



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
March 2021
(Statistics for February 2021)

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 February 2021 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 44% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 56% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In February, the CCRB opened 292 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 3,116 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 75% of its fully investigated cases (page 16).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 7% of the cases it closed in February (page 13) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 20% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency's truncation rate was 72% (page 13). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.
- 4) For February, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 67% 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 February the Police Commissioner finalized 5 decision(s) against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases; 4 were guilty verdicts won by the APU (page 32). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 3 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 2 trials were conducted against respondent officers in February.

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.”

Closed Pending Litigation: Sometimes when a complainant is involved in criminal or civil litigation, their attorney advises against making sworn statements until the conclusion of the court case. When a complainant declines to cooperate with an investigation on the advice of their attorney, the complaint disposition is "Closed Pending Litigation." Prior to January 2021, "Closed Pending Litigation" complaints were counted as truncations in CCRB reporting. In January 2021 the CCRB Board decided that "Closed Pending Litigation" complaints should no longer be counted as truncations.

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 February 2021, the CCRB initiated 292 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2020 - February 2021)




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2020 - February 2021)





Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (YTD 2010 - YTD 2021)



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 23rd Precinct had the highest number at 11 incidents.

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (February 2021)




Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2021)




Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (February 2021)


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
0	2	67	8
1	5	68	6
5	1	69	4
7	2	70	4
9	1	71	4
10	2	72	3
13	1	73	10
14	6	75	10
17	1	76	3
18	4	77	4
19	2	78	3
20	2	79	5
23	11	81	6
24	2	83	1
25	7	84	5
26	3	88	1
28	5	90	2
30	2	100	1
32	5	101	3
33	4	102	6
34	2	103	4
40	6	104	1
41	1	105	7
42	5	107	2
43	2	109	3
44	5	110	2
45	4	111	1
46	4	112	3
47	9	113	5
48	3	114	4
49	5	115	4
50	3	120	3
52	2	121	6
60	6	122	4
61	2	123	1
62	3	Unknown	18
63	3		
66	2		

*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 February 2020 to February 2021, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is down, Abuse of Authority complaints are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are up. Figures for the year-to-date comparison show that in 2021, complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are up.

Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (February 2020 vs. February 2021)




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

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

	February 2020		February 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	146	38%	105	36%	-41	-28%
Abuse of Authority (A)	304	79%	233	80%	-71	-23%
Discourtesy (D)	93	24%	46	16%	-47	-51%
Offensive Language (O)	20	5%	22	8%	2	10%
Total FADO Allegations	563		406		-157	-28%
Total Complaints	384		292		-92	-24%

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 2020 vs. YTD 2021)



*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 2020		YTD 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	292	41%	262	42%	-30	-10%
Abuse of Authority (A)	557	78%	469	76%	-88	-16%
Discourtesy (D)	195	27%	115	19%	-80	-41%
Offensive Language (O)	43	6%	45	7%	2	5%
Total FADO Allegations	1087		891		-196	-18%
Total Complaints	712		617		-95	-13%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	February 2020		February 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	326	20%	231	23%	-95	-29%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1183	72%	683	68%	-500	-42%
Discourtesy (D)	120	7%	59	6%	-61	-51%
Offensive Language (O)	23	1%	25	3%	2	9%
Total Allegations	1652		998		-654	-40%
Total Complaints	384		292		-92	-24%

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

	YTD 2020		YTD 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	662	21%	613	27%	-49	-7%
Abuse of Authority (A)	2145	68%	1458	64%	-687	-32%
Discourtesy (D)	280	9%	159	7%	-121	-43%
Offensive Language (O)	54	2%	56	2%	2	4%
Total Allegations	3141		2286		-855	-27%
Total Complaints	712		617		-95	-13%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of February 2021, 44% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 56% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (February 2021)

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1169	43.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	337	12.6%
Cases 8-11 Months	700	26.1%
Cases 12-18 Months*	412	15.4%
Cases Over 18 Months**	65	2.4%
Total	2683	100%

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

**Over18 Months: 16 cases that were reopened; 4 cases that were on DA Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (February 2021)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1042	38.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	304	11.3%
Cases 8-11 Months	755	28.1%
Cases 12-18 Months*	476	17.7%
Cases Over 18 Months**	106	4.0%
Total	2683	100%

*12-18 Months: 11 cases that were reopened; 0 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 18 cases that were reopened; 6 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 2020 - February 2021)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	January 2021		February 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	2023	70%	2051	66%	28	1%
Pending Board Review	438	15%	632	20%	194	44%
Mediation	413	14%	424	14%	11	3%
On DA Hold	7	0%	9	0%	2	29%
Total	2881		3116		235	8%

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	80	78.4%
30 <= Days < 60	6	5.9%
60 <= Days < 90	4	3.9%
90 <= Days	12	11.8%
Total	102	100%

Figure 19: Percentage of Open Investigations Docket with Pending BWC Requests (January 2020 - February 2021)




Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In February 2021, the CCRB fully investigated 7% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 20% of the cases it closed.

Figure 20: Case Resolutions (January 2020 - February 2021) (%)



Dispositions

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

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

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

Case Abstracts

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

1. Substantiated

Two individuals filed a complaint on the Agency's website stating that an officer disseminated on his twitter account private information about an individual who was arrested during a protest against police violence. The officer made a twitter post accusing the protestor of being a "rioting anarchist" and attached the individual's arrest report which included her address and date of birth along with a photograph of her. Twitter took down the post because it violated their policies – but screenshots had been taken of the post and disseminated among members of the media. The officer stated that someone else had posted the individual's photo before he posted it on his own twitter account.

NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 203-02 states that when accessing information obtained from the department's information system, an officer may only disclose that information as required in the lawful execution of their duty. They are also required to maintain the confidentiality of that information.

When the officer made his post to social media – he disseminated the arrested individual's private information to a wide audience of people who would not have been privy to the confidential information contained in the arrest report. The Board substantiated the Abuse of Authority allegation.

2. Unsubstantiated

An individual was attending protest against police violence when some members of the crowd yelled profane statements at police officers and debris was sporadically thrown toward officers. The individual saw a line of 10 -12 police officers standing in the street and the first subject officer moved with the line of officers and kicked an overturned trash can towards a group of approximate six demonstrators. One of the demonstrators was hit in the leg by the trashcan. The demonstrator stumbled but did not fall. One of the demonstrators kicked the trash can back towards the officers and it did not reach them. Two or three subject officers from the line left the line and arrested the demonstrator who had kicked the trash can back towards the officers as well as some other individuals in the group. The individual approached

the first subject officer approximately ten minutes after the incident and asked why he kicked the trash can. He laughed and rolled his eyes. The individual took photographs of him and the individual only gave a general description of the group of demonstrators that had the trash can kicked towards them. The subject officer stated that during the day of the incident that several people took photographs of him and other officers and he did not specifically recall an individual approaching him and taking his photo nor did he did not recall kicking a trash can at a demonstrator. None of the BWC footage collected from around the time of the incident showed the location that the incident alleged took place – the group of demonstrators could not be located in the available footage. There were no additional independent witness testimony or pertinent video evidence, the investigation was unable to determine which officers alleged used force against at least two unidentified individuals.

The Board unsubstantiated the Abuse of Authority and Use of Force allegations.

3. Unfounded

The CCRB did not close any complaints as "Unfounded" in February 2021

4. Exonerated


The CCRB did not close any complaints as "Exonerated" in February 2021

5. Officer Unidentified

The CCRB did not close any complaints as "Officer Unidentified" in February 2021


Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 21: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (February 2021)



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

Figure 22: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2021)



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 (2020 vs 2021)

	Feb 2020		Feb 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Full Investigations								
Substantiated	11	22%	3	75%	34	24%	18	40%
Exonerated	10	20%	0	0%	33	24%	5	11%
Unfounded	5	10%	0	0%	13	9%	4	9%
Unsubstantiated	20	41%	1	25%	54	39%	12	27%
MOS Unidentified	3	6%	0	0%	6	4%	6	13%
Total - Full Investigations	49		4		140		45	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	6	100%	8	100%	23	100%	8	0%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - ADR Closures	6		8		23		8	
Resolved Case Total	55	26%	12	20%	163	30%	53	17%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	28	18%	10	20%	74	19%	49	18%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	86	55%	22	45%	200	52%	91	34%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	31	20%	11	22%	66	17%	57	21%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	1	2%	4	1%	5	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	10	6%	5	10%	37	10%	64	24%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	1	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	155		49		385		267	
Total - Closed Cases	210		61		548		320	

*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 60% for the month of February 2021, and the allegation substantiation rate is 27% year-to-date.

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2020 vs 2021)

	Feb 2020		Feb 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	23	10%	3	60%	90	13%	43	27%
Unsubstantiated	84	37%	1	20%	219	32%	34	22%
Unfounded	22	10%	0	0%	72	11%	13	8%
Exonerated	70	30%	0	0%	232	34%	49	31%
MOS Unidentified	31	13%	1	20%	65	10%	18	11%
Total - Full Investigations	230		5		678		157	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	17	100%	14	100%	53	100%	14	100%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - ADR Closures	17		14		53		14	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	67	17%	41	25%	181	18%	123	16%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	225	58%	53	33%	573	56%	218	29%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	68	18%	28	17%	148	14%	148	20%
Alleged Victim unidentified	1	0%	5	3%	8	1%	14	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	24	6%	36	22%	95	9%	240	32%
Miscellaneous	3	1%	0	0%	9	1%	12	2%
Administrative closure	0	0%	0	0%	7	1%	3	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	388		163		1021		758	
Total - Closed Allegations	635		182		1752		929	

Figure 25: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (February 2021)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%	1 100%
Abuse of Authority	1 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%
Discourtesy	0 0%	1 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%
Offensive Language	2 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 100%
Total	3 60%	1 20%	0 0%	0 0%	1 20%	5 100%

Figure 26: Disposition of Allegations By FADO Category (YTD 2021)

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	6 16%	4 11%	14 37%	4 11%	10 26%	38 100%
Abuse of Authority	20 22%	23 26%	35 39%	7 8%	4 4%	89 100%
Discourtesy	12 52%	6 26%	0 0%	1 4%	4 17%	23 100%
Offensive Language	4 67%	1 17%	0 0%	1 17%	0 0%	6 100%
Total	42 27%	34 22%	49 31%	13 8%	18 12%	156 100%

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 (February 2021)

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 2021)

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	1	100%	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	1	100%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Substantiation Rates

The February 2021 case substantiation rate was 75%.

Figure 29: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2020 - February 2021)




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 2021 - Feb 2021) (% substantiated shown)



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

Figure 31: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2021 - Feb 2021)
 (% 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*
(Feb 2020, Feb 2021, YTD 2020, YTD 2021)

Disposition	February 2020		February 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	1	9%	3	100%	2	6%	4	22%
Command Discipline	1	9%	0	0%	7	21%	7	39%
Formalized Training	4	36%	0	0%	12	35%	4	22%
Instructions	5	45%	0	0%	13	38%	3	17%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	11		3		34		18	

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* (2021)



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*
(Feb 2020, Feb 2021, YTD 2020, YTD 2021)

Disposition	February 2020		February 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	1	6.2%	3	100%	2	4%	4	16.7%
Command Discipline	1	6.2%	0	0%	10	20%	9	37.5%
Formalized Training	6	37.5%	0	0%	19	38%	6	25%
Instructions	8	50%	0	0%	19	38%	5	20.8%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	16		3		50		24	

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 (February 2021)

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Other		
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Sexual orientation		
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Gender		

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 (February 2021)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Force	16	12	13	3	44
Abuse of Authority	23	36	9	2	70
Discourtesy	1	5	2	0	8
Offensive Language	1	0	4	0	5
Total	41	53	28	5	127

Figure 37: Truncated CCRB Complaints (February 2021)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	10	22	11	1	44

Figure 38: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2021)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0
Force	27	63	61	6	157
Abuse of Authority	79	126	67	7	279
Discourtesy	16	22	14	1	53
Offensive Language	1	7	6	0	14
Total	123	218	148	14	503

Figure 39: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2021)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	49	91	57	5	202

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

	Feb 2020	Feb 2021	YTD 2020	YTD 2021
PSA Complaints	11	1	24	10
Total Complaints	210	61	548	320
PSA Complaints as % of Total	5.2%	1.6%	4.4%	3.1%

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

	Feb 2020	Feb 2021	YTD 2020	YTD 2021
PSA 1	1	0	2	0
PSA 2	2	0	4	4
PSA 3	1	0	1	2
PSA 4	1	0	1	0
PSA 5	1	0	1	0
PSA 6	0	0	7	0
PSA 7	3	2	16	10
PSA 8	4	0	8	0
PSA 9	0	0	4	0
Total	13	2	44	16

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

	Feb 2020		Feb 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	4	24%	0	0%	21	35%	9	45%
Abuse of Authority (A)	9	53%	2	100%	28	47%	10	50%
Discourtesy (D)	3	18%	0	0%	9	15%	1	5%
Offensive Language (O)	1	6%	0	0%	2	3%	0	0%
Total	17	101%	2	100%	60	100%	20	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 (2020 vs 2021)

Full Investigations	Feb 2020		Feb 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	0	0%	0	NaN%	4	20%	0	0%
Exonerated	1	50%	0	NaN%	13	65%	3	75%
Unfounded	0	0%	0	NaN%	0	0%	0	0%
Unsubstantiated	1	50%	0	NaN%	3	15%	1	25%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	NaN%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	2		0		20		4	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - ADR Closures	0		0		1		0	
Resolved Case Total	2	15%	0	0%	21	48%	4	25%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	4	36%	0	0%	5	22%	0	0%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	5	45%	2	100%	10	43%	3	25%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	1	9%	0	0%	4	17%	4	33%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Closed - Pending Litigation	1	9%	0	0%	4	17%	5	42%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	11		2		23		12	
Total - Closed Cases	13		2		44		16	

*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 February and this year.

Figure 44: Mediated Complaints Closed

	February 2021			YTD 2021		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	8	0	8	8	0	8

Figure 45: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	February 2021			YTD 2021		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	1	0	1	1	0	1
Abuse of Authority	11	0	11	11	0	11
Discourtesy	2	0	2	2	0	2
Offensive Language	0	0	0	0	0	0
Untruthful Statement				0	0	0
Total	14	0	14	14	0	14

Figure 46: Mediated Complaints By Borough (February 2021)

	Mediations
	0
Bronx	1
Brooklyn	3
Manhattan	4
Queens	0
Staten Island	0

Figure 47: Mediated Allegations By Borough (February 2021)

	Mediations
	0
Bronx	1
Brooklyn	3
Manhattan	10
Queens	0
Staten Island	0

**Figure 48: Mediated Complaints By Precinct
(Feb 2021 - YTD 2021)**

Precinct	Feb 2021	YTD 2021
10	1	1
17	1	1
18	1	1
25	1	1

**Figure 49: Mediated Allegations By Precinct
(Feb 2021 - YTD 2021)**

Precinct	Feb 2021	YTD 2021
10	1	1
17	5	5
18	3	3
25	1	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	Feb 2021	YTD 2021
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	4	4
	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	0
	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	0
	Disciplinary Action Total		4
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	1	1
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	0
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	0	0
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total		1
Not Adjudicated	Charges not served	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	1
	***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
Total Closures		5	6

*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*	February 2021	YTD 2021
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	1	1
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	3	3
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	0
Formalized Training**	0	0
Instructions***	0	0
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	4	4
No Disciplinary Action†	1	1
Adjudicated Total	5	5
Discipline Rate	80%	80%
Not Adjudicated† Total	0	1
Total Closures	5	6

*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*	February 2021	YTD 2021
Disciplinary Action	Terminated	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	3	3
	Command Discipline B	0	1
	Command Discipline A	1	7
	Formalized Training**	4	6
	Instructions***	10	17
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total	18	34
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	1	3
	SOL Expired	1	1
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	0	0
	No Finding ††††	2	6
	Total	4	10
	Discipline Rate	82%	77%
	DUP Rate	0%	0%

*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 (February 2021)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Threat re: removal to hospital	7	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Threat of summons	18	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	18	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	F	Physical force	28	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	41	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Other	41	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name	41	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Refusal to provide shield number	41	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide shield number	41	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Threat re: removal to hospital	47	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	60	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Threat of arrest	62	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Threat re: removal to hospital	62	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Other	70	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	F	Physical force	72	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Strip-searched	75	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	75	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	75	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	88	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Threat of arrest	90	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	104	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	104	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	107	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	107	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	107	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle stop	112	Queens	Forfeit vacation

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle stop	112	Queens	Forfeit vacation
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Retaliatory summons	112	Queens	Forfeit vacation

Figure 54: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (February 2021)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Chokehold	33	Manhattan	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Restricted Breathing	33	Manhattan	No Discipline (Not guilty after trial)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Frisk	41	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 6 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Frisk	41	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 8 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Stop	41	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 8 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Stop	41	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 6 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	81	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 12 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	81	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Physical force	81	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 12 day(s)

Appendix

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

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

	February 2021		January 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1095	35.2%	1004	34.9%	91	9.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	370	11.9%	468	16.3%	-98	-20.9%
Cases 8 Months	245	7.9%	294	10.2%	-49	-16.7%
Cases 9 Months	290	9.3%	176	6.1%	114	64.8%
Cases 10 Months	177	5.7%	176	6.1%	1	0.6%
Cases 11 Months	179	5.8%	151	5.3%	28	18.5%
Cases 12 Months	152	4.9%	131	4.6%	21	16.0%
Cases 13 Months	132	4.2%	96	3.3%	36	37.5%
Cases 14 Months	93	3.0%	86	3.0%	7	8.1%
Cases 15 Months	85	2.7%	70	2.4%	15	21.4%
Cases 16 Months	68	2.2%	56	1.9%	12	21.4%
Cases 17 Months	54	1.7%	50	1.7%	4	8.0%
Cases 18 Months	49	1.6%	36	1.3%	13	36.1%
Cases Over 18 Months	118	3.8%	80	2.8%	38	47.5%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	3107	100.0%	2874	100.0%	233	8.1%

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

	February 2021		January 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1233	39.7%	1146	39.9%	87	7.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	402	12.9%	519	18.1%	-117	-22.5%
Cases 8 Months	272	8.8%	236	8.2%	36	15.3%
Cases 9 Months	235	7.6%	168	5.8%	67	39.9%
Cases 10 Months	169	5.4%	163	5.7%	6	3.7%
Cases 11 Months	163	5.2%	163	5.7%	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	163	5.2%	105	3.7%	58	55.2%
Cases 13 Months	104	3.3%	94	3.3%	10	10.6%
Cases 14 Months	91	2.9%	76	2.6%	15	19.7%
Cases 15 Months	76	2.4%	50	1.7%	26	52.0%
Cases 16 Months	49	1.6%	36	1.3%	13	36.1%
Cases 17 Months	34	1.1%	47	1.6%	-13	-27.7%
Cases 18 Months	46	1.5%	18	0.6%	28	155.6%
Cases Over 18 Months	70	2.3%	53	1.8%	17	32.1%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	3107	100.0%	2874	100.0%	233	8.1%

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

	February 2021		January 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	777	37.9%	751	37.1%	26	3.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	250	12.2%	354	17.5%	-104	-29.4%
Cases 8 Months	181	8.8%	214	10.6%	-33	-15.4%
Cases 9 Months	196	9.6%	132	6.5%	64	48.5%
Cases 10 Months	122	5.9%	111	5.5%	11	9.9%
Cases 11 Months	104	5.1%	94	4.6%	10	10.6%
Cases 12 Months	86	4.2%	73	3.6%	13	17.8%
Cases 13 Months	66	3.2%	51	2.5%	15	29.4%
Cases 14 Months	43	2.1%	51	2.5%	-8	-15.7%
Cases 15 Months	47	2.3%	48	2.4%	-1	-2.1%
Cases 16 Months	44	2.1%	35	1.7%	9	25.7%
Cases 17 Months	31	1.5%	36	1.8%	-5	-13.9%
Cases 18 Months	36	1.8%	23	1.1%	13	56.5%
Cases Over 18 Months	68	3.3%	50	2.5%	18	36.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	2051	100.0%	2023	100.0%	28	1.4%

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

	February 2021	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	3	33.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 8 Months	1	11.1%
Cases 9 Months	2	22.2%
Cases 10 Months	1	11.1%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	1	11.1%
Cases 14 Months	1	11.1%
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	9	100.0%

Figure 59: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2021)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gun fired	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Radio as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	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	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Vehicle	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hit against inanimate object	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Chokehold	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Pepper spray	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Physical force	4	13.8%	12	41.4%	3	10.3%	2	6.9%	8	27.6%	0	0%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nonlethal restraining device	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	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	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Restricted Breathing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	6	15.8%	14	36.8%	4	10.5%	4	10.5%	10	26.3%	0	0%

Figure 60: Disposition of Abuse of Authority Allegations (YTD 2021)

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Entry of Premises	1	14.3%	5	71.4%	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Strip-searched	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	1	25%	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle search	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of summons	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	2	22.2%	5	55.6%	2	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	1	12.5%	2	25%	0	0%	4	50%	1	12.5%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Property damaged	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Retaliatory summons	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	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	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Seizure of property	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Frisk	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Search (of person)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Stop	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
Question	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Interference with recording	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Search of recording device	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Forcible Removal to Hospital	5	45.5%	6	54.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat re: removal to hospital	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	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	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Search of Premises	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	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)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Arrest)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Frisk)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Strip-Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Vehicle Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Photo/Video)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Summons)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Photography/Videography	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Refusal to provide name	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	2	33.3%	0	0%	4	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	1	14.3%	0	0%	6	85.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	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	1	100%	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	20	22.5%	35	39.3%	23	25.8%	7	7.9%	4	4.5%	0	0%
--------------	----	-------	----	-------	----	-------	---	------	---	------	---	----

Figure 61: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2021)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	7	58.3%	0	0%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	3	25%	0	0%
Gesture	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Action	5	50%	0	0%	5	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	12	52.2%	0	0%	6	26.1%	1	4.3%	4	17.4%	0	0%

Figure 62: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2021)

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Ethnicity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Religion	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual orientation	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gender	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	4	66.7%	0	0%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%	0	0%

Figure 63: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (February 2021)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Calendared for court appearance	0	0%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	0	0%
Trial commenced	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	7	7%
Charges filed, awaiting service	6	6%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	58	62%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	11	12%
Trial scheduled	9	10%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	3	3%
Total	94	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 (February 2021)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	2	11%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	8	42%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	5	26%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	0	0%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	4	21%
Total	19	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 2021 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	0	2	3	10
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	0	4	5	13
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	0	5	8	51
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	0	1	3	30
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	0	3	23	64
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	0	1	5	21
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	0	3	13
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	1	1	14
Special Operations Division Total	0	1	0	8
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	0
Total	0	18	51	224
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	2	3
Transit Bureau Total	0	1	1	12
Housing Bureau Total	0	0	2	16
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	1	1	11
Detective Bureau Total	3	4	4	9
Other Bureaus Total	0	0	1	5
Total	3	6	11	56
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	0	0	2
Undetermined	0	0	0	4
Total	3	24	62	286

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

Figure 66A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
001 Precinct	0	0	0	1
005 Precinct	0	0	0	0
006 Precinct	0	0	0	0
007 Precinct	0	0	0	0
009 Precinct	0	0	0	0
010 Precinct	0	0	0	0
013 Precinct	0	0	0	1
Midtown South Precinct	0	0	0	2
017 Precinct	0	2	3	5
Midtown North Precinct	0	0	0	0
Precincts Total	0	2	3	9
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	0	2	3	10

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

Figure 66B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
019 Precinct	0	0	0	0
020 Precinct	0	0	2	2
023 Precinct	0	0	0	0
024 Precinct	0	0	0	3
025 Precinct	0	0	3	3
026 Precinct	0	1	0	1
Central Park Precinct	0	0	0	0
028 Precinct	0	3	0	3
030 Precinct	0	0	0	0
032 Precinct	0	0	0	0
033 Precinct	0	0	0	1
034 Precinct	0	0	0	0
Precincts Total	0	4	5	13
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	0	0	0
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	0	4	5	13

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

Figure 66C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
040 Precinct	0	0	0	2
041 Precinct	0	0	0	3
042 Precinct	0	2	1	16
043 Precinct	0	0	0	0
044 Precinct	0	1	0	4
045 Precinct	0	0	0	4
046 Precinct	0	0	2	4
047 Precinct	0	0	2	4
048 Precinct	0	1	2	5
049 Precinct	0	0	0	0
050 Precinct	0	0	0	0
052 Precinct	0	1	0	6
Precincts Total	0	5	7	48
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	0	1	3
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	0	5	8	51

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

Figure 66D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
060 Precinct	0	1	0	3
061 Precinct	0	0	1	6
062 Precinct	0	0	1	1
063 Precinct	0	0	0	2
066 Precinct	0	0	0	1
067 Precinct	0	0	1	3
068 Precinct	0	0	0	3
069 Precinct	0	0	0	2
070 Precinct	0	0	0	0
071 Precinct	0	0	0	0
072 Precinct	0	0	0	0
076 Precinct	0	0	0	0
078 Precinct	0	0	0	7
Precincts Total	0	1	3	28
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	0	0	2
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	0	1	3	30

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

Figure 66E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
073 Precinct	0	0	1	1
075 Precinct	0	0	21	52
077 Precinct	0	0	0	0
079 Precinct	0	0	0	1
081 Precinct	0	0	0	1
083 Precinct	0	1	0	4
084 Precinct	0	1	0	2
088 Precinct	0	0	0	0
090 Precinct	0	0	1	2
094 Precinct	0	1	0	1
Precincts Total	0	3	23	64
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	0	3	23	64

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

Figure 66F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
100 Precinct	0	0	0	0
101 Precinct	0	0	0	1
102 Precinct	0	0	1	2
103 Precinct	0	0	0	8
105 Precinct	0	0	0	3
106 Precinct	0	0	0	2
107 Precinct	0	1	0	1
113 Precinct	0	0	4	4
Precincts Total	0	1	5	21
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	0	1	5	21

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

Figure 66G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
104 Precinct	0	0	2	3
108 Precinct	0	0	0	0
109 Precinct	0	0	0	3
110 Precinct	0	0	0	0
111 Precinct	0	0	0	4
112 Precinct	0	0	0	0
114 Precinct	0	0	1	1
115 Precinct	0	0	0	2
Precincts Total	0	0	3	13
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	0	3	13

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

Figure 66H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
120 Precinct	0	1	0	8
122 Precinct	0	0	1	3
123 Precinct	0	0	0	0
121 Precinct	0	0	0	3
Precincts Total	0	1	1	14
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	0	0
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	1	1	14

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

Figure 66I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	1	0	2
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	0	0	6
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	0	1	0	8

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

Figure 66J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Chiefs Office	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	0

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

Figure 66K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	2	3
Brooklyn Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Bronx Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Queens Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Surface Transportation Enforcement Division (STED)	0	0	0	0
Bus Unit	0	0	0	0
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	0
Highway Unit #2	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #3	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	0
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	2	3

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

Figure 66L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Authority Liaison	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Inspections	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Spec. Invest. Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Crime Analysis	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Patrol Operations	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	0	0	0	0
TB DT02	0	0	0	0
TB DT03	0	0	0	1
TB DT04	0	1	0	2
TB DT11	0	0	0	0
TB DT12	0	0	0	1
TB DT20	0	0	0	1
TB DT23	0	0	0	0
TB DT30	0	0	0	1
TB DT32	0	0	0	1
TB DT33	0	0	1	3
TB DT34	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	0	0
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	1
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	0
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	0	0	0
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	0	1	1	12

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

Figure 66M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	0	0	0	0
PSA 2	0	0	0	4
PSA 3	0	0	0	2
PSA 4	0	0	0	0
PSA 5	0	0	0	0
PSA 6	0	0	0	0
PSA 7	0	0	2	10
PSA 8	0	0	0	0
PSA 9	0	0	0	0
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	0	2	16
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	0	0	2	16

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

Figure 66N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Queens Narcotics	0	0	0	3
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	1	1	5
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Bronx Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	0	2
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	0	0	1
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	0
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	1	1	11

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

Figure 660: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Special Victims Division	0	0	0	0
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	0	0	0
Detective Borough Bronx	0	1	0	3
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	0	1	1
Detective Borough Brooklyn	3	3	3	3
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	0	2
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	0	0
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	3	4	4	9

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

Figure 66P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	0	0	1	5
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	0
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	0
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Other Bureaus Total	0	0	1	5

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

Figure 66Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Feb 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Feb 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
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	1
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	0	0	0	0
Police Commissioner Office	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Division	0	0	0	0
Chief of Community Affairs	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Juvenile Section	0	0	0	0
School Safety Bronx/Manhattan	0	0	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	0	0	1
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	0
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	0	0	2

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