructions	6	13%	4	14.3%	19	14.4%	21	14.5%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	46		28		132		145	

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 (April 2019)

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 B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	5	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	5	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Chokehold	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Restricted Breathing	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	104	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	104	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	105	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	105	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	106	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	106	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	106	Queens

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	106	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	120	Staten Island

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 32: Truncated Allegations (April 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	35	83	51	3	78	250
Abuse of Authority	160	402	78	10	71	721
Discourtesy	16	39	10	1	11	77
Offensive Language	1	10	0	0	0	11
Total	212	534	139	14	160	1059

Figure 33: Truncated CCRB Complaints (April 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	72	163	56	7	35	333

Figure 34: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	117	354	194	18	267	950
Abuse of Authority	478	1393	271	56	241	2439
Discourtesy	76	176	36	7	31	326
Offensive Language	19	38	12	1	2	72
Total	690	1961	513	82	541	3787

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2019)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	261	623	213	26	143	1266

*Pending Litigation is a truncation category added in August 2017. It indicates that the complaint was truncated due to the complainant/alleged victim's attorney.

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

	Apr 2018	Apr 2019	YTD 2018	YTD 2019
PSA Complaints	14	11	61	60
Total Complaints	371	446	1364	1865
PSA Complaints as % of Total	3.8%	2.5%	4.5%	3.2%

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

	Apr 2018	Apr 2019	YTD 2018	YTD 2019
PSA 1	0	0	10	11
PSA 2	3	1	19	16
PSA 3	5	2	8	6
PSA 4	3	7	18	30
PSA 5	1	2	5	11
PSA 6	3	0	14	12
PSA 7	7	3	31	6
PSA 8	0	0	8	9
PSA 9	0	3	10	6
Total	22	18	123	107

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

	Apr 2018		Apr 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	13	42%	13	54%	48	29%	43	32%
Abuse of Authority (A)	13	42%	9	38%	92	55%	72	54%
Discourtesy (D)	3	10%	2	8%	20	12%	12	9%
Offensive Language (O)	2	6%	0	0%	7	4%	7	5%
Total	31	100%	24	100%	167	100%	134	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 (2018 vs 2019)

Full Investigations	Apr 2018		Apr 2019		YTD 2018		YTD 2019	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	0	0%	1	12%	12	16%	6	13%
Exonerated	2	22%	4	50%	19	25%	18	39%
Unfounded	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	9%
Unsubstantiated	7	78%	3	38%	44	59%	18	39%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	9		8		75		46	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	0	0%	3	38%	1	33%
Mediation Attempted	2	100%	0	0%	5	62%	2	67%
Total - ADR Closures	2		0		8		3	
Resolved Case Total	11	50%	8	44%	83	67%	49	46%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	3	27%	0	0%	10	25%	10	17%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	2	18%	3	30%	18	45%	29	50%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	1	9%	5	50%	1	2%	9	16%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	1	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	5	45%	1	10%	11	28%	9	16%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	11		10		40		58	
Total - Closed Cases	22		18		123		107	

* Closed - Pending Litigation is a truncation category added in August 2017. It indicates that the complaint was truncated due to the complainant/alleged victim's attorney.

**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 40: Mediated Complaints Closed

	April 2019			YTD 2019		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	17	0	17	55	68	123

Figure 41: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	April 2019			YTD 2019		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	3	0	3	4	16	20
Abuse of Authority	32	0	32	86	114	200
Discourtesy	4	0	4	14	26	40
Offensive Language	2	0	2	4	6	10
Total	41	0	41	108	162	270

Figure 42: Mediated Complaints By Borough (April 2019)

	Mediations
Bronx	5
Brooklyn	6
Manhattan	4
Queens	1
Staten Island	1

Figure 43: Mediated Allegations By Borough (April 2019)

	Mediations
Bronx	6
Brooklyn	17
Manhattan	11
Queens	3
Staten Island	4

**Figure 44: Mediated Complaints By Precinct
(Apr 2019 - YTD 2019)**

Precinct	Apr 2019	YTD 2019	Precinct	Apr 2019	YTD 2019
5	1	1	62	0	1
6	0	1	67	1	1
7	0	1	70	0	1
9	1	1	71	0	1
14	0	1	72	1	2
18	1	2	73	1	1
20	0	1	75	2	3
22	0	1	78	0	1
28	1	2	83	0	1
32	0	1	90	0	1
44	3	4	100	0	3
46	0	2	104	0	1
47	0	6	108	0	1
50	1	1	111	0	1
52	0	2	113	1	1
60	1	3	114	0	1
61	1	1	115	0	1
			120	1	2

**Figure 45: Mediated Allegations By Precinct
(Apr 2019 - YTD 2019)**

Precinct	Apr 2019	YTD 2019	Precinct	Apr 2019	YTD 2019
5	2	2	62	0	2
6	0	1	67	3	3
7	0	1	70	0	2
9	3	3	71	0	2
14	0	2	72	2	3
18	3	7	73	2	2
20	0	1	75	9	11
22	0	1	78	0	1
28	3	5	83	0	2
32	0	3	90	0	3
44	3	4	100	0	3
46	0	3	104	0	3
47	0	10	108	0	1
50	1	1	111	0	1
52	0	3	113	3	3
60	1	3	114	0	6
61	2	2	115	0	3
			120	4	5

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	Apr 2019	YTD 2019
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	1	2
	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	1
	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	1	1
	Disciplinary Action Total		2
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	4	6
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	0
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	0	0
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total		4
Not Adjudicated	Charges not filed	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	0	1
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total		0
Total Closures		6	11

*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 47: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	April 2019	YTD 2019
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	1	1
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	2
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	0
Formalized Training**	0	0
Instructions***	1	1
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	2	4
No Disciplinary Action†	4	6
Adjudicated Total	6	10
Discipline Rate	33%	40%
Not Adjudicated† Total	0	1
Total Closures	6	11

*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*	April 2019	YTD 2019
Disciplinary Action	Terminated	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	0
	Command Discipline B	0	1
	Command Discipline A	4	18
	Formalized Training**	8	35
	Instructions***	5	27
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total		17
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	0	0
	SOL Expired	0	0
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	5	16
	No Finding ††††	4	4
	Total	9	20
	Discipline Rate	65%	80%
	DUP Rate	19%	16%

*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 49: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (April 2019)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	5	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	5	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	5	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	5	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Gesture	5	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	E	Gender	5	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle search	7	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	7	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	7	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	7	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Nonlethal restraining device	10	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	23	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Search (of person)	32	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	34	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	34	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	34	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	34	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	43	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Interference with recording	46	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search of Premises	48	Bronx	Formalized Training

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Vehicle search	62	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	63	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	63	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Action	63	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat re: removal to hospital	63	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	67	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	71	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Interference with recording	84	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	102	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Entry of Premises	102	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	102	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Threat of arrest	108	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Seizure of property	108	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Action	123	Staten Island	No Discipline

Figure 50: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (April 2019)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Chokehold	40	Bronx	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	40	Bronx	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Other	40	Bronx	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	42	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 15 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Threat to damage/seize property	42	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 15 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	63	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Charges)	D	Word	63	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Charges)	O	Physical disability	63	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	73	Brooklyn	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	73	Brooklyn	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)

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

	April 2019		March 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1136	59.9%	1210	63.1%	-74	-6.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	402	21.2%	399	20.8%	3	0.8%
Cases 8 Months	103	5.4%	77	4.0%	26	33.8%
Cases 9 Months	62	3.3%	55	2.9%	7	12.7%
Cases 10 Months	48	2.5%	49	2.6%	-1	-2.0%
Cases 11 Months	39	2.1%	25	1.3%	14	56.0%
Cases 12 Months	20	1.1%	28	1.5%	-8	-28.6%
Cases 13 Months	24	1.3%	24	1.3%	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	22	1.2%	20	1.0%	2	10.0%
Cases 15 Months	13	0.7%	3	0.2%	10	333.3%
Cases 16 Months	3	0.2%	5	0.3%	-2	-40.0%
Cases 17 Months	4	0.2%	5	0.3%	-1	-20.0%
Cases 18 Months	2	0.1%	2	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	17	0.9%	17	0.9%	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1895	100.0%	1919	100.0%	-24	-1.3%

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

	April 2019		March 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1271	67.1%	1362	71.0%	-91	-6.7%
Cases 5-7 Months	388	20.5%	362	18.9%	26	7.2%
Cases 8 Months	81	4.3%	54	2.8%	27	50.0%
Cases 9 Months	43	2.3%	47	2.4%	-4	-8.5%
Cases 10 Months	35	1.8%	40	2.1%	-5	-12.5%
Cases 11 Months	35	1.8%	19	1.0%	16	84.2%
Cases 12 Months	14	0.7%	9	0.5%	5	55.6%
Cases 13 Months	9	0.5%	14	0.7%	-5	-35.7%
Cases 14 Months	10	0.5%	5	0.3%	5	100.0%
Cases 15 Months	4	0.2%	0	0.0%	4	NA
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	-2	NA
Cases 17 Months	2	0.1%	2	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	3	0.2%	3	0.2%	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1895	100.0%	1919	100.0%	-24	-1.3%

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

	April 2019		March 2019		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	760	69.4%	785	69.9%	-25	-3.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	191	17.4%	196	17.5%	-5	-2.6%
Cases 8 Months	41	3.7%	31	2.8%	10	32.3%
Cases 9 Months	23	2.1%	25	2.2%	-2	-8.0%
Cases 10 Months	22	2.0%	21	1.9%	1	4.8%
Cases 11 Months	9	0.8%	15	1.3%	-6	-40.0%
Cases 12 Months	12	1.1%	15	1.3%	-3	-20.0%
Cases 13 Months	11	1.0%	10	0.9%	1	10.0%
Cases 14 Months	10	0.9%	7	0.6%	3	42.9%
Cases 15 Months	4	0.4%	1	0.1%	3	300.0%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	-2	NA
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	-2	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	12	1.1%	13	1.2%	-1	-7.7%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1095	100.0%	1123	100.0%	-28	-2.5%

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

	April 2019	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1	12.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	1	12.5%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	2	25.0%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	1	12.5%
Cases Over 18 Months	3	37.5%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	8	100.0%

Figure 55: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2019)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	1	3.2%	17	54.8%	7	22.6%	4	12.9%	2	6.5%	0	0%
Gun fired	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	0	0%	3	50%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Radio as club	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%
Flashlight as club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Police shield	1	25%	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	1	5%	7	35%	8	40%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%
Chokehold	4	17.4%	0	0%	8	34.8%	8	34.8%	3	13%	0	0%
Pepper spray	0	0%	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
Physical force	18	5.6%	140	43.6%	89	27.7%	48	15%	25	7.8%	1	0.3%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	16	51.6%	11	35.5%	2	6.5%	2	6.5%	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%	2	22.2%	5	55.6%	2	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	2	9.1%	0	0%	10	45.5%	6	27.3%	3	13.6%	1	4.5%
Total	43	8.8%	185	38%	138	28.3%	80	16.4%	38	7.8%	3	0.6%

Figure 56: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2019)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	1	5.9%	9	52.9%	4	23.5%	2	11.8%	1	5.9%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	12	7.5%	122	76.7%	20	12.6%	1	0.6%	4	2.5%	0	0%
Strip-searched	4	19%	2	9.5%	10	47.6%	2	9.5%	3	14.3%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	3	4.1%	38	51.4%	21	28.4%	0	0%	12	16.2%	0	0%
Vehicle search	8	12.7%	26	41.3%	20	31.7%	0	0%	9	14.3%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	0	0%	5	83.3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Threat of summons	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	3	33.3%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	7	5.9%	48	40.7%	49	41.5%	5	4.2%	9	7.6%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	6	9.5%	15	23.8%	24	38.1%	9	14.3%	8	12.7%	1	1.6%
Threat to damage/seize property	3	13%	7	30.4%	9	39.1%	0	0%	4	17.4%	0	0%
Property damaged	5	12.8%	3	7.7%	13	33.3%	5	12.8%	12	30.8%	1	2.6%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	7	25%	0	0%	14	50%	2	7.1%	5	17.9%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	9	16.4%	0	0%	34	61.8%	9	16.4%	3	5.5%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	6	75%	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	9	31%	1	3.4%	6	20.7%	8	27.6%	5	17.2%	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	7	35%	7	35%	3	15%	1	5%	2	10%	0	0%
Seizure of property	4	18.2%	9	40.9%	5	22.7%	1	4.5%	3	13.6%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	0	0%	1	5.6%	14	77.8%	1	5.6%	2	11.1%	0	0%
Frisk	23	25.3%	37	40.7%	16	17.6%	1	1.1%	14	15.4%	0	0%
Search (of person)	13	18.8%	28	40.6%	20	29%	1	1.4%	7	10.1%	0	0%
Stop	20	20.6%	52	53.6%	12	12.4%	3	3.1%	10	10.3%	0	0%
Question	6	18.2%	14	42.4%	7	21.2%	0	0%	6	18.2%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Interference with recording	2	10%	3	15%	6	30%	4	20%	5	25%	0	0%
Search of recording device	1	9.1%	0	0%	5	45.5%	2	18.2%	3	27.3%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0%	0	0%	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%

Forcible Removal to Hospital	4	6%	57	85.1%	6	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat re: removal to hospital	0	0%	2	28.6%	4	57.1%	0	0%	1	14.3%	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%	1	100%	0	0%
Search of Premises	6	6.7%	65	72.2%	12	13.3%	2	2.2%	5	5.6%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	2	28.6%	0	0%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Arrest)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Frisk)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Strip-Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Vehicle Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Photo/Video)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Summons)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Photography/Videography	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	28.6%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	2	3.9%	0	0%	28	54.9%	8	15.7%	13	25.5%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	3	6.2%	3	6.2%	27	56.2%	3	6.2%	12	25%	0	0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	185	13.2%	566	40.4%	406	29%	72	5.1%	171	12.2%	2	0.1%

Figure 57: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2019)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	32	15%	11	5.2%	104	48.8%	37	17.4%	28	13.1%	1	0.5%
Gesture	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Action	4	15.4%	1	3.8%	14	53.8%	4	15.4%	2	7.7%	1	3.8%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	37	15.4%	12	5%	118	49%	41	17%	31	12.9%	2	0.8%

Figure 58: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2019)

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	0	0%	0	0%	13	68.4%	6	31.6%	0	0%	0	0%
Ethnicity	1	16.7%	0	0%	4	66.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	0	0%
Physical disability	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Gender	1	16.7%	0	0%	3	50%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Total	3	6.2%	1	2.1%	29	60.4%	10	20.8%	5	10.4%	0	0%

Figure 59: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (April 2019)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	0	0%
Trial commenced	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	12	12%
Charges filed, awaiting service	22	23%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	43	44%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	7	7%
Calendared for court appearance	5	5%
Trial scheduled	5	5%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	3	3%
Total	97	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 (April 2019)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	1	4%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	12	50%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	9	38%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	0	0%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	2	8%
Total	24	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 2019 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	0	4	31	104
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	3	19	34	201
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	6	32	87	381
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	3	17	62	229
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	5	23	37	260
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	2	10	65	218
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	2	7	20	122
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	1	4	27	103
Special Operations Division Total	0	1	4	17
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	0
Total	22	117	367	1635
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	8	28
Transit Bureau Total	0	5	17	83
Housing Bureau Total	2	7	23	115
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	8	16	69
Detective Bureau Total	2	2	15	75
Other Bureaus Total	2	3	23	55
Total	6	25	102	425
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	1	5	19
Undetermined	0	2	10	36
Total	28	145	484	2115

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

Figure 62A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
001 Precinct	0	0	3	8
005 Precinct	0	1	3	8
006 Precinct	0	0	0	12
007 Precinct	0	0	1	12
009 Precinct	0	0	5	7
010 Precinct	0	0	0	8
013 Precinct	0	0	1	9
Midtown South Precinct	0	0	6	15
017 Precinct	0	0	3	4
Midtown North Precinct	0	1	6	12
Precincts Total	0	2	28	95
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	0	1	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	2	2	8
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	0	4	31	104

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

Figure 62B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
019 Precinct	0	2	3	9
020 Precinct	0	0	0	8
023 Precinct	0	0	1	13
024 Precinct	0	0	2	7
025 Precinct	1	1	5	24
026 Precinct	0	0	2	12
Central Park Precinct	0	0	0	2
028 Precinct	0	3	6	21
030 Precinct	0	1	0	7
032 Precinct	0	1	0	16
033 Precinct	0	2	0	22
034 Precinct	2	7	13	49
Precincts Total	3	17	32	190
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	0	1	3
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	2	1	8
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	3	19	34	201

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

Figure 62C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
040 Precinct	0	1	4	28
041 Precinct	0	1	0	17
042 Precinct	0	2	11	37
043 Precinct	2	7	14	36
044 Precinct	0	3	10	40
045 Precinct	0	0	0	14
046 Precinct	2	7	12	53
047 Precinct	0	2	4	41
048 Precinct	2	5	6	34
049 Precinct	0	1	12	36
050 Precinct	0	3	8	14
052 Precinct	0	0	4	27
Precincts Total	6	32	85	377
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	0	1	3
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	1	1
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	6	32	87	381

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

Figure 62D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
060 Precinct	0	1	5	17
061 Precinct	0	0	3	10
062 Precinct	2	2	4	15
063 Precinct	0	3	5	15
066 Precinct	0	0	4	9
067 Precinct	1	2	14	44
068 Precinct	0	0	0	7
069 Precinct	0	2	9	19
070 Precinct	0	2	5	28
071 Precinct	0	2	1	29
072 Precinct	0	0	5	18
076 Precinct	0	0	7	8
078 Precinct	0	2	0	7
Precincts Total	3	16	62	226
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	0	3
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	3	17	62	229

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

Figure 62E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
073 Precinct	1	4	10	38
075 Precinct	0	0	10	44
077 Precinct	0	2	0	34
079 Precinct	2	6	8	30
081 Precinct	0	0	0	28
083 Precinct	0	5	0	24
084 Precinct	1	2	1	15
088 Precinct	0	3	3	16
090 Precinct	1	1	5	24
094 Precinct	0	0	0	7
Precincts Total	5	23	37	260
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	5	23	37	260

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

Figure 62F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
100 Precinct	0	0	10	27
101 Precinct	0	2	8	26
102 Precinct	0	1	10	19
103 Precinct	0	0	7	30
105 Precinct	2	4	16	41
106 Precinct	0	1	1	18
107 Precinct	0	1	1	11
113 Precinct	0	1	10	43
Precincts Total	2	10	63	215
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	2	3
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	2	10	65	218

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

Figure 62G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
104 Precinct	2	2	6	24
108 Precinct	0	0	5	8
109 Precinct	0	1	3	13
110 Precinct	0	1	1	11
111 Precinct	0	2	1	12
112 Precinct	0	0	1	3
114 Precinct	0	1	2	30
115 Precinct	0	0	1	18
Precincts Total	2	7	20	119
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	3
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	2	7	20	122

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

Figure 62H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
120 Precinct	0	0	12	43
122 Precinct	0	0	8	22
123 Precinct	0	3	1	18
121 Precinct	0	0	3	14
Precincts Total	0	3	24	97
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	1	1	2	4
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	1	1
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	1	4	27	103

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

Figure 62I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	1	4	14
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	1
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	2
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	0	1	4	17

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

Figure 62J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
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 2019 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	5	16
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	1
Bus Unit	0	0	1	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	0	1	5
Highway Unit #2	0	0	0	3
Highway Unit #3	0	0	1	1
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	8	28

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

Figure 62L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
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	1	1	11
TB DT02	0	0	1	6
TB DT03	0	1	0	6
TB DT04	0	0	2	7
TB DT11	0	0	0	2
TB DT12	0	1	0	5
TB DT20	0	1	0	1
TB DT23	0	0	2	3
TB DT30	0	1	3	10
TB DT32	0	0	3	4
TB DT33	0	0	1	5
TB DT34	0	0	1	1
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	1	5
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	2
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	0	2	14
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	0	5	17	83

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

Figure 62M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
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	11
PSA 2	1	1	1	14
PSA 3	0	0	2	6
PSA 4	0	3	7	31
PSA 5	0	0	2	11
PSA 6	0	2	0	12
PSA 7	0	0	3	6
PSA 8	0	0	0	9
PSA 9	0	0	3	8
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	1
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	7	23	115
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	2	3
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	1	1	2	2
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	1	1
Housing Bureau Total	2	7	23	115

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

Figure 62N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Queens Narcotics	0	1	3	12
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	3	0	9
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	1	2	5
Bronx Narcotics	0	1	5	14
Staten Island Narcotics	0	2	2	8
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	4	15
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	0	0	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	0	0
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	2
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	8	16	69

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

Figure 620: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	2
Special Investigations Division	0	0	0	2
Special Victims Division	0	0	0	2
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	0	0	6
Detective Borough Bronx	0	0	4	17
Detective Borough Manhattan	2	2	4	19
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	0	3	12
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	4	15
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	2	2	15	75

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

Figure 62P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	2
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	2	3	23	50
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	1
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	1
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	1
Other Bureaus Total	2	3	23	55

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

Figure 62Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2019 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Apr 2019	Substantiated MOS YTD 2019	Total MOS Apr 2019	Total MOS YTD 2019
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	3
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	0	1
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	2	2
School Safety Queens/Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
Office of Equal Employment	0	0	0	1
Deputy Commissioner Operations	0	0	0	0
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	1	2	10
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	1
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	1	5	19

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