



BILL DE BLASIO
MAYOR

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



FREDERICK DAVIE
CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report
December 2020
(Statistics for November 2020)

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Glossary	3
Complaints Received	4
CCRB Cases Received By Borough and Precinct	5
Allegations Received	7
CCRB Docket	10
Body Worn Camera Footage Requests	12
Closed Cases	13
Resolving Cases	13
Dispositions / Case Abstracts	14
Dispositions - Full Investigations	16
Dispositions - All CCRB Cases	17
Dispositions - Allegations	18
Substantiation Rates	21
Substantiation Rates and Video	22
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints	23
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Allegations	25
Truncations	27
Complaints by PSA	28
Mediation Unit	30
Administrative Prosecution Unit	32
NYPD Discipline	33
Appendix	38

Executive Summary

The Civilian Complaint Review Board (“CCRB”) is an independent municipal Agency that investigates complaints of NYPD misconduct. Every month, the CCRB prepares an Executive Director report for its public meeting. Data for November 2020 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 42% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 69% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In November, the CCRB opened 281 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 2,892 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 40% of its fully investigated cases (page 16).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 5% of the cases it closed in November (page 13) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 5% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency's truncation rate was 95% (page 13). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.
- 4) For November, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 33% of cases - compared to 100% of cases in which video was not available (page 21-22).
- 5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6, 26).
- 6) In November the Police Commissioner did not finalize any decisions against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases (page 32). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 11 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 1 trial was conducted against respondent officers in November.

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

Glossary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Complaints Received

The CCRB's Intake team processes misconduct complaints from the public and referrals from the NYPD. Under the New York City Charter, the CCRB's jurisdiction is limited to allegations of misconduct related to Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy and Offensive Language. All other complaints are referred to the appropriate agency. Figure 1 refers to all complaints that the CCRB receives and Figures 2 and 3 refer to new cases that remain with the Agency. In November 2020, the CCRB initiated 281 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2019 - November 2020)




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2019 - November 2020)





Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (YTD 2010 - YTD 2020)



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Of the five boroughs, the largest number of misconduct complaints stemmed from incidents occurring in Brooklyn, followed by Manhattan. The 75th Precinct had the highest number at 16 incidents.

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (November 2020)




Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2020)




Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (November 2020)


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	5	67	7
5	2	68	3
6	6	69	3
7	2	70	1
9	3	71	1
13	11	73	12
14	5	75	16
17	1	76	1
18	4	77	4
19	3	78	1
23	5	79	5
24	4	81	6
25	3	83	2
28	2	84	3
30	2	88	1
32	5	90	5
33	1	94	2
34	1	100	3
40	4	101	1
41	2	102	1
42	3	103	7
43	10	104	2
44	10	105	6
46	3	106	1
47	7	107	2
48	5	108	3
49	2	109	1
52	6	110	3
60	6	112	3
61	9	113	2
62	1	114	3
63	5	115	2
		120	3
		121	6
		122	6
		1000	1
		Unknown	14

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

Allegations Received

As described in the previous section, the CCRB has jurisdiction over four categories of NYPD misconduct. In comparing November 2019 to November 2020, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is down, Abuse of Authority complaints are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down. Figures for the year-to-date comparison show that in 2020, complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (November 2019 vs. November 2020)




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

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

	November 2019		November 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	131	41%	121	43%	-10	-8%
Abuse of Authority (A)	238	75%	206	73%	-32	-13%
Discourtesy (D)	73	23%	51	18%	-22	-30%
Offensive Language (O)	26	8%	9	3%	-17	-65%
Total FADO Allegations	468		387		-81	-17%
Total Complaints	316		281		-35	-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 2019 vs. YTD 2020)



*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 2019		YTD 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	1831	39%	1511	42%	-320	-17%
Abuse of Authority (A)	3613	78%	2655	74%	-958	-27%
Discourtesy (D)	1108	24%	961	27%	-147	-13%
Offensive Language (O)	281	6%	271	8%	-10	-4%
Total FADO Allegations	6833		5398		-1435	-21%
Total Complaints	4651		3608		-1043	-22%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	November 2019		November 2020			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	255	21%	259	30%	4	2%
Abuse of Authority (A)	823	67%	542	62%	-281	-34%
Discourtesy (D)	126	10%	62	7%	-64	-51%
Offensive Language (O)	32	3%	9	1%	-23	-72%
Total Allegations	1236		872		-364	-29%
Total Complaints	316		281		-35	-11%

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

	YTD 2019		YTD 2020			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	4084	23%	3929	27%	-155	-4%
Abuse of Authority (A)	11368	65%	8829	61%	-2539	-22%
Discourtesy (D)	1681	10%	1463	10%	-218	-13%
Offensive Language (O)	366	2%	357	2%	-9	-2%
Total Allegations	17499		14578		-2921	-17%
Total Complaints	4651		3608		-1043	-22%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of November 2020, 42% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 69% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (November 2020)

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1005	41.7%
Cases 5-7 Months	664	27.5%
Cases 8-11 Months	428	17.8%
Cases 12-18 Months*	286	11.9%
Cases Over 18 Months**	28	1.2%
Total	2411	100%

*12-18 Months: 16 cases that were reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 11 cases that were reopened; 4 cases that were on DA Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (November 2020)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	846	35.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	704	29.2%
Cases 8-11 Months	448	18.6%
Cases 12-18 Months*	358	14.8%
Cases Over 18 Months**	55	2.3%
Total	2411	100%

*12-18 Months: 16 cases that were reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 12 cases that were reopened; 5 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

Figure 15: Number of Active Investigations (January 2019 - November 2020)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	October 2020		November 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	1880	67%	1931	67%	51	3%
Pending Board Review	472	17%	480	17%	8	2%
Mediation	446	16%	475	16%	29	7%
On DA Hold	7	0%	6	0%	-1	-14%
Total	2805		2892		87	3%

Body Worn Camera Footage Requests


Since the widespread roll out of body worn cameras in 2018, the collection of footage from these cameras has become an integral part of CCRB investigations.

The timeliness of the response to BWC footage requests has a direct impact on the length of time it takes to complete an investigation. The longer it takes to fulfill BWC requests, the longer CCRB investigations remain on the open docket.

Figure 18: Pending Requests for BWC Footage

Days Pending	BWC Requests	% of Total
00 <= Days < 30	31	45.6%
30 <= Days < 60	6	8.8%
60 <= Days < 90	2	2.9%
90 <= Days	29	42.6%
Total	68	100%

Figure 19: Percentage of Open Investigations Docket with Pending BWC Requests (January 2019 - November 2020)




Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In November 2020, the CCRB fully investigated 5% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 5% of the cases it closed.

Figure 20: Case Resolutions (January 2019 - November 2020) (%)



Dispositions

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

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

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

Case Abstracts

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

1. Substantiated

An individual was participating in a protest against police brutality when officers placed barricades along the protest route. The individual noticed that one of the officers at the barricade had his shield covered with a black mourning band. The individual asked the officer to show his badge and the officer did not respond to the request – either by verbally giving his shield or by removing the mourning band to display his shield number. Cellphone footage recorded by the individual captured the officer at the barricade with the individual and at least two other civilians asking the officer to show his badge.

Per Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09, officers are required to provide their shield numbers – either verbally or through other means, such as a business card – when requested to do so by civilians.

At the time that the individual and other civilians requested that the officer show his badge, the cellphone footage showed that there were no distracting background noises that would have made the officer unable to hear the multiple requests to show his badge. For these reasons, the investigation determined that the officer refused to provide his shield number. The Board substantiated the abuse of authority allegations.

2. Unsubstantiated

An individual attempted to pass through police barricades and was told by an officer present at the barricades that she could not go through. The individual alleged that the officer told her she could not go through because, “people like you beat up cops.” The individual alleged that the officer had previously let in a number of people ahead of her – people she noted were of a lighter complexion than the individual was. The individual waited and after several minutes, the officer let a vehicle through the barricade and the individual followed after it through the barricades. The officer did not stop her. The officer stated that the area was a frozen zone -so only access to NYPD, construction people, and delivery people were authorized to pass through. The officer stated that she was the only one stationed at the barricades during a tour change and had only let in NYPD members – some of whom had been

plain clothes. She recalls the individual approaching the barricades and asking to be let through and informing her that she could not do so. The office denied making the statement, “people like you beat up cops.” Without any independent witnesses or video footage, along with confirmation that the area the individual tried to enter was a frozen zone, the investigation was unable to reach a conclusive finding. The Board unsubstantiated the offensive language allegation.

3. Unfounded

An individual was participating in a George Floyd/Black Lives Matter protest when he saw several officers near a barricade. The officers were regulating the flow of traffic in and out of a subway station near the protest. The officers were approximately ten feet behind the barricade and the individual approached the barricade and asked approximately seven officers standing closest to the barricade for their names and shield numbers. Two officers provided their names and shield numbers. The others said “this is my name and badge number,” and lifted their shields that were on their shirts towards the individual. The individual couldn’t see them and shouted at a nearby supervisor for assistance but he was one of several people in the crowd shouting for the supervisor’s attention. The individual then asked two protesters – both white, to get the supervisor’s name and shield number. Those two protesters walked behind the barricades and obtained several name and shield numbers from the officers who had not verbally provided them to the individual when he had first asked. The individual asking for and receiving the first two officers’ information was captured in a YouTube video recording. As a result, the investigation found by a preponderance of the evidence that the officers had complied with the individual’s request to identify themselves. The Board unfounded the allegation.

4. Exonerated


A group of officers were arresting a male individual and another group of officers were standing around them in a semi-circle to separate the arrest area from an ongoing Black Lives Matter protest. An unidentified individual approached the group of officers in the semi-circle and asked if the individual under arrest needed legal counsel. The individual attempted to walk through the line of officers. One of the officers informed the unidentified individual that they could not interfere with the arrest and held out his arm and used his hand to push the individual’s shoulder, pushing them a few steps back. The individual responded by telling the officer not to touch her and another officer told her not to come behind them. The unidentified individual did not continue their approach. An individual captured on cellphone video the unidentified individual approaching the police line and the shoulder push back by the officer. The investigation determined that the officer acted appropriately in using reasonable and minimal force by extending his arm to block the unidentified individual from breaching the police line. The force was enough to halt and push the individual away from the police line and ensure that she did not interfere with the ongoing arrest. The Board exonerated the allegation.

5. Officer Unidentified

The CCRB did not close any complaints as “Officer Unidentified” in November 2020.


Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 21: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (November 2020)



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

Figure 22: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2020)



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

Dispositions - All CCRB Cases

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

Figure 23: Disposition of Cases (2019 vs 2020)

	Nov 2019		Nov 2020		YTD 2019		YTD 2020	
Full Investigations	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Substantiated	31	24%	4	40%	344	24%	261	29%
Exonerated	21	17%	1	10%	315	22%	188	21%
Unfounded	14	11%	1	10%	121	8%	85	10%
Unsubstantiated	45	35%	4	40%	556	39%	264	30%
MOS Unidentified	16	13%	0	0%	97	7%	88	10%
Total - Full Investigations	127		10		1433		886	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	14	100%	0	NaN%	169	45%	29	100%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	NaN%	210	55%	0	0%
Total - ADR Closures	14		0		379		29	
Resolved Case Total	141	44%	10	5%	1812	42%	915	31%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	33	18%	31	17%	512	20%	378	18%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	80	44%	68	36%	1173	46%	855	42%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	27	15%	38	20%	410	16%	361	18%
Alleged Victim unidentified	3	2%	7	4%	56	2%	36	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	36	20%	43	23%	345	14%	330	16%
Miscellaneous	2	1%	0	0%	10	0%	8	0%
Administrative closure**	0	0%	0	0%	22	1%	79	4%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	181		187		2528		2047	
Total - Closed Cases	322		197		4340		2962	

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

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

Dispositions - FADO Allegations

“Allegations” are different than “cases.” A case or complaint is based on an incident and may contain one or more allegations of police misconduct. The allegation substantiation rate is 18% for the month of November 2020, and the allegation substantiation rate is 15% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is Discourtesy – substantiating 0% of such allegations during November 2020, and 20% for the year.

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2019 vs 2020)

	Nov 2019		Nov 2020		YTD 2019		YTD 2020	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	97	15%	6	18%	803	12%	660	15%
Unsubstantiated	200	32%	7	21%	2195	33%	1333	30%
Unfounded	68	11%	12	36%	587	9%	487	11%
Exonerated	184	29%	8	24%	2296	35%	1516	34%
MOS Unidentified	77	12%	0	0%	707	11%	521	12%
Total - Full Investigations	626		33		6588		4517	

Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	46	100%	0	NaN%	462	42%	76	100%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	NaN%	627	58%	0	0%
Total - ADR Closures	46		0		1089		76	

Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	83	16%	78	17%	1266	17%	1004	17%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	243	46%	182	40%	3665	50%	2531	44%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	72	14%	63	14%	1011	14%	862	15%
Alleged Victim unidentified	5	1%	13	3%	158	2%	84	1%
Closed - Pending Litigation	111	21%	124	27%	1176	16%	1127	19%
Miscellaneous	11	2%	0	0%	80	1%	83	1%
Administrative closure	0	0%	0	0%	47	1%	100	2%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	525		460		7403		5791	

Total - Closed Allegations	1197		493		15080		10384	
-----------------------------------	------	--	-----	--	-------	--	-------	--

Figure 25: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (November 2020)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	0 0%	0 0%	4 100%	0 0%	0 0%	4 100%
Abuse of Authority	5 22%	3 13%	3 13%	12 52%	0 0%	23 100%
Discourtesy	0 0%	2 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 100%
Offensive Language	1 25%	2 50%	1 25%	0 0%	0 0%	4 100%
Total	6 18%	7 21%	8 24%	12 36%	0 0%	33 100%

Figure 26: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (YTD 2020)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	36 4%	209 25%	385 46%	132 16%	66 8%	828 100%
Abuse of Authority	521 17%	893 29%	1068 34%	260 8%	362 12%	3104 100%
Discourtesy	94 20%	175 37%	62 13%	76 16%	63 13%	470 100%
Offensive Language	9 8%	56 49%	1 1%	19 17%	30 26%	115 100%
Total	660 15%	1333 30%	1516 34%	487 11%	521 12%	4517 100%

Dispositions - Untruthful Statement Allegations

Following the 2019 passage of Ballot Question #2 and the subsequent City Charter Revision, CCRB's jurisdiction was expanded to include untruthful material statements made by police officers. As a result, CCRB added a new "Untruthful Statement" category of allegations.

There are four specific allegations in the new "Untruthful Statement" category: 1) False official statement, 2) Misleading official statement, 3) Inaccurate official statement and 4) Impeding an investigation.

Figure 27: Disposition of Untruthful Statement Allegations (November 2020)

Untruthful Statement Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Administrative Closure		Other	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
False official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Misleading official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inaccurate official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Impeding an investigation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%


Figure 28: Disposition of Untruthful Statement Allegations (YTD 2020)

Untruthful Statement Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Administrative Closure		Other	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
False official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Misleading official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inaccurate official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Impeding an investigation	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	66	0%	0	0%
Total	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	66	100%	0	0%

Substantiation Rates

The November 2020 case substantiation rate was 40%.

Figure 29: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2019 - November 2020)




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

Substantiation Rates and Video


In general, investigations relying on video evidence from security cameras or personal devices result in much higher substantiation rates.

Figure 30: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations without Video (Jan 2020 - Nov 2020) (% substantiated shown)



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

Figure 31: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2020 - Nov 2020)
 (% substantiated shown)



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

Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints

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

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


Figure 32: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints*
(Nov 2019, Nov 2020, YTD 2019, YTD 2020)

Disposition	November 2019		November 2020		YTD 2019		YTD 2020	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	6	19%	1	25%	50	15%	22	8%
Command Discipline	3	10%	3	75%	132	38%	92	35%
Formalized Training	13	42%	0	0%	79	23%	64	25%
Instructions	9	29%	0	0%	83	24%	83	32%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	31		4		344		261	

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

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

Figure 33: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints* (2020)



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

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

Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations

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

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

Figure 34: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations*
(Nov 2019, Nov 2020, YTD 2019, YTD 2020)

Disposition	November 2019		November 2020		YTD 2019		YTD 2020	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	8	15.4%	1	25%	71	14.5%	31	7.9%
Command Discipline	4	7.7%	3	75%	181	36.9%	128	32.5%
Formalized Training	24	46.2%	0	0%	115	23.5%	93	23.6%
Instructions	16	30.8%	0	0%	123	25.1%	142	36%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	52		4		490		394	

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

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

Figure 35: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (November 2020)

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	5	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Other	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn

Truncations

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

Figure 36: Truncated Allegations (November 2020)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Force	13	44	18	9	67	151
Abuse of Authority	51	115	36	4	51	257
Discourtesy	8	18	9	0	4	39
Offensive Language	6	5	0	0	2	13
Total	78	182	63	13	124	460

Figure 37: Truncated CCRB Complaints (November 2020)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	31	68	38	7	43	187

Figure 38: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2020)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Force	183	557	304	27	656	1727
Abuse of Authority	703	1686	461	51	409	3310
Discourtesy	90	234	73	5	50	452
Offensive Language	28	54	24	1	12	119
Total	1004	2531	862	84	1127	5608

Figure 39: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2020)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	378	855	361	36	330	1960

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

Complaints Against Officers Assigned to Police Service Areas

The Police Service Areas (PSA) are commands that police New York City Housing Developments throughout the five boroughs. PSA complaints are defined as complaints that contain at least one FADO allegation against an officer assigned to a PSA command.

Figure 40: PSA Complaints Closed as % of Total Complaints Closed

	Nov 2019	Nov 2020	YTD 2019	YTD 2020
PSA Complaints	17	7	149	116
Total Complaints	322	197	4340	2962
PSA Complaints as % of Total	5.3%	3.6%	3.4%	3.9%

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

Figure 41: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

	Nov 2019	Nov 2020	YTD 2019	YTD 2020
PSA 1	0	2	29	14
PSA 2	10	8	43	35
PSA 3	1	0	10	23
PSA 4	0	0	51	18
PSA 5	0	1	30	17
PSA 6	3	1	22	21
PSA 7	7	0	29	71
PSA 8	6	0	26	14
PSA 9	3	0	26	10
Total	30	12	266	223

Complaints typically contain more than one allegation. The following table shows the allegations made against officers assigned to PSA commands broken out by FADO type.

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

	Nov 2019		Nov 2020		YTD 2019		YTD 2020	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	18	56%	6	40%	119	36%	94	33%
Abuse of Authority (A)	12	38%	5	33%	175	52%	144	50%
Discourtesy (D)	2	6%	3	20%	31	9%	39	14%
Offensive Language (O)	0	0%	1	7%	10	3%	10	3%
Total	32	100%	15	100%	335	100%	287	100%

Dispositions of Officers Assigned to PSAs

The following tables show the Board disposition of officers assigned to a PSA with a FADO allegation made against them.

Figure 43: Disposition of PSA Officers (2019 vs 2020)

	Nov 2019		Nov 2020		YTD 2019		YTD 2020	
Full Investigations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	1	10%	0	0%	18	16%	22	23%
Exonerated	5	50%	1	100%	40	35%	35	37%
Unfounded	0	0%	0	0%	6	5%	10	11%
Unsubstantiated	4	40%	0	0%	50	44%	28	29%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	10		1		114		95	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	0	0%	10	30%	2	100%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	23	70%	0	0%
Total - ADR Closures	0		0		33		2	
Resolved Case Total	10	33%	1	8%	147	55%	97	43%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	6	30%	1	9%	18	15%	20	16%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	6	30%	3	27%	54	45%	51	40%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	4	20%	1	9%	21	18%	23	18%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	2	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	4	20%	6	55%	25	21%	27	21%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	20		11		119		126	
Total - Closed Cases	30		12		266		223	

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

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

Mediation Unit

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

Figure 44: Mediated Complaints Closed

	November 2020			YTD 2020		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	0	0	0	29	0	29

Figure 45: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	November 2020			YTD 2020		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	0	0	0	1	0	1
Abuse of Authority	0	0	0	61	0	61
Discourtesy	0	0	0	11	0	11
Offensive Language	0	0	0	3	0	3
Untruthful Statement				0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	76	0	76

Figure 46: Mediated Complaints By Borough (November 2020)

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

Figure 47: Mediated Allegations By Borough (November 2020)

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

**Figure 48: Mediated Complaints By Precinct
(Nov 2020 - YTD 2020)**

Precinct	Nov 2020	YTD 2020	Precinct	Nov 2020	YTD 2020
19	0	1	62	0	1
23	0	1	67	0	1
24	0	1	71	0	1
28	0	2	75	0	1
34	0	1	78	0	3
43	0	1	81	0	1
44	0	1	84	0	1
45	0	1	103	0	1
47	0	1	104	0	1
50	0	2	107	0	1
52	0	1	110	0	1
61	0	1	121	0	1
			122	0	1

**Figure 49: Mediated Allegations By Precinct
(Nov 2020 - YTD 2020)**

Precinct	Nov 2020	YTD 2020	Precinct	Nov 2020	YTD 2020
19	0	5	62	0	1
23	0	1	67	0	2
24	0	1	71	0	9
28	0	4	75	0	8
34	0	2	78	0	4
43	0	3	81	0	3
44	0	1	84	0	1
45	0	1	103	0	4
47	0	5	104	0	1
50	0	2	107	0	2
52	0	9	110	0	1
61	0	2	121	0	3
			122	0	1

Administrative Prosecution Unit

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

Figure 50: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Nov 2020	YTD 2020
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	0	10
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. A imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. B imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Formalized Training imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Instructions imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Guilty	0	0
	Resolved by plea	0	5
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. B	0	0
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. A	0	0
	Plea set aside, Formalized Training	0	0
	Plea set aside, Instructions	0	0
	*Retained, with discipline	0	6
	Disciplinary Action Total	0	21
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	0	10
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	3
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	0	1
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total	0	14
Not Adjudicated	Charges not served	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	1
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	0	0
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total	0	1
	Total Closures	0	36

*Retained cases are those in which the Department kept jurisdiction pursuant to Section 2 of the April 2, 2012 Memorandum of Understanding between the NYPD and the CCRB.

** When the Department keeps jurisdiction pursuant to Section 2 and does not impose any discipline on the officer, it is the equivalent of a category referred to as "Department Unable to Prosecute" (DUP). Cases are referred to as DUP when the department decides that it will not discipline an officer against whom the Board recommended discipline other than charges.

*** In some cases, the Department conducts its own investigation and prosecution prior to the completion of the CCRB's investigation. In those cases, the APU does not conduct a second prosecution.

† Under the Board's reconsideration process, an officer who has charges recommended as the penalty for a substantiated allegation may have the recommended penalty changed to something other than charges or have the disposition changed to something other than substantiated. In those cases, the APU ceases its prosecution.

NYPD Discipline

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

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

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

Figure 51: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	November 2020	YTD 2020
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	3
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	12
Command Discipline B	0	2
Command Discipline A	0	3
Formalized Training**	0	0
Instructions***	0	1
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	0	21
No Disciplinary Action†	0	14
Adjudicated Total	0	35
Discipline Rate	0%	60%
Not Adjudicated† Total	0	3
Total Closures	0	38

*Where more than one penalty is imposed on a respondent, it is reported under the more severe penalty.

** Formalized training is conducted by the Police Academy, the NYPD Legal Bureau, or other NYPD Unit.

*** Instructions are conducted at the command level.

† The case closure types that define the "Disciplinary Action", "No Disciplinary Action" and "Not Adjudicated" categories are listed in Figure 43 on the previous page.

Figure 52: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	Disposition Type*	November 2020	YTD 2020
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	1
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	1
	Command Discipline B	0	35
	Command Discipline A	3	81
	Formalized Training**	3	102
	Instructions***	10	199
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total	16	420
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	1	13
	SOL Expired	0	3
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	0	24
	No Finding ††††	0	11
	Total	1	51
	Discipline Rate	94%	89%
	DUP Rate	0%	5%

*Where the respondent is found guilty of charges, and the penalty imposed would fall into more than one of the above listed categories, it is reported under the more severe penalty.

** Formalized training is conducted by the Police Academy, the NYPD Legal Bureau, or other NYPD Unit.

*** Instructions are conducted at the command level.

† Trial outcomes in non-APU cases typically involve MOS who turned down command discipline, prompting the police department to proceed with charges.

†† "Filed" is a term used when the police department is not required to take action against the subject officer because the officer has resigned or retired from the department, or has been terminated.

††† When the department decides that it will not discipline an officer against whom the Board recommended discipline other than charges, those cases are referred to as "Department Unable to Prosecute," or DUP.

†††† "No Finding" refers to cases which the department reports as "Administratively Closed."

Figure 53: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (November 2020)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Threat of arrest	18	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Interference with recording	52	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	69	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	70	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide name	70	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide shield number	70	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Other	71	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Other	71	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Other	71	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Other	71	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Entry of Premises	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search of Premises	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to provide name	73	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to provide shield number	73	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Question	75	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Property damaged	77	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Property damaged	77	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	83	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Interference with recording	90	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Vehicle stop	102	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	104	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	109	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	109	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Entry of Premises	115	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Entry of Premises	115	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	115	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	115	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	115	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	115	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	115	Queens	Instructions

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	115	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	115	Queens	Instructions

Figure 54: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (November 2020)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
-------------------	-----------	------------	----------	---------	-----------------

Appendix

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

Figure 55: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	November 2020		October 2020			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	909	31.5%	1051	37.6%	-142	-13.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	790	27.4%	733	26.2%	57	7.8%
Cases 8 Months	189	6.5%	162	5.8%	27	16.7%
Cases 9 Months	158	5.5%	141	5.0%	17	12.1%
Cases 10 Months	140	4.9%	110	3.9%	30	27.3%
Cases 11 Months	108	3.7%	102	3.6%	6	5.9%
Cases 12 Months	102	3.5%	101	3.6%	1	1.0%
Cases 13 Months	101	3.5%	85	3.0%	16	18.8%
Cases 14 Months	84	2.9%	89	3.2%	-5	-5.6%
Cases 15 Months	83	2.9%	66	2.4%	17	25.8%
Cases 16 Months	64	2.2%	49	1.8%	15	30.6%
Cases 17 Months	50	1.7%	31	1.1%	19	61.3%
Cases 18 Months	32	1.1%	21	0.8%	11	52.4%
Cases Over 18 Months	76	2.6%	57	2.0%	19	33.3%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	2886	100.0%	2798	100.0%	88	3.1%

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

	November 2020		October 2020			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	1075	37.2%	1288	46.0%	-213	-16.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	764	26.5%	631	22.6%	133	21.1%
Cases 8 Months	177	6.1%	169	6.0%	8	4.7%
Cases 9 Months	168	5.8%	117	4.2%	51	43.6%
Cases 10 Months	117	4.1%	109	3.9%	8	7.3%
Cases 11 Months	109	3.8%	97	3.5%	12	12.4%
Cases 12 Months	96	3.3%	84	3.0%	12	14.3%
Cases 13 Months	83	2.9%	71	2.5%	12	16.9%
Cases 14 Months	70	2.4%	83	3.0%	-13	-15.7%
Cases 15 Months	76	2.6%	43	1.5%	33	76.7%
Cases 16 Months	44	1.5%	42	1.5%	2	4.8%
Cases 17 Months	42	1.5%	25	0.9%	17	68.0%
Cases 18 Months	25	0.9%	13	0.5%	12	92.3%
Cases Over 18 Months	40	1.4%	26	0.9%	14	53.8%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	2886	100.0%	2798	100.0%	88	3.1%

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

	November 2020		October 2020			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Cases 0-4 Months	667	34.5%	751	39.9%	-84	-11.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	590	30.6%	542	28.8%	48	8.9%
Cases 8 Months	125	6.5%	104	5.5%	21	20.2%
Cases 9 Months	100	5.2%	95	5.1%	5	5.3%
Cases 10 Months	89	4.6%	64	3.4%	25	39.1%
Cases 11 Months	62	3.2%	57	3.0%	5	8.8%
Cases 12 Months	55	2.8%	59	3.1%	-4	-6.8%
Cases 13 Months	54	2.8%	41	2.2%	13	31.7%
Cases 14 Months	40	2.1%	49	2.6%	-9	-18.4%
Cases 15 Months	46	2.4%	39	2.1%	7	17.9%
Cases 16 Months	33	1.7%	26	1.4%	7	26.9%
Cases 17 Months	19	1.0%	11	0.6%	8	72.7%
Cases 18 Months	11	0.6%	9	0.5%	2	22.2%
Cases Over 18 Months	40	2.1%	33	1.8%	7	21.2%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1931	100.0%	1880	100.0%	51	2.7%

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

	November 2020	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1	16.7%
Cases 5-7 Months	3	50.0%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 10 Months	1	16.7%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	1	16.7%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	6	100.0%

Figure 59: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2020)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	3	7.3%	12	29.3%	13	31.7%	8	19.5%	5	12.2%	0	0%
Gun fired	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	0	0%	2	40%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Radio as club	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Flashlight as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Police shield	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle	1	12.5%	0	0%	4	50%	2	25%	1	12.5%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	2	11.1%	2	11.1%	7	38.9%	5	27.8%	2	11.1%	0	0%
Chokehold	2	7.7%	0	0%	12	46.2%	7	26.9%	5	19.2%	0	0%
Pepper spray	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	11	84.6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical force	23	3.7%	339	54.5%	121	19.5%	94	15.1%	45	7.2%	0	0%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	1	12.5%	4	50%	2	25%	1	12.5%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	0	0%	27	73%	7	18.9%	3	8.1%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	2	5.3%	0	0%	24	63.2%	7	18.4%	5	13.2%	0	0%
Total	36	4.3%	385	46.5%	209	25.2%	132	15.9%	66	8%	0	0%

Figure 60: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2020)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	0	0%	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	46	14.6%	213	67.6%	35	11.1%	4	1.3%	16	5.1%	1	0.3%
Strip-searched	13	40.6%	2	6.2%	13	40.6%	4	12.5%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	2	1.8%	55	48.7%	44	38.9%	2	1.8%	10	8.8%	0	0%
Vehicle search	17	9.7%	71	40.6%	67	38.3%	11	6.3%	9	5.1%	0	0%
Threat of summons	1	4.2%	14	58.3%	8	33.3%	0	0%	1	4.2%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	20	8.1%	126	51%	59	23.9%	20	8.1%	22	8.9%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	0	0%	5	41.7%	3	25%	1	8.3%	3	25%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	21	14.9%	36	25.5%	47	33.3%	15	10.6%	22	15.6%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	0	0%	14	40%	12	34.3%	3	8.6%	6	17.1%	0	0%
Property damaged	8	11.4%	16	22.9%	17	24.3%	8	11.4%	20	28.6%	1	1.4%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	10	21.7%	1	2.2%	16	34.8%	1	2.2%	18	39.1%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	4	44.4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	5	11.6%	0	0%	18	41.9%	14	32.6%	6	14%	0	0%
Improper dissemination of medical info	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Other	13	37.1%	14	40%	5	14.3%	1	2.9%	2	5.7%	0	0%
Seizure of property	4	7.8%	31	60.8%	10	19.6%	2	3.9%	4	7.8%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	19	67.9%	2	7.1%	5	17.9%	0	0%
Frisk	34	18.6%	51	27.9%	69	37.7%	4	2.2%	25	13.7%	0	0%
Search (of person)	20	13.8%	28	19.3%	63	43.4%	5	3.4%	29	20%	0	0%
Stop	50	24.2%	86	41.5%	39	18.8%	0	0%	32	15.5%	0	0%
Question	9	10.8%	23	27.7%	25	30.1%	7	8.4%	19	22.9%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	1	14.3%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0%
Interference with recording	10	14.9%	21	31.3%	14	20.9%	18	26.9%	4	6%	0	0%
Search of recording device	2	15.4%	0	0%	6	46.2%	3	23.1%	2	15.4%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	0	0%
Forcible Removal to Hospital	13	7.3%	145	81%	12	6.7%	3	1.7%	5	2.8%	1	0.6%
Threat re: removal to hospital	6	27.3%	6	27.3%	9	40.9%	1	4.5%	0	0%	0	0%

Threat re: immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Disseminated immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Questioned immigration status	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Search of Premises	19	12.8%	80	54.1%	35	23.6%	3	2%	11	7.4%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	0	0%	0	0%	5	45.5%	1	9.1%	5	45.5%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	4	36.4%	0	0%	5	45.5%	2	18.2%	0	0%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Arrest)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Frisk)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Strip-Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Vehicle Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Photo/Video)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Summons)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Photography/Videography	3	13%	7	30.4%	8	34.8%	2	8.7%	3	13%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	0	0%	1	16.7%	3	50%	2	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	14	9%	0	0%	78	50%	50	32.1%	14	9%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	26	14.9%	2	1.1%	75	42.9%	52	29.7%	19	10.9%	1	0.6%
Failure to provide RTKA card	133	54.7%	9	3.7%	45	18.5%	13	5.3%	43	17.7%	0	0%
Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	4	23.5%	0	0%	11	64.7%	1	5.9%	1	5.9%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Question)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Obstructed Shield Number	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Obstructed Rank Designation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Total	521	16.8%	1068	34.4%	893	28.7%	260	8.4%	362	11.6%	4	0.1%
--------------	-----	-------	------	-------	-----	-------	-----	------	-----	-------	---	------

Figure 61: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2020)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	81	20%	60	14.8%	151	37.2%	59	14.5%	55	13.5%	0	0%
Gesture	1	25%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Action	7	13.5%	1	1.9%	20	38.5%	17	32.7%	7	13.5%	0	0%
Other	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	94	20%	62	13.2%	175	37.2%	76	16.2%	63	13.4%	0	0%

Figure 62: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2020)

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	0	0%	0	0%	15	65.2%	3	13%	5	21.7%	0	0%
Ethnicity	2	16.7%	0	0%	1	8.3%	4	33.3%	5	41.7%	0	0%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	6	54.5%	1	9.1%	4	36.4%	0	0%
Physical disability	2	33.3%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%
Other	2	11.8%	1	5.9%	7	41.2%	4	23.5%	3	17.6%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%
Gender	3	7.7%	0	0%	22	56.4%	6	15.4%	8	20.5%	0	0%
Total	9	7.8%	1	0.9%	56	48.7%	19	16.5%	30	26.1%	0	0%

Figure 63: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (November 2020)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Awaiting filing of charges	1	1%
Charges filed, awaiting service	9	9%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	64	65%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	3	3%
Calendared for court appearance	4	4%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	5	5%
Trial scheduled	8	8%
Trial commenced	1	1%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	3	3%
Total	98	100%

CORD is the CO's Report on MOS facing discipline.
SoEH is the Summary of Employment History.
DCS is the Disciplinary Cover Sheet.

Figure 64: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (November 2020)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	2	15%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	4	31%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	5	38%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	0	0%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	2	15%
Total	13	100%

A Fogel response is a letter to the Trial Commissioner with comments from the CCRB on the Trial Commissioner's report and recommendation.

Figure 65: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	1	12	10	213
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	0	25	7	255
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	0	79	27	502
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	1	59	16	436
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	1	69	23	389
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	0	12	11	284
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	1	17	12	182
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	24	4	136
Special Operations Division Total	0	7	1	35
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	3
Total	4	304	111	2435
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	1	1	30
Transit Bureau Total	0	16	8	146
Housing Bureau Total	0	21	12	223
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	17	1	101
Detective Bureau Total	0	13	4	91
Other Bureaus Total	0	13	6	103
Total	0	81	32	694
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	5	0	36
Undetermined	0	4	0	27
Total	4	394	143	3192

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

Figure 66A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
001 Precinct	0	2	0	15
005 Precinct	0	1	4	15
006 Precinct	0	0	1	22
007 Precinct	0	0	1	19
009 Precinct	0	2	1	28
010 Precinct	0	0	1	15
013 Precinct	1	2	1	23
Midtown South Precinct	0	5	0	39
017 Precinct	0	0	0	9
Midtown North Precinct	0	0	1	21
Precincts Total	1	12	10	206
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	0	0	2
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	0	0	4
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	1	12	10	213

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

Figure 66B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
019 Precinct	0	4	0	24
020 Precinct	0	2	0	7
023 Precinct	0	1	0	33
024 Precinct	0	1	0	21
025 Precinct	0	3	2	32
026 Precinct	0	2	0	10
Central Park Precinct	0	0	0	3
028 Precinct	0	0	0	24
030 Precinct	0	1	2	26
032 Precinct	0	1	1	27
033 Precinct	0	0	1	12
034 Precinct	0	9	1	34
Precincts Total	0	24	7	253
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	0	2
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	0	25	7	255

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

Figure 66C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
040 Precinct	0	4	2	32
041 Precinct	0	1	1	27
042 Precinct	0	5	0	34
043 Precinct	0	4	4	43
044 Precinct	0	14	4	77
045 Precinct	0	0	0	21
046 Precinct	0	7	0	41
047 Precinct	0	15	2	75
048 Precinct	0	10	8	44
049 Precinct	0	2	0	12
050 Precinct	0	3	4	23
052 Precinct	0	5	2	57
Precincts Total	0	70	27	486
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	3	0	6
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	0	0	2
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	6	0	8
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	0	79	27	502

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

Figure 66D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
060 Precinct	0	3	1	30
061 Precinct	0	8	0	32
062 Precinct	0	6	3	22
063 Precinct	0	1	2	28
066 Precinct	0	0	2	15
067 Precinct	0	8	1	80
068 Precinct	0	4	0	33
069 Precinct	0	5	0	14
070 Precinct	1	12	3	63
071 Precinct	0	2	2	43
072 Precinct	0	2	1	37
076 Precinct	0	2	0	14
078 Precinct	0	3	1	16
Precincts Total	1	56	16	427
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	3	0	8
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	1	59	16	436

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

Figure 66E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
073 Precinct	0	10	7	70
075 Precinct	0	13	5	80
077 Precinct	0	10	2	52
079 Precinct	0	7	2	43
081 Precinct	0	4	1	7
083 Precinct	0	1	0	19
084 Precinct	1	4	3	28
088 Precinct	0	3	0	12
090 Precinct	0	14	3	60
094 Precinct	0	3	0	18
Precincts Total	1	69	23	389
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	1	69	23	389

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

Figure 66F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
100 Precinct	0	0	0	8
101 Precinct	0	1	4	37
102 Precinct	0	0	2	19
103 Precinct	0	3	1	79
105 Precinct	0	3	0	26
106 Precinct	0	2	2	34
107 Precinct	0	1	2	20
113 Precinct	0	2	0	53
Precincts Total	0	12	11	276
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	0	6
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	2
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	0	12	11	284

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

Figure 66G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
104 Precinct	0	2	0	35
108 Precinct	0	1	6	14
109 Precinct	0	0	0	23
110 Precinct	0	2	3	26
111 Precinct	0	0	0	4
112 Precinct	0	2	2	17
114 Precinct	1	3	1	26
115 Precinct	0	7	0	30
Precincts Total	1	17	12	175
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	4
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	1	17	12	182

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

Figure 66H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
120 Precinct	0	7	2	39
122 Precinct	0	0	0	24
123 Precinct	0	10	0	31
121 Precinct	0	5	2	33
Precincts Total	0	22	4	127
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	2	0	4
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Housing Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Court Section	0	0	0	2
Staten Island Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	24	4	136

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

Figure 66I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	0	1	23
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	0
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	0	0	0
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	0
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	7	0	12
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	0	7	1	35

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

Figure 66J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
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 66K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	1	0	16
Brooklyn Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Bronx Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Queens Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Surface Transportation Enforcement Division (STED)	0	0	0	2
Bus Unit	0	0	1	3
Traffic Control Parking Enforcement District	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Tow Units	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Summons Enforcement	0	0	0	0
Traffic Command Intersection Control	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Intelligence Unit	0	0	0	0
Highway District	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #1	0	0	0	3
Highway Unit #2	0	0	0	1
Highway Unit #3	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	1
Traffic Control Division Total	0	1	1	30

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

Figure 66L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Authority Liaison	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Inspections	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Spec. Invest. Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Crime Analysis	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Patrol Operations	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	0	2	0	8
TB DT02	0	2	0	5
TB DT03	0	0	0	5
TB DT04	0	0	0	16
TB DT11	0	2	0	13
TB DT12	0	1	0	10
TB DT20	0	1	0	9
TB DT23	0	0	0	4
TB DT30	0	0	4	14
TB DT32	0	2	2	17
TB DT33	0	0	2	11
TB DT34	0	2	0	7
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	2	0	13
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	1
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	0
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	2	0	13
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	0	16	8	146

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

Figure 66M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	0	3	2	15
PSA 2	0	5	8	33
PSA 3	0	1	0	18
PSA 4	0	1	0	18
PSA 5	0	0	1	17
PSA 6	0	1	1	19
PSA 7	0	8	0	71
PSA 8	0	1	0	14
PSA 9	0	0	0	10
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	2
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	21	12	223
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	1	0	4
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	0	0	1
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	1
Housing Bureau Total	0	21	12	223

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

Figure 66N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Queens Narcotics	0	11	0	33
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	0	0	8
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	3
Bronx Narcotics	0	0	0	8
Staten Island Narcotics	0	5	1	15
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	0	21
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	1	0	10
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	0
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	1
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	2
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	17	1	101

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

Figure 66O: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	0	3
Special Victims Division	0	1	0	3
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	3	0	12
Detective Borough Bronx	0	1	0	11
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	1	0	18
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	3	4	28
Detective Borough Queens	0	4	0	10
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	0	6
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	0	13	4	91

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

Figure 66P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	7
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	0	13	6	92
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	0
Fleet Services	0	0	0	1
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	1
Health Services	0	0	0	1
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	1
Other Bureaus Total	0	13	6	103

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

Figure 66Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Nov 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Nov 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
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	7
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	1	0	2
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	1
Community Affairs Juvenile Section	0	0	0	0
School Safety Bronx/Manhattan	0	0	0	0
School Safety Queens/Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
Office of Equal Employment	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Operations	0	0	0	0
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	3	0	23
Chief of Department	0	0	0	0
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	2
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	5	0	36

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