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

BILL DE BLASIO
MAYOR

MAYA D. WILEY, ESQ.
CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report

January 2017

(Statistics for December 2016)

Contents

Executive Summary

The Civilian Complaint Review Board ("CCRB") is an independent municipal Agency that investigates complaints of NYPD misconduct. Every month, the CCRB prepares an Executive Director report for its public meeting. In general, investigations are being conducted more efficiently than at any period in the Agency's history. The raw number of substantiations and percentage of cases being substantiated are at historic levels. Video evidence is playing a crucial role in the outcome of cases. Data for December 2016 included the following highlights:

1) The CCRB continues to close its cases more efficiently. Of the cases that remain in the CCRB active docket, 89% have been open for four months or less, and 98% have been open for seven months or less (page 10). In December, the CCRB opened 296 new cases (page 4), and currently has a docket of 886 cases (page 11).

2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 16% of its fully investigated cases (page 19).

3) The CCRB fully investigated 16% of the cases it closed in December (page 12) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 28% of the cases it closed in December (page 12). The Agency's truncation rate is 71% (page 12). This is primarily driven by complainant/victim/witness uncooperative.

4) For December, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 26% of cases - compared to 10% of substantiated cases in which video was not available (page 19).

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

6) In December the PC finalized penalty decisions against 12 officers. The APU has conducted trials against 117 respondent officers year to date, and trials against 7 respondent officers in December. The CCRB's Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct.

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

Glossary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Complaints Received

The CCRB's Intake team processes misconduct complaints from the public and referrals from the NYPD. Under the New York City Charter, the CCRB's jurisdiction is limited to allegations of misconduct related to Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy and Offensive Language. All other complaints are referred to the appropriate agency. Figure 1 refers to all complaints that the CCRB receives and Figures 2 and 3 refer to new cases that remain with the Agency. In December 2016, the CCRB initiated 296 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2015 - December 2016)



Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2015 - December 2016)



Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (2010 - 2016)



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Of the five boroughs, the largest number of misconduct complaints stemmed from incidents occurring in Brooklyn, followed by Manhattan. A leading 17 incidents took place in the 75th Precinct.

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (December 2016)



Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2016)



Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (December 2016)

NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	1
5	1
6	4
7	1
9	4
10	3
13	1
14	5
17	2
18	4
19	2
20	4
22	2
23	6
24	7
25	1
26	2
28	3
30	5
32	2
33	3
34	5
40	3
41	9
42	10
43	5
44	5
45	1
46	3
47	9
48	3
49	4
50	6
52	7
61	1
63	4
66	5

NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
67	9
68	2
69	3
70	6
71	6
72	6
73	5
75	18
76	2
77	2
78	2
79	7
81	4
83	1
84	6
88	4
90	3
94	2
100	3
101	3
102	1
103	6
104	1
105	4
106	4
107	3
108	1
109	3
110	4
111	3
112	1
113	2
114	5
115	2
120	5
121	1
122	4
123	1
Unknown	8

*These figures track where an incident occurred, not necessarily the Command of the officer. For example, a complaint filed against officers assigned to a Narcotics unit working in East New York would be counted as occurring in the 75th Precinct.

Allegations Received

As described in the previous section, the CCRB has jurisdiction over four categories of NYPD misconduct. In comparing December 2015 to December 2016, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down. Figures for the year to date comparison show that in 2016 complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are up, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (December 2015 vs. December 2016)



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

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

	December 2015		December 2016			
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints	Change	% Change
Force (F)	145	44%	115	39%	-30	-21%
Abuse of Authority (A)	229	69%	189	64%	-40	-17%
Discourtesy (D)	108	32%	85	29%	-23	-21%
Offensive Language (O)	29	9%	22	7%	-7	-24%
Total FADO Allegations	511		411		-100	-20%
Total Complaints	333		296		-37	-11%

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 2015 vs. YTD 2016)



*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 2015		YTD 2016			
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints	Change	% Change
Force (F)	2086	47%	1789	42%	-297	-14%
Abuse of Authority (A)	2816	63%	2993	70%	177	6%
Discourtesy (D)	1515	34%	1391	32%	-124	-8%
Offensive Language (O)	363	8%	343	8%	-20	-6%
Total FADO Allegations	6780		6516		-264	-4%
Total Complaints	4462		4282		-180	-4%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	December 2015		December 2016			
	Count	%of Total Allegations	Count	%of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	283	28%	180	23%	-103	-36%
Abuse of Authority (A)	558	55%	468	60%	-90	-16%
Discourtesy (D)	131	13%	114	15%	-17	-13%
Offensive Language (O)	37	4%	24	3%	-13	-35%
Total Allegations	1009		786		-223	-22%
Total Complaints	333		296		-37	-11%

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

	YTD 2015		YTD 2016			
	Count	%of Total Allegations	Count	%of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	3691	29%	3657	26%	-34	-1%
Abuse of Authority (A)	6667	52%	7872	56%	1205	18%
Discourtesy (D)	1991	16%	1991	14%	0	0%
Offensive Language (O)	418	3%	416	3%	-2	0%
Total Allegations	12767		13936		1169	9%
Total Complaints	4462		4282		-180	-4%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of December 2016, 89% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 98% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (December 2016)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	778	89.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	79	9.0%
Cases 8-11 Months	8	0.9%
Cases 12-18 Months*	6	0.7%
Cases Over 18 Months**	3	0.3%
Total	**874**	**100%**

* 12-18 Months: 5 cases that were reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold.
** Over 18 Months: 1 case that was reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (December 2016)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	720	82.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	99	11.3%
Cases 8-11 Months	31	3.5%
Cases 12-18 Months	20	2.3%
Cases Over 18 Months	4	0.5%
Total	**874**	**100%**

An active case is specifically one in which the facts are still being investigated.

Figure 15: Number of Active Investigations (January 2015 - December 2016)



Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis



Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	November 2016		December 2016			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Investigations	556	62%	507	57%	-49	-9%
Pending Board Review	223	25%	269	30%	46	21%
Mediation	99	11%	98	11%	-1	-1%
On DA Hold	14	2%	12	1%	-2	-14%
Total	892		886		-6	-1%

Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In December 2016, the CCRB fully investigated 16% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 28% of the cases it closed.

Figure 18: Case Resolutions (January 2015 - December 2016) (%)



Dispositions

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

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

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

Case Abstracts

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

1. Substantiated
An officer stopped and pointed a firearm at a man who was suspected of stealing a motorcycle. The man testified he was in the area looking for his mobile phone, and as he closed the gate of his U-Haul, he turned around and saw the officer pointing a firearm at him. The officer testified he planned to stop the man for grand larceny, since there were reports of motorcycle thefts in the area and the man's behavior seemed suspicious. The officer testified the man did not respond to the first command issued and he justified drawing his weapon for safety concerns due to the time of night, the violent nature of the crime that was suspected and the size of the man. Although an officer can draw a firearm when there is a reasonable fear for safety, grand larceny is not among the list of violent felonies enumerated in New York Penal Law. Additionally, the officer did not notice any bulges on the man's body that could have been a weapon. As a result, the Board "Substantiated" the force allegation.

2. Unsubstantiated
A woman was issued two vehicle-related summonses and she wanted to record the names of all the officers involved. The woman testified she was double parked outside of repair shop waiting for her vehicle to get serviced when an officer issued two summons for obstructing traffic and failing to provide proof of insurance. Believing she was being harassed by the officer, the woman requested the name and shield number of the officers on scene. Three officers complied, and the fourth officer allegedly ordered her back to her vehicle without providing any identifying information. The officer testified the woman was "acting irate" and he ordered the woman back to her vehicle without hearing the request for his name or badge number. Without supplementary evidence or additional witnesses, the investigation could not determine if the officer was in a position to hear the woman ask for identifying information. As a result, the Board "Unsubstantiated" the allegation.

3. Unfounded
A man alleged that an officer pointed a firearm at him while he was stopped, frisked and searched. The man testified he was inside a store when an officer approached him to conduct a frisk and search of his person. At some point throughout the incident, the man alleged the officer pointed a firearm at him. Video evidence from the stop shows one officer interacting with the man and at no time throughout the interaction did the officer point a firearm at the man. Since video evidence contradicts the man's testimony, the allegation that an officer pointed a firearm at the man was deemed to be false. Therefore, the Board recommended to "unfound" the allegation.

4. Exonerated
Officers entered a woman's house and searched the premises for her son. The woman testified that she awoke to officers standing above her in the bedroom and was ordered to sit on the couch in the living room. The woman believed officers entered her residence without consent through a door she mistakenly left unlocked and searched her dwelling without saying a word through the entire incident. The officer stated they arrived at the woman's residence in the morning hours with a warrant for her son. The officer stated the woman provided verbal consent for them to enter as they spoke at the front door and deny officers entered without verbal consent. Although testimonies differ, the officer had a reasonable belief the woman's son lived at the residence and would be present and consent was not a necessary condition needed to execute the arrest warrant. As a result, the Board closed the allegation as "Exonerated".

5. Officer Unidentified
A man testified that two plainclothes officers stopped and search him after officers threatened to arrest him if he didn't consent to a search. The man submitted his complaint approximately seven months after the incident and did not remember the exact day and time the alleged misconduct occurred. Furthermore, the incident occurred on the boundary of three precincts. Without a specific date of occurrence, additional documents could not be ordered to identify the subject officers. As a result, the allegations were recommended as "Officers Unknown".

Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 19: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (December 2016)



Figure 20: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2016)



Dispositions - All CCRB Cases

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

Figure 21: Disposition of Cases (2015 vs 2016)

	Dec 2015		Dec 2016		YTD 2015		YTD 2016	
Full Investigations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	52	30%	8	16%	519	24%	347	23%
Exonerated	31	18%	10	20%	296	14%	256	17%
Unfounded	12	7%	3	6%	150	7%	139	9%
Unsubstantiated	65	37%	23	47%	1050	48%	675	45%
MOS Unidentified	14	8%	5	10%	162	7%	99	7%
Total - Full Investigations	174		49		2177		1516	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	23	44%	17	46%	192	46%	208	48%
Mediation Attempted	29	56%	20	54%	222	54%	227	52%
Total - ADR Closures	52		37		414		435	
Resolved Case Total	226	46%	86	28%	2591	50%	1951	44%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	55	21%	45	20%	372	14%	462	19%
Complainant/Victim/Witness uncooperative	169	64%	129	57%	1642	62%	1520	61%
Complainant/Victim/Witness unavailable	37	14%	44	19%	436	17%	407	16%
Victim unidentified	4	2%	3	1%	31	1%	40	2%
Miscellaneous	1	0%	0	0%	14	1%	3	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	5	2%	147	6%	51	2%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	266		226		2642		2483	
Total - Closed Cases	492		312		5233		4434	

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

Dispositions - 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 5% for the month of December 2016, and the allegation substantiation rate is 13% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is Abuse of Authority – substantiating 7% of such allegations during December 2016, and 18% for the year.

Figure 22: Disposition of Allegations (2015 vs 2016)

	Dec 2015		Dec 2016		YTD 2015		YTD 2016	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	140	21%	11	5%	1266	14%	877	13%
Unsubstantiated	244	36%	96	42%	3819	42%	2681	40%
Unfounded	64	10%	21	9%	786	9%	628	9%
Exonerated	158	24%	58	25%	2038	22%	1851	27%
MOS Unidentified	64	10%	42	18%	1155	13%	698	10%
Total - Full Investigations	670		228		9064		6735	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	56	43%	44	46%	372	44%	484	47%
MediationAttempted	73	57%	51	54%	478	56%	549	53%
Total - ADR Closures	129		95		850		1033	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	115	17%	103	18%	775	13%	908	15%
Complainant/Victim/Witness uncooperative	452	68%	366	62%	4044	68%	4006	67%
Complainant/Victim/Witness unavailable	74	11%	92	16%	788	13%	857	14%
Victim unidentified	12	2%	17	3%	80	1%	112	2%
Miscellaneous	7	1%	0	0%	80	1%	22	0%
Administrative closure	0	0%	8	1%	209	3%	84	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	660		586		5976		5989	
Total - Closed Allegations	1526		924		16777		14323	

Figure 23: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (December 2016)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	3	37	20	15	14	89
	3%	42%	22%	17%	16%	100%
Abuse of Authority	8	40	38	4	19	109
	7%	37%	35%	4%	17%	100%
Discourtesy	0	17	0	2	9	28
	0%	61%	0%	7%	32%	100%
Offensive Language	0	2	0	0	0	2
	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	11	96	58	21	42	228
Total	5%	42%	25%	9%	18%	100%

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (YTD 2016)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	84	583	615	286	176	1744
	5%	33%	35%	16%	10%	100%
Abuse of Authority	696	1364	1214	192	365	3831
	18%	36%	32%	5%	10%	100%
Discourtesy	87	618	22	119	135	981
	9%	63%	2%	12%	14%	100%
Offensive Language	10	115	0	31	22	178
	6%	65%	0%	17%	12%	100%
	877	2680	1851	628	698	6734
Total	13%	40%	27%	9%	10%	100%

Substantiation Rates

The December 2016 case substantiation rate was 16%.

Figure 25: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2015 - December 2016)



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 2016 - Dec 2016) (% substantiated shown)



Figure 27: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2016 - Dec 2016) (% substantiated shown)



Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints

After a CCRB investigative team has completed its investigation and recommended the substantiation of a complaint against an officer, a panel of three Board members determines whether or not to substantiate the allegation and make a disciplinary recommendation.

- "Charges and Specifications" are recommended for the most serious allegations of misconduct. Charges launch an administrative trial in the NYPD Trial Room. An officer may lose vacation days, be suspended, or terminated if he is found guilty.
- "Instructions" or "Formalized Training" are the least severe discipline, often recommended for officers who misunderstand a policy. This determination results in training at the command level (Instructions) or training at the Police Academy or NYPD Legal Bureau (Formalized Training).
- "Command Discipline" is recommended for misconduct that is more problematic than poor training, but does not rise to the level of Charges. An officer can lose up to ten vacation days as a result of a Command Discipline.
- When the Board has recommended Instructions, Formalized Training or Command Discipline, the case is sent to the NYPD Commissioner to impose training and/or other penalties, while cases where the Board recommends charges are prosecuted by the CCRB's Administrative Prosecution Unit.

Figure 28: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints* (Dec 2015, Dec 2016, YTD 2015, YTD 2016)

	December 2015		December 2016		YTD 2015		YTD 2016	
Disposition	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	7	14%	2	25%	126	24%	43	12%
Command Discipline	20	39%	4	50%	213	41%	152	44%
Formalized Training	23	45%	2	25%	164	32%	128	37%
Instructions	1	2%	0	0%	13	3%	24	7%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	51		8		516		347	

* 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* (2016)



* 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 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 substsantiated 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 Substantiated Allegations* (Dec 2015, Dec 2016, YTD 2015, YTD 2016)

	December 2015		December 2016		YTD 2015		YTD 2016	
Disposition	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	13	17.3%	2	22.2%	225	29.1%	74	14.2%
Command Discipline	33	44%	4	44.4%	338	43.8%	234	45%
Formalized Training	28	37.3%	3	33.3%	195	25.3%	184	35.4%
Instructions	1	1.3%	0	0%	14	1.8%	28	5.4%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	75		9		772		520	

* The counts in this table reflect the number of distinct MOS.

Figure 31: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (December2016)

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurence	Borough of Occurence
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Gun Pointed	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory summons	5	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Other	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Premises entered and/or searched	100	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	100	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	114	Queens

Truncations

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

Figure 32: Truncated Allegations (December 2016)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Force	31	84	29	1	145
Abuse of Authority	56	205	50	13	324
Discourtesy	13	62	13	2	90
Offensive Language	3	15	0	1	19
Total	103	366	92	17	578

Figure 33: Truncated CCRB Complaints (December 2016)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	45	129	44	3	221

Figure 34: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2016)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Force	220	1146	330	26	1722
Abuse of Authority	519	2139	396	72	3126
Discourtesy	136	592	100	9	837
Offensive Language	33	128	31	5	197
Total	908	4005	857	112	5882

Figure 35: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2016)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	462	1520	407	40	2429

Mediation Unit

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

Figure 36: Mediated Complaints Closed

	December 2016			YTD 2016		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	17	20	37	208	227	435

Figure 37: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	December 2016			YTD 2016		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	4	6	10	33	46	79
Abuse of Authority	28	30	58	331	372	703
Discourtesy	11	12	23	105	107	212
Offensive Language	1	3	4	15	24	39
Total	44	51	95	484	549	1033

Figure 38: Mediated Complaints By Borough (December 2016)

	Mediations
Bronx	1
Brooklyn	3
Manhattan	7
Queens	4
Staten Island	2

Figure 39: Mediated Allegations By Borough (December 2016)

	Mediations
Bronx	3
Brooklyn	19
Manhattan	13
Queens	6
Staten Island	3

Figure 40: Mediated Complaints By Precinct (Dec 2016 - YTD 2016)

Precinct	Dec 2016	YTD 2016	Precinct	Dec 2016	YTD 2016
1	0	3	68	0	4
5	0	4	69	0	2
6	1	7	70	0	5
7	0	2	71	0	5
9	0	3	72	0	1
10	0	7	73	2	8
13	0	2	75	0	5
14	1	8	76	0	1
17	0	3	77	0	1
18	0	1	78	0	3
19	0	2	79	1	3
23	0	3	81	0	1
24	1	1	83	0	2
25	1	3	84	0	2
26	0	2	88	0	3
28	1	4	90	0	1
30	0	2	94	0	1
32	1	5	100	0	2
33	1	3	101	0	1
34	0	3	102	0	3
40	0	6	103	0	1
41	0	1	105	0	5
42	0	1	106	0	2
43	1	2	107	0	3
45	0	2	108	0	4
46	0	4	109	0	2
47	0	2	110	0	2
48	0	1	111	0	1
49	0	2	112	0	1
50	0	1	113	2	6
52	0	7	114	1	1
60	0	3	115	0	2
61	0	3	120	0	2
62	0	2	121	1	4
67	0	8	122	2	5

Figure 41: Mediated Allegations By Precinct (Dec 2016 - YTD 2016)

Precinct	Dec 2016	YTD 2016	Precinct	Dec 2016	YTD 2016
1	0	4	68	0	5
5	0	5	69	0	2
6	1	11	70	0	16
7	0	4	71	0	8
9	0	3	72	0	1
10	0	27	73	18	35
13	0	6	75	0	13
14	2	22	76	0	1
17	0	3	77	0	1
18	0	8	78	0	10
19	0	2	79	1	4
23	0	4	81	0	2
24	4	4	83	0	5
25	1	13	84	0	3
26	0	9	88	0	5
28	2	19	90	0	3
30	0	3	94	0	3
32	1	8	100	0	3
33	2	6	101	0	8
34	0	6	102	0	7
40	0	10	103	0	1
41	0	13	105	0	9
42	0	1	106	0	5
43	3	4	107	0	5
45	0	2	108	0	9
46	0	13	109	0	4
47	0	4	110	0	4
48	0	1	111	0	4
49	0	3	112	0	1
50	0	1	113	3	9
52	0	25	114	1	1
60	0	6	115	0	5
61	0	3	120	0	7
62	0	4	121	1	7
67	0	13	122	4	8

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 42: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Dec 2016	YTD 2016
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	1	67
	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	1
	Resolved by plea	0	63
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. B	0	0
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. A	0	3
	Plea set aside, Formalized Training	0	17
	Plea set aside, Instructions	0	0
	*Retained, with discipline	0	2
	Disciplinary Action Total	**1**	**153**
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	8	66
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	3
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	1
	**Retained, without discipline	0	2
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total	**8**	**72**
Not Adjudicated	Charges not filed	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	1	1
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	1	6
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	0	16
	Retired	0	2
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total	**2**	**25**
	Total Closures	**11**	**250**

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

NYPD Discipline

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

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

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

Figure 43: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	December 2016	YTD 2016
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	1
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	4
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	1	14
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	98
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	3
Formalized Training**	0	18
Instructions***	0	6
Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	9
Disciplinary Action† Total	**1**	**153**
No Disciplinary Action†	8	72
Adjudicated Total	**9**	**225**
Discipline Rate	**11%**	**68%**
Not Adjudicated† Total	2	25
Total Closures	**11**	**250**

*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 42 on the previous page.

Figure 44: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	**Disposition Type***	December 2016	YTD 2016
Disciplinary Action	Terminated	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	1
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	0
	Command Discipline B	1	10
	Command Discipline A	2	108
	Formalized Training**	16	183
	Instructions***	4	63
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total	**23**	**365**
No Disciplinary Action	Not Guilty	0	2
	Filed ††	0	4
	SOL Expired	0	5
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	2	28
	Total	**2**	**39**
	Discipline Rate	**92%**	**90%**
	DUP Rate	**8%**	**7%**

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

Figure 45: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (December 2016)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	18	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search (of person)	18	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	18	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Other	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	33	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	33	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	33	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Physical force	40	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Retaliatory arrest	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Retaliatory arrest	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Retaliatory arrest	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	44	Bronx	No Penalty
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	44	Bronx	No Penalty
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle search	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Vehicle search	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Retaliatory summons	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	46	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	46	Bronx	No Penalty
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search (of person)	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	47	Bronx	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Premises entered and/or searched	47	Bronx	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle stop	68	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	68	Brooklyn	No Penalty
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	E	Gender	69	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	72	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	72	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	101	Queens	Instructions

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	109	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Frisk	109	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search (of person)	109	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	109	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Stop	109	Queens	Formalized Training

Figure 46: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (December 2016)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	1	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Refusal to provide name/shield number	28	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Other	28	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	D	Word	28	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Stop	28	Manhattan	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Property damaged	46	Bronx	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	105	Queens	Forfeit vacation 15 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Vehicle stop	113	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Vehicle stop	113	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	113	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	D	Word	113	Queens	No Penalty
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	121	Staten Island	No Penalty

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

	December 2016		November 2016			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	720	82.4%	764	87.0%	-44	-5.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	99	11.3%	80	9.1%	19	23.8%
Cases 8 Months	9	1.0%	6	0.7%	3	50.0%
Cases 9 Months	8	0.9%	9	1.0%	-1	-11.1%
Cases 10 Months	8	0.9%	5	0.6%	3	60.0%
Cases 11 Months	6	0.7%	2	0.2%	4	200.0%
Cases 12 Months	4	0.5%	3	0.3%	1	33.3%
Cases 13 Months	3	0.3%	0	0.0%	3	NA
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	-2	NA
Cases 15 Months	4	0.5%	3	0.3%	1	33.3%
Cases 16 Months	6	0.7%	1	0.1%	5	500.0%
Cases 17 Months	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	4	0.5%	2	0.2%	2	100.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**874**	**100.0%**	**878**	**100.0%**	**-4**	**-0.5%**

Figure 48: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On CCRB Received Date

	December 2016		November 2016			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	778	89.0%	806	91.8%	-28	-3.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	79	9.0%	63	7.2%	16	25.4%
Cases 8 Months	6	0.7%	0	0.0%	6	NA
Cases 9 Months	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	-1	NA
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	-1	NA
Cases 11 Months	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%	3	0.3%	-3	NA
Cases 13 Months	3	0.3%	0	0.0%	3	NA
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	-1	NA
Cases 15 Months	2	0.2%	1	0.1%	1	100.0%
Cases 16 Months	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	NA
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	3	0.3%	2	0.2%	1	50.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**874**	**100.0%**	**878**	**100.0%**	**-4**	**-0.5%**

Figure 49: CCRB Investigations Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	December 2016		November 2016			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	452	89.2%	507	91.2%	-55	-10.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	25	4.9%	25	4.5%	0	0.0%
Cases 8 Months	4	0.8%	5	0.9%	-1	-20.0%
Cases 9 Months	4	0.8%	5	0.9%	-1	-20.0%
Cases 10 Months	3	0.6%	3	0.5%	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	3	0.6%	2	0.4%	1	50.0%
Cases 12 Months	4	0.8%	2	0.4%	2	100.0%
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	-1	NA
Cases 15 Months	2	0.4%	2	0.4%	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	5	1.0%	1	0.2%	4	400.0%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	-1	NA
Cases 18 Months	2	0.4%	0	0.0%	2	NA
Cases Over 18 Months	3	0.6%	2	0.4%	1	50.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	**507**	**100.0%**	**556**	**100.0%**	**-49**	**-8.8%**

Figure 50: CCRB DA Hold Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	December 2016	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	3	25.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	1	8.3%
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	1	8.3%
Cases 14 Months	1	8.3%
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	1	8.3%
Cases 17 Months	2	16.7%
Cases 18 Months	1	8.3%
Cases Over 18 Months	2	16.7%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	**12**	**100.0%**

Figure 51: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2016)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	8	6.9%	54	46.6%	31	26.7%	10	8.6%	13	11.2%	0	0%
Gun fired	0	0%	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	5	12.2%	17	41.5%	4	9.8%	13	31.7%	2	4.9%	0	0%
Gun as club	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Radio as club	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%
Flashlight as club	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0%
Police shield	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle	0	0%	1	12.5%	4	50%	3	37.5%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	5	50%	3	30%	2	20%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	3	6.7%	4	8.9%	21	46.7%	12	26.7%	5	11.1%	0	0%
Chokehold	3	3.4%	0	0%	40	46%	28	32.2%	16	18.4%	0	0%
Pepper spray	4	8.9%	23	51.1%	9	20%	6	13.3%	3	6.7%	0	0%
Physical force	47	3.9%	484	40.7%	389	32.7%	162	13.6%	105	8.8%	3	0.3%
Handcuffs too tight	1	4.3%	0	0%	13	56.5%	8	34.8%	1	4.3%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	6	13.6%	27	61.4%	6	13.6%	5	11.4%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	3	2.6%	1	0.9%	53	46.1%	32	27.8%	26	22.6%	0	0%
Total	84	4.8%	615	35.2%	583	33.4%	286	16.4%	176	10.1%	3	0.2%

Figure 52: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2016)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	0	0%	20	47.6%	15	35.7%	2	4.8%	5	11.9%	0	0%
Strip-searched	18	22.2%	9	11.1%	38	46.9%	5	6.2%	11	13.6%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	15	6.1%	135	54.9%	77	31.3%	1	0.4%	18	7.3%	0	0%
Vehicle search	40	18.1%	71	32.1%	85	38.5%	3	1.4%	22	10%	0	0%
Premises entered and/or searched	72	13.6%	331	62.3%	107	20.2%	6	1.1%	15	2.8%	0	0%
Threat of summons	1	3%	14	42.4%	13	39.4%	2	6.1%	3	9.1%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	20	5.8%	148	43.3%	125	36.5%	17	5%	32	9.4%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	1	5%	8	40%	7	35%	1	5%	3	15%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	14	6.7%	27	13%	115	55.3%	26	12.5%	26	12.5%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	4	7%	17	29.8%	27	47.4%	4	7%	5	8.8%	0	0%
Property damaged	11	11%	19	19%	41	41%	7	7%	22	22%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	7	14.6%	0	0%	34	70.8%	2	4.2%	5	10.4%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name/shield number	41	10.5%	1	0.3%	250	64.3%	65	16.7%	32	8.2%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	9	81.8%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	19	86.4%	2	9.1%	1	4.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	17	15.9%	0	0%	64	59.8%	19	17.8%	7	6.5%	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	53	37.9%	36	25.7%	37	26.4%	9	6.4%	5	3.6%	0	0%
Seizure of property	2	7.4%	14	51.9%	7	25.9%	2	7.4%	2	7.4%	0	0%
Failure to show search warrant	7	21.2%	1	3%	20	60.6%	5	15.2%	0	0%	0	0%
Frisk	106	37.1%	60	21%	72	25.2%	2	0.7%	45	15.7%	1	0.3%
Search (of person)	66	22.3%	55	18.6%	125	42.2%	5	1.7%	45	15.2%	0	0%
Stop	147	31.2%	206	43.7%	64	13.6%	7	1.5%	47	10%	0	0%
Question	19	20.7%	37	40.2%	24	26.1%	1	1.1%	11	12%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%
Interference with recording	5	29.4%	2	11.8%	8	47.1%	0	0%	2	11.8%	0	0%
Search of recording device	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Total	696	18.2%	1214	31.7%	1364	35.6%	192	5%	365	9.5%	1	0%

Figure 53: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2016)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	73	8.4%	20	2.3%	547	63.1%	101	11.6%	123	14.2%	3	0.3%
Gesture	0	0%	0	0%	5	62.5%	1	12.5%	2	25%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Action	13	12.4%	2	1.9%	63	60%	17	16.2%	10	9.5%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	87	8.8%	22	2.2%	618	62.8%	119	12.1%	135	13.7%	3	0.3%

Figure 54: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2016)

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	2	2.9%	0	0%	45	65.2%	10	14.5%	12	17.4%	0	0%
Ethnicity	0	0%	0	0%	14	66.7%	6	28.6%	1	4.8%	0	0%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender	5	11.1%	0	0%	30	66.7%	6	13.3%	4	8.9%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	1	3.8%	0	0%	15	57.7%	8	30.8%	2	7.7%	0	0%
Physical disability	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	1	8.3%	0	0%	7	58.3%	1	8.3%	3	25%	0	0%
Total	10	5.6%	0	0%	115	64.6%	31	17.4%	22	12.4%	0	0%

Figure 55: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (December 2016)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Awaiting filing of charges	0	0%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	0	0%
Charges filed, awaiting service	11	14%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	11	14%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	3	4%
Calendered for court appearance	21	28%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	3	4%
Trial scheduled	26	34%
Trial commenced	1	1%
Total	**76**	**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 56: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (December 2016)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	4	4%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	46	48%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	28	29%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	5	5%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	12	13%
Total	**95**	**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 57: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	2	31	27	340
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	0	36	18	414
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	3	113	48	811
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	0	57	18	503
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	1	68	14	596
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	1	45	12	371
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	1	16	12	187
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	13	16	177
Special Operations Division Total	0	2	3	59
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	3
Total	**8**	**381**	**168**	**3461**
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	3	5	52
Transit Bureau Total	0	12	22	207
Housing Bureau Total	0	29	17	308
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	39	12	298
Detective Bureau Total	0	26	7	175
Other Bureaus Total	1	17	14	149
Total	**1**	**126**	**77**	**1189**
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	6	0	43
Undetermined	0	7	6	56
Total	**9**	**520**	**251**	**4749**

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

Figure 58A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
001 Precinct	0	4	2	31
005 Precinct	1	1	1	20
006 Precinct	0	9	4	50
007 Precinct	0	1	3	25
009 Precinct	0	0	1	15
010 Precinct	0	6	1	40
013 Precinct	0	0	1	24
Midtown South Precinct	0	3	6	37
017 Precinct	0	0	0	18
Midtown North Precinct	0	1	2	44
Precincts Total	**1**	**25**	**21**	**304**
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	2	2	8
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	2	1	22
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	1	2	3	6
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	**2**	**31**	**27**	**340**

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

Figure 58B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
019 Precinct	0	0	3	43
020 Precinct	0	0	1	24
023 Precinct	0	4	1	45
024 Precinct	0	0	1	17
025 Precinct	0	4	0	49
026 Precinct	0	0	0	7
Central Park Precinct	0	2	0	6
028 Precinct	0	3	1	40
030 Precinct	0	4	1	30
032 Precinct	0	10	4	50
033 Precinct	0	8	2	43
034 Precinct	0	1	4	48
Precincts Total	**0**	**36**	**18**	**402**
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	0	0	12
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	**0**	**36**	**18**	**414**

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

Figure 58C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
040 Precinct	0	21	4	65
041 Precinct	2	4	5	59
042 Precinct	0	7	4	74
043 Precinct	0	2	5	50
044 Precinct	1	8	4	67
045 Precinct	0	0	0	19
046 Precinct	0	24	5	98
047 Precinct	0	4	3	74
048 Precinct	0	11	6	64
049 Precinct	0	3	0	48
050 Precinct	0	5	1	34
052 Precinct	0	6	10	96
Precincts Total	**3**	**95**	**47**	**748**
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	1	1	9
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	16	0	47
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	0	7
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	**3**	**113**	**48**	**811**

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

Figure 58D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
060 Precinct	0	12	3	45
061 Precinct	0	0	2	34
062 Precinct	0	5	2	48
063 Precinct	0	2	1	19
066 Precinct	0	1	1	18
067 Precinct	0	19	1	74
068 Precinct	0	1	0	16
069 Precinct	0	6	3	55
070 Precinct	0	2	3	44
071 Precinct	0	5	0	75
072 Precinct	0	2	0	15
076 Precinct	0	1	0	15
078 Precinct	0	1	0	23
Precincts Total	**0**	**57**	**16**	**481**
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	8
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	2	11
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	**0**	**57**	**18**	**503**

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

Figure 58E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
073 Precinct	0	13	2	80
075 Precinct	0	18	2	174
077 Precinct	0	4	2	51
079 Precinct	0	6	1	64
081 Precinct	1	7	1	49
083 Precinct	0	1	3	38
084 Precinct	0	5	1	25
088 Precinct	0	1	2	32
090 Precinct	0	1	0	21
094 Precinct	0	1	0	13
Precincts Total	**1**	**57**	**14**	**547**
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	5	0	30
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	6	0	19
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	**1**	**68**	**14**	**596**

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

Figure 58F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
100 Precinct	1	2	2	23
101 Precinct	0	5	0	46
102 Precinct	0	4	1	35
103 Precinct	0	5	2	81
105 Precinct	0	18	0	69
106 Precinct	0	4	0	38
107 Precinct	0	2	2	15
113 Precinct	0	3	3	57
Precincts Total	**1**	**43**	**10**	**364**
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	2	2	5
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	**1**	**45**	**12**	**371**

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

Figure 58G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
104 Precinct	0	1	0	21
108 Precinct	0	1	2	28
109 Precinct	0	1	2	31
110 Precinct	0	3	3	26
111 Precinct	0	0	0	13
112 Precinct	0	0	0	7
114 Precinct	1	8	4	34
115 Precinct	0	1	1	22
Precincts Total	**1**	**15**	**12**	**182**
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	1	0	5
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	**1**	**16**	**12**	**187**

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

Figure 58H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
120 Precinct	0	2	8	64
122 Precinct	0	0	3	21
123 Precinct	0	0	1	16
121 Precinct	0	8	3	63
Precincts Total	**0**	**10**	**15**	**164**
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	1	0	6
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	2	1	7
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Housing Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Court Section	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	**0**	**13**	**16**	**177**

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

Figure 58I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	0	3	36
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	0
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	0	0	1
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	2
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	2	0	20
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	**0**	**2**	**3**	**59**

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

Figure 58J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Chiefs Office	0	0	0	3
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**

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

Figure 58K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	7
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	3
Bus Unit	0	0	0	4
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	1	3
Highway Unit #1	0	1	1	12
Highway Unit #2	0	0	2	8
Highway Unit #3	0	1	1	12
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	2
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	1	0	1
Traffic Control Division Total	**0**	**3**	**5**	**52**

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

Figure 58L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	1	0	6
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	1
Transit Bureau Patrol Operations	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	0	0	0	9
TB DT02	0	0	4	20
TB DT03	0	2	2	17
TB DT04	0	2	5	30
TB DT11	0	1	1	11
TB DT12	0	2	1	13
TB DT20	0	2	1	8
TB DT23	0	0	0	3
TB DT30	0	0	0	12
TB DT32	0	0	0	14
TB DT33	0	0	0	10
TB DT34	0	0	6	15
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	0	6
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	1	0	9
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	1	0	2
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	3
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	0	2	17
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	**0**	**12**	**22**	**207**

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

Figure 58M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	0	4	2	39
PSA 2	0	2	6	41
PSA 3	0	1	0	23
PSA 4	0	5	0	40
PSA 5	0	2	0	20
PSA 6	0	3	4	28
PSA 7	0	4	1	52
PSA 8	0	4	2	25
PSA 9	0	0	1	15
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Bronx/Queens	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Investigations	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Elevator Vandalism Unit	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Operations and Misc. Commands	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	**0**	**29**	**17**	**308**
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	0	13
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	4	1	10
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	2
Housing Bureau Total	**0**	**29**	**17**	**308**

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

Figure 58N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Queens Narcotics	0	11	2	55
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	7	2	53
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	20
Bronx Narcotics	0	6	7	48
Staten Island Narcotics	0	3	1	14
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	6	0	48
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	4	0	48
Narcotics Headquarters	0	1	0	5
Auto Crime Division	0	1	0	2
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	3
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	2
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	**0**	**39**	**12**	**298**

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

Figure 58O: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	1	3
Special Victims Division	0	0	0	2
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	1
Gang Division	0	14	0	58
Detective Borough Bronx	0	6	0	22
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	3	0	19
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	2	2	38
Detective Borough Queens	0	1	2	29
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	2	2
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	1
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	**0**	**26**	**7**	**175**

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

Figure 58P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	1	7
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	1	17	13	138
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	1
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	0
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	2
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	1
Other Bureaus Total	**1**	**17**	**14**	**149**

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

Figure 58Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2016 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Sustantiated MOS Dec 2016	Substantiated MOS YTD 2016	Total MOS Dec 2016	Total MOS YTD 2016
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - Legal Bureau	0	0	0	0
DC Training	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy Training	0	0	0	4
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	0	4
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	0	1	0	1
Police Commissioner Office	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Division	0	0	0	0
Chief of Community Affairs	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Juvenile Section	0	0	0	0
School Safety Bronx/Manhattan	0	0	0	0
School Safety Queens/Brooklyn	0	2	0	4
Office of Equal Employment	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Operations	0	0	0	1
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	2	0	22
Chief of Department	0	1	0	6
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**	**6**	**0**	**43**

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