In Re Public Board Meeting NYC - Civilian Complaint Review Board April 17, 2024

```
1
 2
                  CIVILIAN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD
 3
                            PUBLIC MEETING
 4
                            April 17, 2024
 5
                              4:12 p.m.
 6
 7
                     HELD VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE/
                   100 Church Street, 10th Floor
 8
                     New York, New York 10007
9
10
11
12
      B E F O R E:
13
      ARVA RICE - INTERIM CHAIR
14
      JONATHAN DARCHE, ESQ. - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
15
16
17
      COURT REPORTER:
18
      Sabrina Brown Stewart
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

In Re Public Board Meeting NYC - Civilian Complaint Review Board April 17, 2024

1	PUBLIC	MEETING AGENDA	
2	======	=======================================	
3	1.	Call to Order	
4	2.	Adoption of Minutes	
5	3.	Remarks from the Chair	
6	4.	Remarks from the Executive Director	
7	5.	Presentation from Outreach on the CCRB	
8	6.	Public Comment	
9	7.	Old Business	
10	8.	New Business	
11	9.	Adjourn to Executive Session	
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1	CCRB	BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
2	====	=======================================
3	1.	Arva Rice - Interim Chair
4	2.	Joseph A. Puma - Board Member
5	3.	AU Hogan - Board Member
6	4.	June Northern - Board Member
7	5.	Herman Merritt - Board Member
8	6.	Joe Fox - Board Member
9	7.	Kevin Jemmott - Board Member
10	8.	Pat Smith - Board Member
11	9.	Charlane Brown-Wyands, Esq Board Member
12	10.	Frank Dwyer - Board Member
13	11.	Esmeralda Simmons, Esq Board Member
14	12.	John Siegal - Board Member
15		
16		
17	PRESE	NTERS:
18		A RIGHI - Deputy Director of Outreach and governmental Affairs of the Civilian Complaint
19		w Board
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	SPEAKERS:
2	Royce Russell - NY Civil Rights Attorney
3	Chris Dunn - NYCLU, Legal Director
4	Michael Meyers - President, NY Civil Rights Coalition
5	Mari Moss - Public Official
6	Ibrahim Ahmed - Civilian
7	Asma Abdallah - Civilian
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	MR. ROSE: Good evening, everyone.
2	Thank you for joining us. For those
3	utilizing ASL Interpretation Services, our
4	two interpreters today are Andria Lamberton
5	and Erika Agramonte. The display names are
6	on the screen as ASL Interpreter SignNexus
7	Andria, and ASL Interpreter SignNexus Erika.
8	For those utilizing if you'd like to get
9	captions for those videos, the instructions
10	will be in the chat.
11	Thank you all very much.
12	CHAIR RICE: Good evening and welcome.
13	My name is Arva Rice. I use she/her
14	pronouns, and I am the Interim Chair of the
15	Civilian Complaint Review Board. I would
16	like to call the CCRB's February (sic) Public
17	Board Meeting to order.
18	Would the Board please introduce
19	themselves now, and we will start with Pat.
20	MR. SMITH: Pat Smith, mayoral
21	appointee, Manhattan.
22	MR. HOGAN: AU Hogan, City Council
23	designee, South Jamaica, Queens.
24	MR. DWYER: Frank Dwyer, Police
25	Commissioner designee.
	I control of the cont

1	MR. MERRITT: Herman Merritt, City
2	Council designee from Brooklyn.
3	MS. BROWN-WYANDS: Good afternoon.
4	Charlane Brown-Wyands, Police Commissioner
5	designee.
6	MR. DARCHE: Good evening. My name is
7	Jon Darche. I use he/him pronouns, and I'm
8	the Executive Director of the CCRB.
9	MR. SIEGAL: John Siegal, I'm one of the
10	Mayoral appointees.
11	MS. SIMMONS: Esmeralda Simmons, Public
12	Advocate appointee from Brooklyn, New York.
13	MR. FOX: Hi. Joe Fox. I'm a Police
14	Commissioner designee.
15	MR. JEMMOTT: Good afternoon. I'm
16	Kevin Jemmott, Mayoral appointee from Queens.
17	CHAIR RICE: And we also have somebody
18	joining us.
19	Mr. Puma, would you introduce yourself,
20	please.
21	MR. PUMA: Good afternoon. My name is
22	Joseph Puma. I go by he/him pronouns, and
23	I'm the City Council designee from the
24	Borough of Manhattan.
25	CHAIR RICE: Thank you.
	1

1	MS. NORTHERN: Good afternoon. June
2	Northern, Mayoral appointee from Brooklyn.
3	CHAIR RICE: Thank you, June.
4	I would like to ask for a motion to
5	approve the February Board Meeting minutes.
6	MS. BROWN-WYANDS: Move for the
7	approval of the February Board Meeting
8	minutes.
9	CHAIR RICE: And can I have a second.
10	MR. HOGAN: Second.
11	CHAIR RICE: Thank you.
12	Are there any changes or corrections to
13	the minutes?
14	(No response).
15	CHAIR RICE: If not, hearing none, all
16	those in favor of approving the minutes as
17	presented, say aye.
18	(Chorus of ayes).
19	CHAIR RICE: All those opposed?
20	(No response).
21	CHAIR RICE: The minutes are approved.
22	I would also like to ask for a motion
23	to approve the March Board Meeting minutes.
24	MS. BROWN-WYANDS: So moved.
25	CHAIR RICE: And can I have a second.

1	MS. SIMMONS: Second.
2	MS. NORTHERN: Second.
3	CHAIR RICE: Are there any changes or
4	corrections to the minutes?
5	(No response).
6	CHAIR RICE: Hearing none, all those in
7	favor of approving the minutes, say aye.
8	(Chorus of ayes).
9	CHAIR RICE: All those opposed?
10	(No response).
11	CHAIR RICE: The minutes are approved
12	as presented.
13	This past Sunday marked the five-year
14	anniversary of Kawaski Trawick's death at the
15	hand of Officers Thompson and Davis. Five
16	years ago, Mr. Trawick called 9-1-1 for help
17	to get back into his apartment. The Fire
18	Department came, helped him, and left without
19	incident. Officers Thompson and Davis
20	arrived minutes later, drove around the
21	block, took their time to find parking, and
22	spoke to the staff at the assisted living
23	facility that Mr. Trawick lived. The
24	officers knew it was a sensitive location,
25	and acknowledged that Mr. Trawick might be

2.0

classified as what NYPD calls an emotionally disturbed person.

Officers Thompson and Davis walked up to Mr. Trawick's floor, approached his door, and a hundred and twelve seconds later, Kawaski was on the floor, shot by Officer Thompson three times. Officers Davis and Thompson left Mr. Trawick on the floor, closed the door and didn't call for help. After Mr. Trawick was killed, the Bronx DA determined they did not have enough evidence to prosecute the officers for criminal conduct.

The NYPD conducted its own internal investigation, where they interviewed the officers for less than 30 minutes and did not ask them any questions about the footage in question. When the officers made misleading statements that did not match the footage, nothing was done. They failed to find any misconduct by either officer.

The CCRB received a complaint and requested evidence and body-worn camera footage from NYPD, but did not receive anything for over 18 months. Despite the

2

3

4

5

6

25

interference, the CCRB investigation established that both officers improperly entered Kawaski's home, that Officer Thompson improperly tased Mr. Trawick, that Officer Thompson improperly shot Mr. Trawick four times, and that both officers failed to get Mr. Trawick medical attention, while they left him dying on the floor of his apartment. The NYPD's refusal to release the evidence in this matter meant that when the CCRB's prosecutors file charges against Mr. Trawick, they had to use the crime exception to the statute of limitations. Using the crime exception imposed added requirements on the prosecution, which Executive Director, Jon Darche, will explain in more detail shortly.

In addition to having to prove that the officers violated the NYPD Patrol Guide, we had to prove that they broke criminal law. Our talented and dedicated prosecutors rose to the challenge, and they did just that. But the NYPD trial commissioner, who presided over this case, blamed the CCRB for the delays in this case, and refuse to hold the officers accountable. She did, however,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

concede that the NYPD investigation ignored sections of the Patrol Guide and left her with disquieting questions about how they could have cleared the officers' conduct.

This past Friday, just before the fifth anniversary of Kawaski's death, the NYPD announced the police commissioner's decision to endorse the trial commissioner's flawed recommendation. The Trawick family was not informed of the decision in advance, and heard the decision through the media. NYPD conducted a legitimate investigation and held their officers accountable, Kawaski's family could have avoided the last five years of fighting for justice, and would not have had to sit through a trial, watching their son being killed over and over again.

To their credit, the NYPD recognized that their delays in this case were obstructing the disciplinary process and many other investigations, and both agencies agreed to a policy which limited the NYPD to 90 days to respond to the CCRB's request for While this MOU is an excellent start, it is not enough to ensure that we

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

have comprehensive police accountability.

Last month, Executive Director Darche and I testified before the City Council, and we asked for a historic 37.7 million budget for the CCRB. The CCRB has been chronically underfunded since its inception. In the last several years, the Board, the City Council, and people of New York have voted to expand the CCRB's jurisdiction and increase its responsibilities. This included investigating racial profiling and bias-based policing, body-worn camera misuse, sexual misconduct, untruthful statements and more. Instead of receiving more funds to hire the investigators and secure the resources we need to complete these cases efficiently in a timely manner, we face budget cuts. For the first time, the CCRB has not had a sufficient budget to investigate allegations within its jurisdiction.

I would like to thank the City Council, who last week publicly supported the CCRB's request for a \$5 million increase. We hope that the Office of Management and Budget will support the CCRB and the City Council to

ensure that all components of public safety are adequately funded in the City. For people to trust in the police, they must have faith that there's a system that holds police officers responsible for misconduct. The CCRB is an unbiased, independent civilian voice in the police disciplinary system, and failing to adequately fund the CCRB shortchanges public safety in the City.

I will now pass it to Executive

Director, Jonathan Darche, who will explain
the crime exception rule in more detail.

Jon.

MR. DARCHE: Thank you, Chair.

The crime exception to the statute of limitations is often misunderstood. I'm going to attempt to explain it to you all now.

New York State Civil Service Law
Section 75 establishes the statute of
limitations for disciplinary actions against
members of the NYPD as 18 months from the
date of the incident. The only exception to
this is also found in Section 75, "Such
limitations shall not apply where the

2.0

2.0

incompetency or misconduct complained of and described in the charges would, if proved in a court of appropriate jurisdiction, constitute a crime." We refer to that language as the crime exception to the statute of limitations.

When the CCRB brings charges under the crime exception, it adds to the CCRB's burden as the Agency must prove the elements of a crime that constitutes the alleged misconduct. This also means the CCRB must disprove the defenses available to that crime. What doesn't change is the burden of proof, which is a preponderance of the evidence, more likely than not. In criminal court, the burden of proof is beyond a reasonable doubt.

I'm going to focus on a single specification from the trial against the two officers who killed Kawaski Trawick.

Specification 6, against Police Officer Thompson, to illustrate how the crime exception works, Specification 6 alleges that Police Officer Brendan Thompson, on or about April 14, 2019, at approximately 2300 hours,

2.0

2.3

while assigned to the 46th Precinct and on duty in the vicinity of 1616 Grand Avenue, Bronx County, wrongfully used force in that with intent to cause physical injury to Kawaski Tyrone Trawick, Officer Thompson caused such injury by intentionally firing a dart from a conducted electrical weapon into Kawaski Tyrone Trawick without police necessity.

If you were to have the charges in front of you, you would note that the CCRB listed the appropriate Patrol Guide sections 221-08, Use of a Conducted Electrical Weapon, and 221-02, Use of Force, underneath that particular specification. The CCRB also listed Penal Law Section 120.05, assault in the second degree, subsection two; "A person is guilty of assault in the second degree when: With intent to cause physical injury to another person, they cause such injury to such person or to a third person by means of a deadly weapon or a dangerous instrument."

The CCRB presented evidence that proved every element of assault in the second degree. Article 10 of the New York State

2.0

Penal Law defines physical injury as impairment of physical condition or substantial pain. A Taser, or a conducted electrical weapon, delivers 50,000 volts of electricity into a person's body. It overrides a person's central nervous system and causes uncontrollable muscle contraction. The preponderance of the evidence, based upon our knowledge of what a Taser does, and Mr. Trawick's reaction to being shot with the Taser on the body-worn camera footage of Police Officer Thompson, indicates that this action caused Mr. Trawick substantial pain.

New York State's Penal Law definition of a deadly weapon does not include Tasers, but the Penal Law defines a dangerous instrument as "any instrument, article or substance, including a vehicle which, under the circumstances in which it is used, is attempted to be used, or is threatened to be used, is readily capable of causing death or other serious physical injury." We already determined a Taser can cause physical injury, but can it cause death or serious physical injury? New York State Penal Law defines a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

serious physical injury as one that "creates a substantial risk of death, or which causes death, or serious and protracted disfigurement, protracted impairment of health, protracted loss or impairment of the function of any bodily organ."

Between 2010 and 2021, more than 500 people in the United States were killed by police officers using Tasers. The NYPD Patrol Guide also states the following about Tasers; "Members should consider that the exposure to the CEW for longer that 15 seconds, whether due to multiple applications or continuous cycling, may increase" -increase -- "the risk of death or serious If prolonged use of the Taser injury." increases the risk of death, that implies the regular use carries with it a risk of death. Put more plainly, if a vehicle can be a dangerous instrument, then clearly a Taser is a dangerous instrument.

Finally, Respondents have the opportunity to use all defenses available to them under the Penal Law. In the trial commissioner's decision, they stated that the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Respondents could invoke the justification defense under Penal Law Section 35.15 (1). The justification defense reads, "A person may use physical force upon another person when and to the extent he or she reasonably believes such to be necessary to defend himself, herself or a third person from what he or she reasonably believes to be the use or imminent use of unlawful physical force by such other person, unless; the latter's conduct was provoked by the actor with the intent to cause physical injury to another person; or the actor was the initial aggressor; except in such case the use of physical force is nevertheless justifiable if the actor has withdrawn from the encounter and effectively communicated such withdrawal to such other person but the latter persists in continuing the incident by the use or threatened imminent use of unlawful physical force."

The fact that Police Officer Thompson is a member of the NYPD does not eliminate the initial aggressor exception to his eligibility or the justification defense.

2.0

Let's examine the evidence presented at trial; Police Officer Davis and Police Officer Thompson entered Mr. Trawick's home in an assisted living facility for individuals with mental health challenges.

Mr. Trawick was cooking in his studio apartment and was holding a knife when the officers entered his apartment. Almost immediately upon entering the apartment, Police Officer Thompson drew his Taser.

Mr. Trawick made no threats, but Police Officer Thompson hit him with the Taser.

Mr. Trawick made no motion toward the officers to suggest he was about to use physical force, but Police Officer Thompson hit him with the Taser. Mr. Trawick was not physically resisting either Police

Officer Thompson or Police Officer Davis, but Police Officer Thompson decided to put 50,000 volts of electricity into Mr. Trawick.

Mr. Trawick genuinely had no idea why the police were there because the Fire Department had already resolved the issue that had caused him to called 9-1-1. And rather than take the time to explain what had

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

happened, Police Officer Thompson hit him with the Taser. Police Officer Thompson completely ignored the de-escalation training given by the Department and the requirements of the Patrol Guide when he fired the Taser at Mr. Trawick. Even the trial commissioner in her decision referred to police officer's decision to fire the Taser as tactically premature. Police Officer Davis testified he would not have fired his own Taser at Mr. Trawick. And, in fact, Police Officer Davis did not fire the Taser. All of those factors point to the fact that Police Officer Thompson was the initial aggressor. It is clear that the preponderance of the evidence rebuts the Respondents' claim that the use of the Taser was justified.

The CCRB is committed to making as much of the material from the trial as possible available on our website, so that the public can review the matter, review the evidence and determine whether or not Police

Officer Thompson was guilty of

Specification 6. The public will be able to make their own determination whether Police

1	Officer Davis and Police Officer Thompson
2	committed misconduct by a preponderance of
3	the evidence, and the public will be able to
4	determine whether justice was served.
5	CHAIR RICE: Does the Board have any
6	questions?
7	Oh, I'm sorry. Did you make your
8	MR. DARCHE: I can answer questions
9	about that, and then I'll finish up.
10	CHAIR RICE: Okay. Does the Board have
11	any questions?
12	MR. SMITH: Is there any further course
13	of action to be taken here?
14	MR. DARCHE: I don't believe so. I
15	think the family might have their own civil
16	case, but there's nothing that the City can
17	do now.
18	MR. SMITH: Is there anything for this
19	body to be doing here?
20	MR. DARCHE: No.
21	MR. SMITH: Okay.
22	MR. DARCHE: Well, we'll be making the
23	materials available on our website.
24	MR. SMITH: And what is the point of
25	making those materials available if there is

1	no course of action for this body to
2	undertake?
3	MR. DARCHE: So, I think under our
4	procedures, we're trying, since Civil Rights
5	Law 50a has been repealed, to make as much
6	information about what our investigations
7	determine public. And so, now that the
8	matter is closed, that's what we'll do. It's
9	not we're not treating this case special.
10	MR. SMITH: Okay.
11	MR. HOGAN: What does that mean, with
12	that last thing, that we're not treating this
13	case special?
14	MR. DARCHE: We're not making an
15	exception to the making the materials
16	public.
17	MR. HOGAN: Okay.
18	MR. DARCHE: This is what we did.
19	MR. HOGAN: Okay. Was there a
20	possibility to refile this under racial bias
21	or prejudicial policing at the time when
22	Trawick is/was a young black man, correct?
23	MR. DARCHE: Yes.
24	MR. HOGAN: And when they 'cause I
25	believe that the approach inside the

2.0

2.3

apartment would have been a lot different if he was not a young black man. And so, if we can't go forward with what we went forward with already, could we look at it another way? Because it seems to be such an injustice to the family; one, that it's been five years; and two, the way they found out about it. And if there's any way that we could -- I don't know why the federal government has not looked at this cases, you know?

And so, is there any way that we can look at charging these police officers from this Board through bias policing and racial profiling?

MR. DARCHE: The staff and I have discussed that. We have not seen an angle where that is possible, but we can revisit and report back to the Board on that question.

MR. SMITH: Following up on AU.

Is it possible that this Board votes to call on the Justice Department to pursue a civil rights investigation here, as they have done in other cases around the country? When

1	the local municipalities have acted
2	inappropriately or failed to act, the Justice
3	Department steps in and revisits this as a
4	civil rights violation. Can this Board go on
5	the record as calling on the Justice
6	Department to do that? Something that we are
7	actually doing something, to express our
8	obvious disagreement with what the City has
9	done here
10	MR. HOGAN: And if not, why not?
11	MR. SMITH: I'm not a lawyer. I
12	don't
13	MR. HOGAN: Excuse me.
14	MR. DARCHE: The truth is, I would want
15	to do more research and get the general
16	counsel's feedback on that, to make sure I'm
17	giving the Board accurate information. I
18	don't have an answer right now.
19	MR. HOGAN: 'Cause, Jon, I don't want
20	it to set a particular precedent that these
21	things aren't anomalies. I mean, these
22	things, if they're accepted once, then they
23	reoccur.
24	And so, how do we make sure that these
25	things don't reoccur, you know, in this

1	municipality?
2	MR. SMITH: Right.
3	MR. HOGAN: That definitely was
4	erroneous and them looking at the case, it
5	definitely was lethargic, the time that it
6	took for them to even consider because of all
7	the things that I was hearing, you know,
8	through the case as it was going on, that
9	NYPD took as long as they wanted to even look
10	at the case. And then, by the time it get to
11	the case, we almost can't fight for this
12	young man, and his family, who lost his life
13	senselessly.
14	MR. DARCHE: I hear what you're saying,
15	AU, and I will talk with the general counsel
16	and get a actually, informed legal
17	opinion, rather than making one up right here
18	on the spot.
19	MR. HOGAN: Thank you.
20	CHAIR RICE: Jon, would you mind
21	restating what we've done with the memo with
22	the Police Department?
23	MR. DARCHE: So, at the end of last
24	year, the CCRB entered into a memorandum of
25	understanding with the NYPD, so that when we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

make a request for evidence, that in a matter that is being investigated by the Force Investigations Division, or FID, which is the -- generally investigates the most serious uses of force by members of the NYPD. In the past, CCRB would have to wait until the investigation was completely concluded, that the police commissioner had signed off on that investigation, before CCRB could get the paperwork in that matter. But pursuant to the MOU, within 90 days of us making a request now, the Department will provide us with the evidence that they're in possession of and that we've requested, and the Department is treating those requests as ongoing.

And so, if we make a request in an investigation for evidence and at the time we request that evidence it's not in the Department's possession, but it gets into their possession, they're going to provide it to us. I should have the exact numbers, but I believe there were 33 investigations where we have made requests for evidence pursuant to the MOU since it was signed, and only two

of them are past 90 days, and one of them was 1 2 partially responded to, and the other one 3 on -- the last time I got an update, it was 4 on day 90, and the Department, the NYPD 5 Legal, had the materials and were copying 6 them and preparing them to come to us. So, I 7 think that the MOU we've entered into is 8 working. And so, hopefully, things -- there 9 will not be investigations that are hampered 10 in the same way that the investigation into 11 the officers in this matter was hampered. 12 MR. SMITH: Good commendation to you 13 and whatever staff were involved in achieving 14 that result. 15 CHAIR RICE: Are there any other 16 questions or comments from the members of the 17 Board? 18 MR. HOGAN: Yes, I have one. 19 CHAIR RICE: Uh-huh. 2.0 MR. HOGAN: It's like this -- it is 21 great that this happened, but it's like 22 almost on the back of this young man. And I 2.3 think, you know, if the MOU becomes a 24 particular moral contract, it's not a 25 contract that is being recognized and being

with respected, we're not going to be able to 1 2 have any kind of authenticity without 3 autonomy. And it's very important that we 4 look at this and say -- 'cause I don't know 5 how everyone else feels, but I almost feel like in a vulnerable spot in being a member 6 of this board, and that atrocious act seems 7 8 so regular. 9 And if we don't have the ability to 10 find some -- I don't want to use "wiggle 11 room, " because it sounds too light in this 12 case, but finds a way to identify what is a 13 proper way to fight when we know that they're 14 playing games; that's all. 15 Thank you. 16 CHAIR RICE: Thank you. 17 MR. DARCHE: Can I just give some 18 ground rules --19 CHAIR RICE: Sure. 2.0 MR. DARCHE: -- for the rest of the 21 meeting? 22 CHAIR RICE: Absolutely. 2.3 MR. DARCHE: Just a few administrative 24 reminders. Our office is open for walk-in 25 complaints. It is also possible to file

complaints online at nyc.gov/ccrbcomplaint, 1 by telephone at 1(800)341-2272, or by calling 2 3 3-1-1. If anyone online or here wishes to 4 file a complaint right now, we have three 5 investigators on hand ready to take 6 complaints; Julian Bevins, Emma Stydahar, and 7 Rob Bryan, and also a member of our Civilian 8 Assistance Unit, Ivonne Torres. 9 And then, just some ground rules for 10 the rest of the meeting: We're going to limit comments to four minutes, whether 11 12 you're here or online. If you're going to 13 join online and want to participate, please 14 use the raise-your-hand feature, and we will 15 get to you. 16 And that's all I got, Madam Chair. 17 CHAIR RICE: Thank you. 18 We're going to hear a presentation from 19 our Deputy Director of Outreach and 2.0 Intergovernmental Affairs, Maroua Righi. MS. RIGHI: Good afternoon. My name is 21 22 Maroua, and I'll be giving a brief 2.3 presentation. 24 So, the CCRB is the nation's largest 25 independent oversight entity over the largest

police force in the country. The CCRB investigates, mediates, and prosecutes complaints of misconduct against members of the NYPD. The Agency is governed by a 15-member board with five seats appointed by the Mayor, five appointed by the New York City Council, three designated by the Police Commissioner, one appointed by the Public Advocate, and lastly, the Chair is appointed jointly by the Mayor and City Council.

So, the CCRB investigates abuses of force, authority, discourtesy, and offensive language. So, there is an important update that we want to share with everyone. As of on September 9, 2023, the Office of Management and Budget announced citywide budget cuts. So, as a result, the CCRB is no longer able to fully investigate certain cases within its jurisdiction. After careful consideration, effective January 1, 2024, the CCRB suspended investigating the following: Failure to provide the Right to Know Act cards with no other allegations; refusal to provide name or shield number with no other allegations; discourteous words or actions

2.0

2.3

with no other allegations; threats with no other allegations; refusal to process a civilian complaint with no other allegations; property seizures with no other allegations; forcible removal to hospital with no other allegations; untruthful statements with no other allegations; and lastly, any complaints that has only the above-referenced allegations.

The CCRB will resume investigating these cases as soon as the City allocates sufficient funding to do so. If a complaint contains one of the above allegations, in addition to other allegations that still fall within CCRB jurisdiction, every allegation in the complaint will still be investigated. So, if a person would like to file a complaint or report police misconduct, you can do so by visiting out website nyc.gov/ccrbcomplaint. You can also call the CCRB at 1(800)341-CCRB. And remember, if you see footage of misconduct on social media or in the news, you can still file a complaint, even if you weren't there in person.

complaint, so you can call our hotline, you 1 2 can call 3-1-1, you can visit us at our 3 We are located at 100 Church Street, 4 New York, New York 10007. You can file a 5 complaint on our website again at 6 nyc.gov/ccrbcomplaint. You can also DM us on 7 social media. We have the same username; 8 CCRB_NYC on Facebook, Twitter and Instagram. 9 You can also mail a complaint in to our 10 office at the same address. 11 You can also file a complaint at your 12 local precinct. NYPD is required to accept 13 CCRB complaints at any precinct. And you can 14 request a complaint form and a postage-free 15 envelope. If anyone would like to request a 16 CCRB presentation, you can reach out to us at 17 outreach@ccrb.nyc.gov, and please be sure to 18 follow us on social media, again, Instagram, 19 Twitter, and Facebook, same username, 2.0 CCRB NYC. 21 Any questions? 22 (No response). 2.3 CHAIR RICE: Does the Board have any 24 comments or questions? 25 (No response).

CHAIR RICE: All right. Seeing none, 1 2 thank you so much. 3 MS. RIGHI: Thank you. CHAIR RICE: We will now enter the 4 5 public comment portion of the meeting, and we 6 will begin with those joining us virtually, 7 who would like to make a comment, followed by 8 those who are joining us in person. 9 those joining virtually, we please ask that 10 you use the raise-the-hand feature, and keep 11 your comments to four minutes, as you heard 12 before. 13 Okay. Jahi, would you please call on 14 the first person. 15 MR. ROSE: We'll be hearing from Royce 16 Russell. 17 MR. RUSSELL: Thank you for today's 18 I would say, as the attorney for 19 the Trawick family, I can appreciate the 2.0 comments that were made here today. Once I heard the make up of what the Board was or 21 22 what the Board is, I would say that mostly I 23 was disappointed in that it was appointments 24 by the Mayor and the City Council and the

Public Advocate, and not really anyone from

25

2.0

the community, such as members of the Justice Committee or Until Freedom or Justice NYC. However, hearing the comments that were made in reference to this tragedy, I was encouraged that despite titles and despite appointments, that this board is trying to get to the heart of the matter of the lack of humanity and the lack of justice in this particular case.

I've been doing this for a very long time, fighting for those that have been subject to excessive force and wrongful death in New York City, and at a time where I can tell you the CCRB really didn't have any bite, and that has changed. And I can see the bite and I can see the effort, and I commend this current staff for doing almost the impossible, really fighting a fight with one arm tied behind their back, and that being their best arm.

It is not beyond the community at large that Internal Affairs would come back with a decision, or the Use of Firearm Committee or whatever title you want to give the internal mechanisms of the Police Department, would

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

come back with no finding against their own. It's the only organization that I'm aware of where those who are police officers have to judge themselves. And how does that work out when you can see the internal conflict? is also a conflict to see the DA's Office play a role in this. But I think the community and, in particular, the Trawick family, has been prepared and has been climbing up that hill, understanding that justice may not be in the forefront of this administration or at least the hearing officer's tablet, and that something like this could happen.

What they weren't prepared for, as we look at MOUs and Memorandums Of Understanding of what will happen in reference to the statute of limitations of getting evidence is that maybe we could look at a humanity MOU, which clearly states that when a decision is going to happen, that the family is afforded some time and space to have an understanding of what the decision would be, what the decision may be, and not just have CCRB try to figure that out and try to be a conduit or

2.0

a liaison to ease the pain of families that suffer the death of a loved one by the hands of the police; that is something that needs to be looked into.

Moreover, when I heard the comments of what can this board do? How much can this board play a role in showing its dissatisfaction with the rubber stamp that we have seen throughout history and continues today? Where we know that there was infractions and there were violations of Patrol Guide procedures, where we know there was infractions and violations of just training concerning the emotionally disturbed, and just basic training of de-escalation and safety and isolation and conversation, rather than barking orders to an individual when we know that there was really no threat of violence.

Because you wouldn't be laughing as you take the elevator upstairs to approach the individual for where there is an issue, and where we know that there was no exigent circumstances when you are responding to, at worse, a misdemeanor, and at the very least,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

an harassment call. And we know that the FDNY was present with this individual, and so, therefore, he was no threat to those individuals, so why would he be a threat to you?

There is something that is systematically wrong with the lack of humanity in this particular case. But what the Board can do or can think about is making its own statement and making a statement loud and clear by way of the press and by way of print of its dissatisfaction, of its lack of understanding how someone can come to this conclusion, given the facts that were presented. And when, if ever, will the Police Department, and the internal mechanisms for which it works, will hold their own accountability, and speak to the fact that police officers have the ability to resign just before a decision is made one way or the other, and how they get the inside call before everybody else gets a chance to have an understanding of what has taken place, which leads to the lack of transparency among the folks in the

community.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

I'm going to do my part. The people in the community, the Bronx community, is going to hear about this case by way of litigation, and they'll make the determination how much the City will have to pay one way or the other in reference to this man losing his life for no apparent reason. And they'll be the judge of how incestuous the protocol and the procedures within the Police Department can yield the result where we now change the standards to a criminal standard as to whether or not these police officers should be punished, versus an administrative standard, which is whether or not this young man would still be alive had they followed the police Patrol Guide.

Once again, I commend Jon and his staff, Attorney Applewhite for fighting a good fight and his staff. There is faith in the CCRB, from my perspective, that there is bite with the bark. But there's a hill to be climbed, and if the Board could make this statement and make this statement loud and clear, that will be helpful. And we all

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

2.0

2.3

know, as board members, we have networks and we have insight to those that are within the power structure, that can try to make this family whole in some shape, form or fashion, and we ask that you use all your power to do that, given the lack of respect and the disrespect and the lack of humanity shown to this family.

So, thank you for my time, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Trawick family, on behalf as the family attorney to this tragedy.

CHAIR RICE: Thank you, Mr. Russell, for your comments. Once again, our condolences to the Trawick family. Thank you for the strong recommendation for us to make a statement, which we made the initial statement when the decision was made on Friday evening, but we will revisit that as well. And I also wanted to also thank the incredible staff at the CCRB for their work on this case and the continued work that they do, the hours that they spend and dedicate.

And to this board, we all introduced ourselves by saying who our confirmation is

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1	from but this aroun also menuosents folks
1	from, but this group also represents folks
2	who are leadership coaches, who are
3	educators, who are attorneys, who are social
4	justice advocates, and so that is who also
5	makes up this grouping of people.
6	So, I wanted to say that before I ask
7	Jon if he wanted to add anything in the
8	comments?
9	MR. DARCHE: No.
10	CHAIR RICE: Okay. Thank you.
11	Any other members of the Board?
12	(No response).
13	CHAIR RICE: All right. Jahi.
14	MR. ROSE: Next, we will be hearing
15	from Chris Dunn.
16	MR. DUNN: Arva, can you hear me? I'm
17	sorry. Can you hear me?
18	CHAIR RICE: Yes, we can hear you.
19	MR. DUNN: Good afternoon, everyone.
20	For those who don't know me, I'm Chris Dunn.
21	I'm the legal director of the NYCLU. I also
22	want to speak to the Trawick conversation and
23	start by expressing my appreciation that the
24	Board is discussing it. There have been too
25	many meetings, in my view, recently where

2.0

there has not been much substantive discussion, so I'm very pleased to hear this discussion, as tragic as the topic is. And I think the question of what more the Board can do is an important question. I think the Agency gets enormous credit for what you have done so far in this case, but there is more to be done, starting with today.

And Arva, I think that your comments are an important starting point. I also think the notion about the CCRB making a request of the Department of Justice is a terrific suggestion. It's a bold suggestion.

Jon, I'm not quite sure what you meant by asking Matt about his legal opinion about this, but I certainly want to encourage the Board of that. I think there are two things that are going on here; the first is the question about the Department choosing not to discipline these officers, that raises obvious and serious questions; and the Department has a terrible track record in cases like this. Daniel Pantaleo having been Exhibit A, and this is now a close second.

But beyond that, there's the question about

this took five years, and on a Friday night, they announced their decision.

And whatever one may think about the merits of a particular prosecution or disciplinary action, the way the Department approaches these things is very important. The very fact that the process is flawed and completely undermine the legitimacy of the decision, whatever the decision is. And I know the police representatives on the Board, I can guess what your views are about the substantive decision. I think it was Frank who was asking the question. I'm sorry. I couldn't quite tell.

But I would like to hear what the police representatives think about the process here, and I would like to hear what the police representatives have to say about why it's defensible or appropriate for the Department to have taken five years to decide this. Because I think that while there are many people who are upset, and rightly upset, about the ultimate decision, I think almost everybody will be asking questions about the process and how in the world it could have

taken five years. What does that mean about the Department's approach to this? And what does this mean about the Department's actual interest in accountability?

So, I would like to hear from the police representatives about their views about why it would have taken five years to come to this decision. And I want to urge, again, the suggestion that the Board make a request to the Department of Justice to have a look at this case.

Thank you.

2.0

CHAIR RICE: Thank you, Mr. Dunn. I appreciate that, and I wanted to see if the police representatives did want to make a comment, or if you all wanted to -- go ahead, Frank, please.

MR. DWYER: Am I on? Yeah.

The only comment I can make without having a chance to go back and go through the record -- I don't remember.

Jon, maybe you remember. When did we look at this case? Was it a year and a half ago? I just -- I remember going through the case, but I just can't remember the time and

date. The one thing I will say from experience is that it's long been the policy to wait for the prosecutors in the individual boroughs or the federal prosecutors to finish their work before proceeding. And Mr. Dunn, you're certainly, as a member, you know, as an attorney, understand why that is. Without having the chance to go through the record and -- I can't speak to the specific, but certainly in a lot of these cases, they wait until the prosecutors say, "We have completed our review. We have no objection to the Police Department proceeding."

MS. BROWN-WYANDS: Yeah. I think I can echo what Mr. Dwyer said, and again with not having been a member of the Board during the time this case was investigated, and also not knowing all of the reasons why there were delays. Some of the delays do relate to referrals to other agencies. That does not excuse other delays, but again, until there's a complete review of the record, I can't really speak to the delays. But I think the Board has spoken when it relates to this

Board's position about delays that are unnecessary.

2.0

2.3

MR. DARCHE: So, just to answer

Mr. Dwyer's question, Mr. Trawick was killed on April 14, 2019. The Board voted in June of 2021, but our investigation only lasted five months, so we probably were finally given the evidence we needed to conduct our investigation in January of 2021.

CHAIR RICE: Unless anyone has any other questions, I'm going to go ahead and ask Jahi to call on the next person.

MR. ROSE: There are no more hands raised for the public comment section online, so that will conclude public comment online.

CHAIR RICE: Thank you.

For those joining us in person and interested in making a public comment, if you could please line up behind the podium, and we're going to ask you to please keep your comments to four minutes.

MR. MEYERS: I'm Michael Meyers,
president, New York Civil Rights Coalition.

I am -- first of all, I want to say that a
month or so ago, I was with the mayor. I'm

2.0

2.3

very rarely with the mayor. I don't like him, for the record. But this was an anti-Semitism rally, he showed up to speak. He spoke for more than three or four minutes, I could tell you that. So, in the short time that I have, I didn't have the time or the inclination to speak to him then about the acting Chair.

What is the delay in getting a permanent Chair of the CCRB? I think -- you know, I shouldn't say this because I'm nonpartisan. I shouldn't say this, but I think your acting Chair has been doing a terrific job. So, if you're going to be doing anything today, how about sending a letter to the mayor, saying "What's the delay in appointing a permanent Chair to the CCRB?" This is important to the public, not just to this committee, and not just to the Chair. So, I want to briefly say in my passing time that I recommend excellence as a rating for our Chair, acting Chair, as well as for the executive director.

What you continue to do here is beyond me. I don't understand the courage, and I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

don't know courage, but your courage, given the political situation in this City, and given the power of the Police Department to stand up for themselves. But nobody is speaking up for us, for the public, other than this Board. And this Board is already at least partially divided. I mean, how can Chris Dunn call upon the Police representatives? You're not the police representatives on this body. Yeah, you're appointed to the body by the Police Commissioner, but you're the representative of the People. This is the Civilian Complaint Review Board, "civilian complaint." So, you know, we don't care about the Police Department's viewpoint, and I'm disgusted that the Legal Director of the NYCLU should think that you have a different point of view in terms of your public responsibility as a member of this committee, this board. CCRB, I recommend again that the CCRB understand what's going on in the streets. Ι don't ever hear anything about what's going on on the subways, the streets, the marches, the rallies. There's nobody in the CCRB

there. There used to be. CCRB used to represent, like the NYCLU representatives, used to come to the rallies and marches and wear their bands, so there would not be disgraceful, disrespectful conduct on the part of the Police Department towards the protesters and demonstrators.

So, I suggest that CCRB reintroduce going to these rallies, going to these marches, so there can be control on the street corners, and on the sidewalks, and in the subways, there should be some control, some monitoring, some surveillance of the Police Department by you guys, not just the civil rights community, because nobody listen to us anymore. The CCRB has many ways of serving as a watchdog, so I suggest you be a little more resourceful in terms of how to be a watchdog, directly observe the police officers, so it's not just my word against them or the persons in the streets word against them, you're going to be there providing your own testimony. Not you, personally, but your representatives will be a presence as the watchdogs.

1

2

3

4

2.0

2.3

I have to say, also, that the police on the subways, all I see them -- not monitoring the subways, not walking the cars in the subways, they're talking. They're yacking, playing around. They're not supervising themselves, and I don't see anybody monitoring the bad behavior in the subways, at least in terms of the Police Department. And I watch. Every day, I'm on the subways, and they're standing there congregating with each other on the platform, talking, not even looking in the subway cars when the train comes in the station. Ridiculous. It's ridiculous.

As far as the MOU is concerned, yeah, you know, with all respect, Mr. Executive Director and Madam Acting Chair, we don't need another MOU. Those things are paper thin. Paper thin. The Police Department, the police commissioner knows what they're supposed to do, and they just don't do the right thing. I am so upset with the case that you have brought to our attention, Mr. Executive Director. I am so upset by that because they knew what they should have

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

The administrative law judge should done. have done better, but nobody is criticizing What the hell is going on here? People know the facts, they have the evidence, and they still delay. And they delay and delay and delay until time is up, and we got the head of the Chair of the CCRB, or the Acting Chair of the CCRB, the Executive Director of the CCRB who serves at the pleasure of, you know who, we gotta remind them, and goad them, and criticize them. Nobody can criticize the Mayor. Nobody can criticize the Police Department, like the people who are in charge of the Mayor and the Police Department. The people are in charge of the mayor, and the Mayor in charge of the Police Department. Do something or resign.

CHAIR RICE: Thank you for your comments.

MS. MOSS: Wow. It's hard to follow that, but yeah. Prevention is far better than the cure. Oh, thank you.

My name is Mari Moss, and I want to talk to you about how our police are doing with -- the last time I was here, the police

2.0

dealing with domestic violence in our city.

And this is for Catherine Kassenoff and all women mothers who have stood up for themselves in time of injustice and paid dearly for it. And like I said, the last time I was here, I was talking about how police had handled a domestic violence situation.

When I think about our police, we, the People, we expect our police to protect and serve and to do that honorably. The word "honorable" means to have some morals, to have some values, and to have some integrity. And sometimes our police seem to be lacking that. And what I have seen, though, since the last time I was here, is an improvement in some of our police who are trying to do what's right and have some humanity and have some morals and some values.

But if police had done the right things from the very beginning -- and I'm talking about a personal situation in 2017 -- there are so many things that could have been prevented today. We put a lot of our faith and trust in our police, and this body is the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

watchdog body that is supposed to make sure that our police are acting in the proper ways, and this is about saving lives, this is about our future generations, and this is about making sure that our young people, and especially mothers, women who are dealing with domestic violence, anybody who's dealing with domestic violence has their rights protected now into the future, and this is important for our society. So, I'm just asking that you all please do everything that you can to ensure the safety of our people, and especially in domestic violence situations. And I did -and I'm just going to end this with this: I sent a letter to the Mayor's Office, and I said they need to make Arva Rice the Chair of the CCRB. No more delays. We need action. Thank you.

CHAIR RICE: Thank you.

MR. DARCHE: I'll just respond real quick.

Victims of domestic violence are one of the number of groups who are very vulnerable when they encounter police. And so, our

Agency makes a real effort to understand the 1 2 trauma they are facing when they come to us, 3 and to make sure that we are treating them in 4 a way that does not re-traumatize them, while 5 still taking their complaint seriously and 6 moving forward with our investigation of 7 their complaint. 8 So, you mentioned that you had a 9 personal situation, and if there's someone 10 you would like to speak to here, we have a 11 staff here that would be happy to do so. So, 12 just if you tell us, we'll be right there. 13 CHAIR RICE: Thank you, Jon. 14 Is there anyone else who would like to 15 make a comment, you want to step to the 16 podium? 17 MR. AHMED: Good afternoon. I'm here 18 just for -- actually, for a point. I have to 19 start with NYPD. The problem is not --2.0 MR. DARCHE: Your name.

MR. AHMED: Oh. I'm sorry. My name is Ibrahim Ahmed. And I have, by the way, a case in CCRB. It was actually more than one, but the real one is this happened in, I believe, January -- no, sorry. November 26,

21

22

23

24

'23. The problem we have is not starting from CCRB. The problem starts from NYPD.

NYPD follow every single one, if they have.

And every single one making complaint for the CCRB, two things we have; close the case, or no action. And even if the case have something, there's no action. That's what they give the power to NYPD in the street to do whatever they want to do for the public.

I'm personally got hurt inside my apartment. I got hurt and I have a problem with my kidney. I can't even find a lawyer to take my case to the Court because every single way I go --

MR. SMITH: This person has a case before the CCRB, that ultimately it's going to be judged by three people on this panel now.

So, should we be discussing this?

MR. AHMED: No, I'm just saying this.

I'm just saying general. I'm not saying
about my case. I'm saying general. The
problem start with NYPD because if we have an
action for every single case, go to CCRB and
they find out that this person or this police

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

officer is quilty, and we have an action, the other will never do this. I won't have no action. A lot of people got hurt, complain, make a -- I just want to let you know, most of the people, when they get hurt, not all of them they go to CCRB to make a complaint, some of them. And some of them, most of these people when they make a complaint to CCRB, two things; sometimes you ask, case is closed or no action. What you expect for NYPD to do with the public in the street? Am I right or wrong? So, the problem start with NYPD.

If we have an action for every single person, make -- actually, making serious things to person, to any person, we don't see nothing. The only thing show up in the public, two things; when you come in the newspaper or somebody got death or killed. You see anyone, one, from the public gets hurt or got beat up from NYPD and something happened or any action come to this person? Only thing comes and show up, and they show on the case for the people get death, get killed, get shot. That's what you guys

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

talk about, but you don't talk about the others. What happened to the people get hurt and nobody knows about them? Nobody knows about them. Even if you make a complaint, the complaint has already been closed.

Thank you.

2.0

CHAIR RICE: I'm not sure if we have any comments based on this.

MR. DARCHE: I do.

Mr. Ahmed -- so, if you want to speak, ma'am, you can, but can I just say one thing first?

So, the CCRB investigates all the cases in its jurisdiction, except until recently. As Maroua described, there are certain types of complaints that we just don't have the resources to investigate now. But until January of this year, if you came to us with a complaint, we would look at the allegations, and if they're in our jurisdiction, which is governed by the Charter and the CCRB's rules, then we will investigate it. And sometimes we will substantiate misconduct, and sometimes we won't. But we look at every complaint that

2.0

2.3

we get that's within our jurisdiction, except now because of the budget situation, there are certain complaints that we just can't look at.

The complaints we get that are not within our jurisdiction, we refer to the appropriate investigatory body. Sometimes we get complaints that are not about the NYPD, sometimes they're about the Marshal Service, or ICE, or the different -- like CUNY has its own police, or court officers. And so, we will refer those complaints to the right body to do an investigation. But when we get complaints about the NYPD that aren't within our jurisdiction, we refer them to the NYPD.

And so, one of the things -- because someone else had recently brought to my attention, the difficulties that folks have when they make a complaint to us that we then refer to the Department because they're outside our jurisdiction, how they can follow up with the Department. So, internally, our staff is looking at a way to streamline the process, so that folks could better able follow up with the Department on complaints

that have been made to us, that are outside 1 2 our jurisdiction. 3 Ma'am, if you -- you wanted to speak. 4 (Indiscernible - away from 5 microphone). 6 MR. DARCHE: So, just to be clear, if 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

you're just speaking about the general topic, that's one thing.

MS. ABDALLAH: Good afternoon, first. And my name is Asma Abdallah, but I'm not sure if this one it will be like I supposed to speak or not, but if we can make it as a general, that is fine. But because I don't understand, so I am here just this first time. I have no idea about anything. The only thing I needed, if really, if somebody -- so, again, I state it as general, so I'm going to try. But first, I can't speak English very well, so I'm going to try my best to speak better.

I have so many issues with the NYPD still. Until this moment, it's not solved, even I already contacted the CCRB. like, as he said before, whatever they have a serious, serious situation, they always

2.0

transfer to the IAB, and IAB relate it to NYPD, so we still keep continue on like that in the circles. And after that, they close it. Even I never heard anyone from the IAB told me what's going on, what is the investigation, what's going on, why they close it. Even sometimes I have so many proof, they never listen to us. They listen to themselves, and they never get any help from them.

But let's just say I'll be here, even when I have something and when I try to say I came here before, they said, "Anything related to the misconduct, NYPD is relate it to us." I said, "That is fine." And after I did this one with them, the complaint, they never told me what's going on. They said, "We're going to transfer it to the other section, and after that we can send it like lotto," but I didn't understand anything, it's just like that, and I have more than like three cases or maybe from so many years I didn't get any solution.

Plus, please, if you allowed me to speak for one minute for something so

2.0

serious, please just allow to me, even if it's not supposed to be I speak, they should treat me like just as person. I am like a terrorist or I am criminal or I am crazy, or I'm taking my clothing off, like I am really crazy, just like question. If you see something like that, you can let me go outside because I don't want to feel bad. Because every single time I'm trying to speak with the NYPD for something happen to me, they told me, "If you don't like NY -- if you like to live here in New York, go back your country." Even the neighbor, they keep continuing to scare me, and they say, "Okay. Go back your country," that is already discrimination.

This country is for everybody, not for anyone just like -- if you like me, you're going to leave me like that. If you don't like me even I did something wrong or I did something right, you're going to hurt me every single time. And the other thing that I wanted to speak with you, and please try to make it as serious. I have here so many cases in the CCRB, I didn't feel that they're

2.0

going to do anything. They're not going to make any action. Trust me, I leave here right now, if I'm going to call them, they said, "Okay. We'll transfer you to the IAB," then they're going to close it, like every single time.

I'm going to speak for something private. I don't have to speak it, but please just -- you can see that I am like anyone from your neighbor and they're going to feel sorry for me. We got arrest for nothing. The people broke in my apartment. I tried to call 9-1-1. Do you know what happened? The police came, more than ten, like ten peoples. I don't know why for only woman. They came arresting me. They cut already my shoulder, and when I tried to prove this one, even they took my information, they canceled the appointment for the MRI. Them, not me.

And after that, I still have like pain in all my body. I still have like cut. I have hurt. No one helping me. Still, until this moment, the NYPD hurting us. Nothing. I want to know what's going on because until

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

this moment, why is a woman can be arrested for nothing? And until this moment, no one take action.

The NYPD is living on me till everyone in my apartment and my neighbor, they keep continuing hurting me. And after that said, "Go back to your country." They heard that in the proof. I have video. The police came, they hurt my husband for nothing. Nothing. Just as he said, "Why you broke in our apartment?" Why you are entering our apartment?" They arrested him, too. Is that make sense? Is that make sense? And after that, the neighbor now, they're trying to scare me, they said -- okay. "We are going to call your police for us, " for us, for nothing. They have the personal numbers. Is that what's supposed to be happening in New York? Supposed to be no one here above Supposed to be no one here above the law. the law. The law is the law. But why is the NYPD always doing something like that? Because no one try to charge them, until we get killed.

MR. DARCHE: Ms. Ahmed, so I hear what

2.0

2.3

you're saying. I understand how upset you are, and it pains me that you made a complaint like that to this agency, and you feel that we did not treat you properly. So, I apologize to you that you feel we did not take your complaint seriously. We have investigators here today who will -- if you want to speak in the language that you're more comfortable in than English, although I have to say, you seem pretty comfortable in English, we will get an interpreter, so that we can make sure we understand exactly what you're saying.

MS. ABDALLAH: That is fine. If you don't understand me right now, we can.

MR. DARCHE: No, I understood you. And we're going to get to the bottom of it, but to do the investigation, we need to take a recorded statement with an investigator. And they're here, and they're going to do that right now.

Right? Excellent.

So, if you could stand up, those are the investigators who are going to talk to you right now, and they're going to take your

complaints. And if it's about something that we already have, they're still going to take full statements.

MS. ABDALLAH: Even, I have proof. I still have the proof and this keep continuing make something report to fake report for us. I want to see what I have done, if they said I am terrorist or criminal or crazy, why they don't want to show to us what I have done? Is this supposed to be happen right, but like that --

MR. DARCHE: So, ma'am?

MS. ABDALLAH: Okay.

MR. DARCHE: So, one of the things that we do is if we have evidence that you would like us to give to you, then at the conclusion of your case, of our investigation into your complaint, we will provide that material to you. If you provide us with material, we'll provide it to you regardless of what state our investigation is in. But if there is information that we've gathered from the Department while we're pursuing your investigation, then we will release it to you, if you just e-mail me, frankly, and I

will make sure it's taken care of.

2.0

2.3

There is often a delay, just because we have one person in our whole agency, for the whole City, who's in charge of making those FOIL requests, of responding to those FOIL requests. So, it takes some time, but we'll make sure you get the information that you're entitled to from us.

MS. ABDALLAH: Thank you, but if you don't mind, please try to take it as much as you can, like for, to self with this issue.

Because until this month, I wanted to understand why is it doing this stuff for me, and even I get sometimes help from people working with the mayor. Do you know what they told them? They threatened them and they said, "That is bigger than you." So, how it's bigger? Who is -- I don't understand how it's bigger.

Is that the NYPD scared everyone and they said, don't get touch with this lady because there's suspicion. Why I'm suspicion? Why? I want to understand why.

MR. DARCHE: So, I hear what you're saying, but we have to do an investigation.

1	We can't just make up hearing you
2	MS. ABDALLAH: But I have proof. I can
3	show it to you right now in front of
4	everybody.
5	MR. DARCHE: But we have a process, and
6	it's important that you give the information
7	to the investigators and we'll conduct an
8	investigation.
9	MS. ABDALLAH: Thank you. Thank you so
10	much.
11	MR. DARCHE: You guys should go with
12	them right now because they're going to start
13	right now, the statements.
14	Oh, you want to still can you guys
15	hold on? They want to finish the
16	CHAIR RICE: The meeting.
17	MR. AHMED: Sure.
18	MR. DARCHE: You can wait?
19	CHAIR RICE: Thank you. Thank you for
20	your comments.
21	Do we have any other public comments
22	this evening?
23	(No response).
24	CHAIR RICE: Any other public comments
25	this evening?

1 (No response). 2 CHAIR RICE: All right. Do we have any 3 old business to come before the Board this evening, any old business? 4 5 (No response). CHAIR RICE: Okay. Do we have any new 6 7 business to come before the Board? 8 Yes, Esmeralda. 9 MS. SIMMONS: I wanted to bring up the 10 fact that I've raised before, I have not seen 11 any change. Our jurisdiction has been 12 increased over the last three years 13 dramatically. Yet, when we talk to the 14 public, we are continuing to use the acronym, FADO, which does not include some of the new 15 16 jurisdictions that we have, some of the 17 newest jurisdictional basis for complaints; sexual misconduct by police officers, patent 18 19 and practice, and profiling by police 2.0 officers, untruthful statements by police 21 officers, and we also have, you know, 22 refusing to provide an ID card. But I know 23 what's happened with the budget, so we don't 24 have to advertise something we're not going 25 to investigate. All right?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

I hate to say that publicly, but it's real. I would like for our public announcements to let people know that our enlarged jurisdiction -- about our enlarged jurisdiction, and make sure that they know that they can file complaints against police officers that violate them on any of these grounds, as well as force and the other FADO, you know? I understand that cost money, everything cost money. So, that means that we have to change the video, change some of our handout statements, et cetera. would rather it be accurate and let people know it exists, than for us to continue to go by what we had and continue to have, but only limited to what we used to have.

So, that's what I would like, all of our communications to the public to iterate the fact that we now have an enlarged jurisdictional area on which people could file complaints.

CHAIR RICE: Good enough.

MS. SIMMONS: And that's no complaint against the wonderful outreach team who are doing everything they can. I want them to be

able to, as well -- not to be able to. I want them to explicitly make those comments when they're talking to the public.

CHAIR RICE: Thank you, Esmeralda, for that. It is true. We very much have expanded our jurisdiction over the course of the last couple of years, and FADO may not be as inclusive as it has been in the past. So, I think that that's something that we should be taking up and having more conversation about.

MR. DARCHE: So, if I would quibble like a lawyer, as I still am, our jurisdiction, except for the expansion by the City Council to allow the CCRB to investigate untruthful statements made to the CCRB, is still abuse of authority. What has changed is that both the CCRB and the City Council have expanded what is considered abuse of authority. And so, I think while I did have a small quibble, the idea that we need to change how we communicate with folks, so that the extent of abuse of authority is more broadly understood, no question about that, Ms. Simmons.

2.0

And it's something that the Chair has brought to my attention recently, and I've been speaking to the outreach team and the comms team about it, but it's going to take us some time on our public messaging to pivot and because it's not -- it's important to change in a constructive way that actually makes it better, rather than change that doesn't actually effectively communicate what we want to communicate.

MS. SIMMONS: Well, I am dealing with communication issues on the other -- on other projects, so I understand that completely, but I do not believe that the public when they hear abuse of authority naturally go to patent and practice, sexual misconduct. And since we had that acronym, since we had abuse of authority jurisdiction before, once it's been expanded, I think we have to be explicit about expanding. We can say, "And our abuse of authority has been expanded to include" --

MR. DARCHE: A hundred percent.

MS. SIMMONS: -- but it has to be said because people are thinking we don't have the jurisdiction. If we don't tell them, they

```
1
            won't know.
 2
                  MR. DARCHE: And I think when I was
 3
            speaking with Jahi about this, and when we
 4
            are doing presentations that are longer, not
 5
            what's here being done for the board
            meetings, they more fully go into how -- I
 6
 7
            can see one of our outreach people nodding at
 8
                 They do more fully explain how the abuse
9
            of authority encompasses more than it used
10
                 But from a legal point of view, which is
11
            important, from when you're thinking about
12
            whether the Agency is acting within its legal
13
            jurisdiction, while the abuse of authority
14
            has -- it's definition has changed and grown,
15
            it's still abuse of authority.
16
                  CHAIR RICE: Okay. Thank you.
17
                  Does anyone else have any thoughts or
18
            questions on that?
19
                  (No response).
2.0
                   CHAIR RICE: Okay. Interesting.
                   Any other new business?
21
22
                  (No response).
2.3
                   CHAIR RICE: Any other new business
24
             this evening?
25
                  (No response).
```

```
CHAIR RICE:
                               Okay. Hearing none, I'm
1
 2
            going to move now that we're going to break
 3
            into Executive Session. The agenda for the
            Executive Session is the Board will hear from
 4
 5
            the executive director about pending
            personnel actions, and the general counsel
 6
 7
            provide updates regarding pending litigation.
8
                   I'd like to accept a motion.
9
                   MS. BROWN-WYANDS: Motion to move.
10
                   CHAIR RICE: Okay. Do I have a second?
11
                   MR. HOGAN:
                               Second.
12
                   CHAIR RICE: All right.
                                             So moves.
13
                   I'm going to conclude that the public
14
            session for the board meeting for April is at
15
            conclusion. Thank you.
16
                  (TIME ADJOURNED: 5:35 p.m.)
17
18
19
2.0
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF NEW YORK)
3	:SS
4	COUNTY OF QUEENS)
5	
6	I, Sabrina Brown Stewart, a Notary Public
7	within and for the State of New York, do hereby
8	certify:
9	That the witness whose examination is
10	hereinbefore set forth was duly sworn and that such
11	an examination is a true record of the testimony
12	given by such a witness.
13	I further certify that I am not related to
14	any of these parties to this action by blood or
15	marriage, and that I am not in any way interested in
16	the outcome of this matter.
17	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
18	hand on this 1st day of May, 2024.
19	
20	
21	Sabrina Brown-Stewart
0.0	Sabrina Brown Stewart
22	
23	
24	
25	