



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
July 2021
(Statistics for June 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	28
Complaints by PSA	29
Mediation Unit	31
Administrative Prosecution Unit	33
NYPD Discipline	34
Appendix	39

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 June 2021 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 40% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 53% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In June, the CCRB opened 287 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 3,292 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 40% of its fully investigated cases (page 16).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 25% of the cases it closed in June (page 13) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 40% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency's truncation rate was 43% (page 13). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.
- 4) For June, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 47% of cases - compared to 0% 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, 25-27).
- 6) In June the Police Commissioner finalized 3 decision(s) against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases; 2 were guilty verdicts won by the APU (page 33). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 13 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; no trials were conducted against respondent officers in June.

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 June 2021, the CCRB initiated 287 new complaints.

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




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2020 - June 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 75th Precinct had the highest number at 12 incidents.

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




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




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


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
0	3	67	9
1	2	68	4
5	1	69	6
6	6	70	2
7	2	71	6
9	6	72	3
10	2	73	5
13	2	75	12
14	6	76	1
17	2	77	4
18	5	78	6
19	2	79	7
20	2	81	2
24	3	83	2
25	10	84	2
28	1	88	4
30	1	100	1
32	1	102	5
33	5	103	9
34	6	104	3
40	4	105	6
41	1	106	1
42	6	107	3
43	3	109	2
44	4	110	2
45	1	111	5
46	7	112	2
47	4	113	6
48	3	114	5
49	2	115	2
52	4	120	7
60	5	121	6
61	7	122	4
62	2	123	3
63	4	Unknown	14
66	1		

*These figures track where an incident occurred, not necessarily the Command of the officer. Please review Figures 65A-65Q for Command Level data for cases closed in 2021.

Allegations Received

As described in the previous section, the CCRB has jurisdiction over four categories of NYPD misconduct. In comparing June 2020 to June 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 down. 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 down.

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




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

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

	June 2020		June 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	286	55%	94	33%	-192	-67%
Abuse of Authority (A)	339	65%	219	76%	-120	-35%
Discourtesy (D)	157	30%	62	22%	-95	-61%
Offensive Language (O)	60	12%	10	3%	-50	-83%
Total FADO Allegations	842		385		-457	-54%
Total Complaints	518		287		-231	-45%

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)	1020	44%	720	41%	-300	-29%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1733	75%	1364	78%	-369	-21%
Discourtesy (D)	677	29%	388	22%	-289	-43%
Offensive Language (O)	187	8%	115	7%	-72	-39%
Total FADO Allegations	3617		2587		-1030	-28%
Total Complaints	2300		1758		-542	-24%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	June 2020		June 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	1012	42%	207	25%	-805	-80%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1067	44%	545	65%	-522	-49%
Discourtesy (D)	269	11%	79	9%	-190	-71%
Offensive Language (O)	83	3%	10	1%	-73	-88%
Total Allegations	2431		841		-1590	-65%
Total Complaints	518		287		-231	-45%

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

	YTD 2020		YTD 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	2883	27%	1645	25%	-1238	-43%
Abuse of Authority (A)	6394	60%	4383	65%	-2011	-31%
Discourtesy (D)	1110	10%	535	8%	-575	-52%
Offensive Language (O)	262	2%	150	2%	-112	-43%
Total Allegations	10649		6713		-3936	-37%
Total Complaints	2300		1758		-542	-24%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of June 2021, 40% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 53% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

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

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1192	40.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	403	13.5%
Cases 8-11 Months	401	13.4%
Cases 12-18 Months*	831	27.9%
Cases Over 18 Months**	155	5.2%
Total	2982	100%

*12-18 Months: 19 cases that were reopened; 7 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 14 cases that were reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1029	34.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	423	14.2%
Cases 8-11 Months	394	13.2%
Cases 12-18 Months*	915	30.7%
Cases Over 18 Months**	221	7.4%
Total	2982	100%

*12-18 Months: 22 cases that were reopened; 7 cases that were on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 15 cases that were reopened; 3 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 - June 2021)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	May 2021		June 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	1979	60%	2014	61%	35	2%
Pending Board Review	918	28%	968	29%	50	5%
Mediation	374	11%	304	9%	-70	-19%
On DA Hold	8	0%	6	0%	-2	-25%
Total	3279		3292		13	0%

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	63	68.5%
30 <= Days < 60	3	3.3%
60 <= Days < 90	5	5.4%
90 <= Days	21	22.8%
Total	92	100%

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




Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In June 2021, the CCRB fully investigated 25% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 40% of the cases it closed.

Figure 20: Case Resolutions (January 2020 - June 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

An individual was inside a deli when four plainclothes officers entered the deli a few minutes after him. The officers ordered him to show them his hands and he complied with the instruction. The officers stated that he fit the description of someone wanted for a crime in the area. The individual stated that he was not who they were looking for. The officers accused him of engaging in credit card fraud and having a gun. The officers took a gift card and photo ID from the individual and the individual became upset at the accusations and argued with the officers. Two other officers arrived, and the individual asked them why he was stopped. The subject officer told the individual that “I know you are fucking playing stupid”, and “he is not even a sergeant you fucking idiot”. The individual told the officers “if ya play with fire, ya get burned”, and the subject officer stated that the individual was threatening them. As the other officers argued if the individual’s statement was a threat, the subject officer grabbed the individual’s neck and throat and pushed the individual back against shelves in the deli.

Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 states that officers must be courteous and respectful when interacting with members of the public. Patrol Guide Procedure 221-01 prohibits officers from using chokeholds, which are defined as “any pressure to the throat or windpipe, which may prevent or hinder breathing or reduce intake of air.”

The officer’s actions were captured on BWC footage. The subject officer was captured making the discourteous words throughout the interaction with the individual in the presence of other officers. The subject officer stated that he made those statements because he was frustrated with the individual’s behavior. Other officers present were also frustrated but did not make such statements to the individual. The subject officer stated that the statement made by the individual was a threat and he pushed the individual to keep a safe distance between the officers and the individual. He also stated that his hand ended up in the individual’s throat due to the individual’s movements. The BWC footage showed that the individual was standing approximately two to three feet away from the officers while they argued about the individual’s statement. It also showed the subject officer immediately grabbing the individual by the throat and pushing him into the

shelves. The investigation determined that the officer improperly used discourteous language and improperly used force against the individual. The Board substantiated the Use of Force and Discourteous Word allegations.

2. Unsubstantiated

Three individuals were living in a basement apartment for approximately one to five months. The landlord of the building had two sons – the older son lived in the basement apartment and the younger son was a police officer who did not reside at the apartment. One evening, the individuals, along with some guests and the landlord's older son were playing video games when the older son stated that he had gotten a call from his younger brother and told the guests to leave. The guests were leaving as the officer arrived, along with his landlord father and told the three individuals to “get the fuck out “as he stood in the doorway of the apartment. Police records indicate during the time period of the incident, there was an incident when officers responded to the location. The landlord's officer son was not the officer that responded. Furthermore, the officer stated that he had not spoken to his brother in over eight years and did not have his phone number. The Board unsubstantiated the Abuse of Authority and Discourteous Word allegations.

3. Unfounded

An individual received a phone call and stated that when he answered the phone, the voice on the phone was that of an officer that he was familiar with from a past incident. He stated that the officer threatened to arrest him and “beat the fucking shit out of [the individual]”. The individual stated that the officer hung up before he could respond. The individual provided the number that called him and each time the CCRB investigative team called the number it was out of service. NYPD documents showed that the number did not appear in NYPD's directory and that the subject officer was on leave at the time of the incident. The individual was not able to say whether the caller identified themselves as the subject officer. The investigation found no evidence to support the individual's assertion that it was the subject officer who called him on the incident date. The Board unfounded the Abuse of Authority and Discourteous Word allegations.

4. Exonerated


An individual was watching a protest on her way home from work when she saw police start to arrest protestors that had gotten close to them. The police told everyone to leave the location. The individual stated that she refused to leave because she was concerned about people being arrested. The subject officer came up to the individual, picked her up by both of her arms, pushed her back into a fence and told her, “when I tell you to get out of the park, get out of the fucking park”. The incident was captured on BWC worn by other officers at the scene of the incident. It showed the individual standing approximately five to ten feet away from officers arresting people. It showed the subject officer approach the individual, grab her arms, and push her lightly on the back in the direction of the stairs behind her. The individual walked towards the stairs. It also showed a large hostile crowd who were pushing on officers and a trash can on fire. The subject officer's perception of a threat to the safety of people in the park and thus having everyone leave, and escorting people out who had stayed on despite police instructions to clear the area was reasonable. The investigation determined that the officer used a brief restraint to ensure that the individual followed the instructions in a loud and chaotic environment. The use of profanity while not captured on the BWC, given the stressful and chaotic environment which the subject officer was enmeshed in, the patrol guide allows such language to be used in such a circumstance. The Board exonerated the Use of Force and Discourteous Word allegations.

5. Officer Unidentified

An individual stated that five officers came to her apartment and two of them entered the premises. She believed that the officers were there because of a complaint from her downstairs neighbor. She stated that the officers who were in plainclothes demanded that she showed them her keys as proof that she lived at the apartment. She stated that as she went to look for her keys, the officers told her to forget it and they left. NYPD records shows that there were no search warrants issued for the individual's home, nor arrest warrants for the individual. Without additional information the investigation was unable to identify a subject officer in this case. The Board closed the Abuse of Authority allegation as Officer Unidentified.


Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 21: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (June 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)

	Jun 2020		Jun 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Full Investigations								
Substantiated	46	31%	27	40%	183	29%	75	31%
Exonerated	32	21%	5	7%	129	21%	37	15%
Unfounded	11	7%	1	1%	54	9%	16	7%
Unsubstantiated	43	29%	11	16%	210	33%	67	28%
MOS Unidentified	17	11%	24	35%	51	8%	47	19%
Total - Full Investigations	149		68		627		242	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	0	0%	24	57%	29	0%	43	56%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	18	43%	0	0%	34	44%
Total - ADR Closures	0		42		29		77	
Resolved Case Total	149	23%	110	40%	656	35%	319	25%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	92	19%	29	17%	237	19%	208	21%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	240	48%	45	27%	605	49%	322	33%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	80	16%	45	27%	201	16%	235	24%
Alleged Victim unidentified	7	1%	1	1%	17	1%	17	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	73	15%	27	16%	158	13%	171	17%
Miscellaneous	3	1%	5	3%	6	0%	9	1%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	15	9%	3	0%	17	2%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	495		167		1227		979	
Total - Closed Cases	644		277		1883		1298	

*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 25% for the month of June 2021, and the allegation substantiation rate is 21% year-to-date.

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2020 vs 2021)

	Jun 2020		Jun 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Fully Investigated Allegations								
Substantiated	109	12%	101	25%	410	13%	223	21%
Unsubstantiated	236	27%	79	20%	1009	31%	271	25%
Unfounded	93	11%	14	4%	333	10%	66	6%
Exonerated	333	38%	70	18%	1133	35%	306	28%
MOS Unidentified	103	12%	134	34%	346	11%	213	20%
Total - Full Investigations	874		398		3231		1079	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	64	62%	76	100%	104	56%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	40	38%	0	0%	82	0%
Total - ADR Closures	0		104		76		186	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	277	18%	68	13%	679	19%	542	19%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	757	49%	154	30%	1830	51%	938	32%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	228	15%	138	27%	520	14%	638	22%
Alleged Victim unidentified	23	1%	3	1%	46	1%	47	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	228	15%	98	19%	473	13%	658	23%
Miscellaneous	36	2%	24	5%	66	2%	59	2%
Administrative closure	0	0%	30	6%	7	0%	41	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	1549		515		3621		2923	
Total - Closed Allegations	2423		1017		6928		4189	

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	24 16%	23 15%	25 17%	3 2%	75 50%	150 100%
Abuse of Authority	62 35%	37 21%	35 20%	7 4%	35 20%	176 100%
Discourtesy	10 18%	17 31%	10 18%	3 5%	15 27%	55 100%
Offensive Language	3 20%	2 13%	0 0%	1 7%	9 60%	15 100%
Total	99 25%	79 20%	70 18%	14 4%	134 34%	396 100%

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	57 15%	86 23%	96 26%	21 6%	113 30%	373 100%
Abuse of Authority	118 23%	122 24%	179 35%	32 6%	63 12%	514 100%
Discourtesy	33 22%	51 33%	30 20%	11 7%	28 18%	153 100%
Offensive Language	11 31%	12 34%	1 3%	2 6%	9 26%	35 100%
Total	219 20%	271 25%	306 28%	66 6%	213 20%	1075 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 (June 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	2	100%	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	2	100%	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	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Misleading official statement	2	100%	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%
Impeding an investigation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Substantiation Rates

The June 2021 case substantiation rate was 40%.

Figure 29: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2020 - June 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 - Jun 2021) (% substantiated shown)




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

**Figure 31: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2021 - Jun 2021)
(% substantiated shown)**



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

Figure 32: Disposition of Substantiated Complaints* (2021)



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

* A substantiated complaint may contain a number of substantiated allegations with different dispositions. To determine the disposition associated with the complaint as a whole, the CCRB uses the most severe of the substantiated allegation dispositions. The order of severity is: 1) Charges 2) Command Discipline 3) Formalized Training 4) Instructions.

Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Officers

After a CCRB investigative team has completed its investigation, a panel of Board members determines whether to substantiate the allegation(s) and make a disciplinary recommendation against the officer(s).

- “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 if the officer is found guilty.
- “Command Discipline B” and "Command Discipline A" are recommended for misconduct that is moderately serious. An officer can lose up to ten vacation days as a result of Command Discipline B and up to five vacation days as a result of Command Discipline A.
- “Formalized Training” and “Instructions*” are the least severe discipline, often recommended for officers who misunderstand a policy. This determination results in training at the Police Academy or NYPD Legal Bureau (Formalized Training) or training at the command level (Instructions*).
- 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 33: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations
(Jun 2020, Jun 2021, YTD 2020, YTD 2021)**

Disposition	June 2020		June 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Charges	10	13%	22	46%	26	10%	54	46%
Command Discipline B	11	15%	11	23%	25	9%	22	19%
Command Discipline A	9	12%	13	27%	43	16%	25	21%
Formalized Training	12	16%	2	4%	67	25%	10	9%
Instructions	33	44%	0	0%	111	41%	6	5%
Total	75		48		272		117	

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

*With the adoption of the NYPD Disciplinary Matrix on 03/15/2021, the CCRB no longer issues Instructions as a Board Discipline Recommendation.

** The Board issues a separate Board Discipline Recommendation for each officer in a complaint against whom an allegation is substantiated.

Prior to the CCRB's adoption of the NYPD's Disciplinary Matrix on 03/15/2021, the Board Discipline Recommendation for each officer was determined by the most severe disposition of the allegation(s) substantiated against the officer, with the order of severity as follows: 1. Charges 2. Command Discipline B 3. Command Discipline A 4. Formalized Training 5. Instructions.

Following the adoption of the NYPD Disciplinary Matrix on 03/15/2021, the Board Discipline Recommendation for each officer is determined by the sum of the Matrix penalty days associated with the allegation(s) substantiated against the officer as follows: 1. Charges (penalty days >= 11) 2. Command Discipline B (6 <= penalty days <= 10) 3. Command Discipline A (1 <= penalty days <= 5) 4. Formalized Training (0 < penalty days < 1)

Figure 34: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (June 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)	Offensive Language	Race		
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Race		
Substantiated (Charges)	Untruthful Statement	Misleading official statement		
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	17	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Chokehold	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Restricted Breathing	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Restricted Breathing	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Question	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Question	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Action	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	46	Bronx

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Gun Pointed	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Gun fired	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Retaliatory arrest	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Untruthful Statement	Misleading official statement	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Other	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Obstructed Shield Number	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Obstructed Shield Number	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Pepper spray	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Gun Pointed	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	90	Brooklyn

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat to notify ACS	107	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	107	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Other	109	Queens

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 35: Truncated Allegations (June 2021)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0
Force	6	33	41	3	83
Abuse of Authority	53	105	85	0	243
Discourtesy	9	14	9	0	32
Offensive Language	0	2	3	0	5
Total	68	154	138	3	363

Figure 36: Truncated CCRB Complaints (June 2021)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	29	45	45	1	120

Figure 37: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2021)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0
Force	102	225	219	22	568
Abuse of Authority	374	616	348	22	1360
Discourtesy	59	75	46	3	183
Offensive Language	7	22	25	0	54
Total	542	938	638	47	2165

Figure 38: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2021)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Total	208	322	235	17	782

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 39: PSA Complaints Closed as % of Total Complaints Closed

	Jun 2020	Jun 2021	YTD 2020	YTD 2021
PSA Complaints	27	10	100	53
Total Complaints	644	277	1883	1298
PSA Complaints as % of Total	4.2%	3.6%	5.3%	4.1%

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 40: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

	Jun 2020	Jun 2021	YTD 2020	YTD 2021
PSA 1	4	3	13	10
PSA 2	12	0	27	22
PSA 3	3	2	25	4
PSA 4	2	0	16	3
PSA 5	4	0	19	10
PSA 6	1	0	18	1
PSA 7	20	4	59	30
PSA 8	5	5	13	16
PSA 9	1	1	10	3
Total	52	15	200	99

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

	Jun 2020		Jun 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	22	30%	6	27%	83	32%	53	44%
Abuse of Authority (A)	33	45%	11	50%	137	52%	57	47%
Discourtesy (D)	14	19%	5	23%	33	13%	9	7%
Offensive Language (O)	4	5%	0	0%	9	3%	2	2%
Total	73	99%	22	100%	262	100%	121	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 42: Disposition of PSA Officers (2020 vs 2021)

Full Investigations	Jun 2020		Jun 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	5	28%	1	100%	18	21%	3	30%
Exonerated	3	17%	0	0%	29	33%	6	60%
Unfounded	3	17%	0	0%	13	15%	0	0%
Unsubstantiated	7	39%	0	0%	24	28%	1	10%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	3	3%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	18		1		87		10	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	1	100%	2	100%	1	100%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - ADR Closures	0		1		2		1	
Resolved Case Total	18	35%	2	13%	89	44%	11	11%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	12	35%	1	8%	21	19%	9	10%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	10	29%	2	15%	62	55%	28	32%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	8	24%	6	46%	18	16%	35	40%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Closed - Pending Litigation	4	12%	3	23%	11	10%	14	16%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	2	2%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	34		13		112		88	
Total - Closed Cases	52		15		201		99	

*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 June and this year.

Figure 43: Mediated Complaints Closed

	June 2021			YTD 2021		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	24	18	42	43	34	77

Figure 44: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	June 2021			YTD 2021		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	3	2	5	8	8	16
Abuse of Authority	47	32	79	67	64	131
Discourtesy	12	5	17	21	7	28
Offensive Language	2	1	3	8	3	11
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	64	40	104	104	82	186

Figure 45: Mediated Complaints By Borough (June 2021)

	Mediations
	0
Bronx	5
Brooklyn	11
Manhattan	5
Queens	3
Staten Island	0

Figure 46: Mediated Allegations By Borough (June 2021)

	Mediations
Bronx	16
Brooklyn	28
Manhattan	16
Queens	4
Staten Island	0

**Figure 47: Mediated Complaints By Precinct
(Jun 2021 - YTD 2021)**

Precinct	Jun 2021	YTD 2021	Precinct	Jun 2021	YTD 2021
5	0	1	62	0	1
9	1	1	68	1	1
10	0	2	70	2	2
14	0	1	71	1	1
17	0	1	72	0	1
18	2	3	73	1	1
19	1	1	75	0	1
25	0	1	77	1	1
34	1	1	79	2	3
41	2	2	81	2	2
42	1	1	84	0	1
44	1	1	90	0	1
45	0	1	102	2	3
48	1	1	103	0	1
52	0	2	104	1	1
61	1	1	105	0	1

**Figure 48: Mediated Allegations By Precinct
(Jun 2021 - YTD 2021)**

Precinct	Jun 2021	YTD 2021	Precinct	Jun 2021	YTD 2021
5	0	3	62	0	1
9	7	7	68	1	1
10	0	2	70	3	3
14	0	2	71	3	3
17	0	5	72	0	4
18	4	7	73	1	1
19	4	4	75	0	1
25	0	1	77	7	7
34	1	1	79	5	6
41	10	10	81	7	7
42	3	3	84	0	2
44	2	2	90	0	1
45	0	1	102	2	7
48	1	1	103	0	2
52	0	4	104	2	2
61	1	1	105	0	2

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 49: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Jun 2021	YTD 2021
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	2	6
	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	2	6
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	0	1
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	0
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	1	1
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total	1	2
Not Adjudicated	Charges not served	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	2
	***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	2
	Total Closures	3	10

*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 50: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	June 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	0	1
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	2	5
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	2	6
No Disciplinary Action†	1	2
Adjudicated Total	3	8
Discipline Rate	67%	75%
Not Adjudicated† Total	0	4
Total Closures	3	12

*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 51: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	Disposition Type*	June 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	1
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	6
	Command Discipline B	8	10
	Command Discipline A	6	31
	Formalized Training**	10	38
	Instructions***	0	38
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total		24
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	0	4
	SOL Expired	0	1
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	0	0
	No Finding ††††	0	9
	Total	0	14
	Discipline Rate	100%	90%
	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 52: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (June 2021)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	F	Physical force	19	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Threat of arrest	19	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Stop	19	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	19	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Stop	19	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Stop	19	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	19	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	19	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	19	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	19	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of arrest	40	Bronx	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Retaliatory summons	40	Bronx	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Retaliatory summons	40	Bronx	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Interference with recording	40	Bronx	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Strip-searched	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Strip-searched	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Threat of arrest	70	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	71	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	71	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Entry of Premises	72	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Entry of Premises	72	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search of Premises	72	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Search of Premises	72	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Entry of Premises	73	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Entry of Premises	73	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of arrest	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of arrest	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of arrest	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Demeanor/tone	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Demeanor/tone	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Demeanor/tone	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Seizure of property	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat re: removal to hospital	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat re: removal to hospital	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Seizure of property	79	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	102	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	102	Queens	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of summons	122	Staten Island	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of arrest	122	Staten Island	Command Discipline A

Figure 53: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - APU Adjudicated Cases (June 2021)

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Vehicle	52	Bronx	No Discipline (Retained, without discipline)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Vehicle stop	73	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Vehicle search	73	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Threat of summons	73	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Search (of person)	73	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Vehicle stop	114	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Retaliatory summons	114	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 day(s)
Substantiated (Charges)	D	Action	114	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 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 54: CCRB Open Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	June 2021		May 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1057	32.2%	1076	32.9%	-19	-1.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	472	14.4%	448	13.7%	24	5.4%
Cases 8 Months	146	4.4%	127	3.9%	19	15.0%
Cases 9 Months	122	3.7%	114	3.5%	8	7.0%
Cases 10 Months	110	3.3%	88	2.7%	22	25.0%
Cases 11 Months	82	2.5%	220	6.7%	-138	-62.7%
Cases 12 Months	199	6.1%	262	8.0%	-63	-24.0%
Cases 13 Months	239	7.3%	171	5.2%	68	39.8%
Cases 14 Months	167	5.1%	164	5.0%	3	1.8%
Cases 15 Months	156	4.7%	138	4.2%	18	13.0%
Cases 16 Months	128	3.9%	114	3.5%	14	12.3%
Cases 17 Months	104	3.2%	65	2.0%	39	60.0%
Cases 18 Months	58	1.8%	65	2.0%	-7	-10.8%
Cases Over 18 Months	246	7.5%	219	6.7%	27	12.3%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	3286	100.0%	3271	100.0%	15	0.5%

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

	June 2021		May 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1227	37.3%	1241	37.9%	-14	-1.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	452	13.8%	423	12.9%	29	6.9%
Cases 8 Months	132	4.0%	139	4.2%	-7	-5.0%
Cases 9 Months	129	3.9%	111	3.4%	18	16.2%
Cases 10 Months	104	3.2%	107	3.3%	-3	-2.8%
Cases 11 Months	102	3.1%	242	7.4%	-140	-57.9%
Cases 12 Months	216	6.6%	217	6.6%	-1	-0.5%
Cases 13 Months	200	6.1%	150	4.6%	50	33.3%
Cases 14 Months	145	4.4%	156	4.8%	-11	-7.1%
Cases 15 Months	147	4.5%	142	4.3%	5	3.5%
Cases 16 Months	128	3.9%	84	2.6%	44	52.4%
Cases 17 Months	81	2.5%	62	1.9%	19	30.6%
Cases 18 Months	55	1.7%	60	1.8%	-5	-8.3%
Cases Over 18 Months	168	5.1%	137	4.2%	31	22.6%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	3286	100.0%	3271	100.0%	15	0.5%

Figure 56: CCRB Investigations Docket - Age of CCRB Cases Based On Incident Date

	June 2021		May 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	760	37.7%	729	36.8%	31	4.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	315	15.6%	305	15.4%	10	3.3%
Cases 8 Months	96	4.8%	85	4.3%	11	12.9%
Cases 9 Months	77	3.8%	66	3.3%	11	16.7%
Cases 10 Months	60	3.0%	52	2.6%	8	15.4%
Cases 11 Months	42	2.1%	130	6.6%	-88	-67.7%
Cases 12 Months	119	5.9%	155	7.8%	-36	-23.2%
Cases 13 Months	146	7.2%	95	4.8%	51	53.7%
Cases 14 Months	83	4.1%	78	3.9%	5	6.4%
Cases 15 Months	68	3.4%	60	3.0%	8	13.3%
Cases 16 Months	54	2.7%	47	2.4%	7	14.9%
Cases 17 Months	40	2.0%	26	1.3%	14	53.8%
Cases 18 Months	24	1.2%	30	1.5%	-6	-20.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	130	6.5%	121	6.1%	9	7.4%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	2014	100.0%	1979	100.0%	35	1.8%

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

	June 2021	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	2	33.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 8 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 9 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	1	16.7%
Cases 13 Months	1	16.7%
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	1	16.7%
Cases 18 Months	1	16.7%
Cases Over 18 Months	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	6	100.0%

Figure 58: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2021)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	2	7.7%	6	23.1%	13	50%	2	7.7%	3	11.5%	0	0%
Gun fired	1	20%	4	80%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	1	3%	3	9.1%	0	0%	1	3%	28	84.8%	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	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	0	0%
Vehicle	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Chokehold	3	30%	0	0%	6	60%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%
Pepper spray	8	50%	1	6.2%	0	0%	1	6.2%	6	37.5%	0	0%
Physical force	33	13.8%	79	33.1%	44	18.4%	11	4.6%	67	28%	5	2.1%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	4	33.3%	3	25%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	3	16.7%	0	0%	10	55.6%	1	5.6%	4	22.2%	0	0%
Total	57	15.1%	96	25.4%	86	22.8%	21	5.6%	113	29.9%	5	1.3%

Figure 59: 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%	5	50%	3	30%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	12	20.7%	29	50%	11	19%	0	0%	4	6.9%	2	3.4%
Strip-searched	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	1	14.3%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%
Vehicle search	4	19%	14	66.7%	2	9.5%	0	0%	1	4.8%	0	0%
Threat of summons	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	4	6.8%	27	45.8%	13	22%	5	8.5%	6	10.2%	4	6.8%
Threat to notify ACS	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	7	18.9%	11	29.7%	6	16.2%	7	18.9%	6	16.2%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	1	16.7%	3	50%	1	16.7%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Property damaged	3	17.6%	3	17.6%	3	17.6%	1	5.9%	7	41.2%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	5	55.6%	0	0%	1	11.1%	0	0%	3	33.3%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	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	2	14.3%	1	7.1%	9	64.3%	0	0%	2	14.3%	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	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Seizure of property	4	26.7%	7	46.7%	1	6.7%	1	6.7%	2	13.3%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Frisk	3	15%	11	55%	4	20%	0	0%	2	10%	0	0%
Search (of person)	10	50%	5	25%	3	15%	0	0%	2	10%	0	0%
Stop	3	11.5%	8	30.8%	9	34.6%	0	0%	6	23.1%	0	0%
Question	4	44.4%	3	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22.2%	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	2	18.2%	3	27.3%	3	27.3%	2	18.2%	1	9.1%	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%	1	100%	0	0%
Forcible Removal to Hospital	5	12.8%	21	53.8%	5	12.8%	4	10.3%	3	7.7%	1	2.6%
Threat re: removal to hospital	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Threat re: immigration status	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	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	10	32.3%	14	45.2%	5	16.1%	0	0%	2	6.5%	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	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	0	0%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	7	53.8%	3	23.1%	1	7.7%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	7	25.9%	0	0%	13	48.1%	3	11.1%	4	14.8%	0	0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	13	40.6%	0	0%	16	50%	1	3.1%	2	6.2%	0	0%
Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	2	100%	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	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	0	0%
Obstructed Rank Designation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Sex Miscon (Humiliation: fail to cover)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Untruthful Statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Inappropriate Touching)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Forcible Touching)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Rape)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Sexual Assault)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (On-duty Sexual Activity)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Miscon (Penetrative Sex. Contact)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	118	22.6%	179	34.4%	122	23.4%	32	6.1%	63	12.1%	7	1.3%

Figure 60: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2021)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	26	19.8%	30	22.9%	42	32.1%	7	5.3%	25	19.1%	1	0.8%
Gesture	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Action	7	36.8%	0	0%	7	36.8%	3	15.8%	2	10.5%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	33	21.4%	30	19.5%	51	33.1%	11	7.1%	28	18.2%	1	0.6%

Figure 61: Disposition of Offensive Language Allegations (YTD 2021)

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	0	0%
Ethnicity	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Religion	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%
Physical disability	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	1	11.1%	0	0%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	3	33.3%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender	5	50%	0	0%	4	40%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%
Total	11	31.4%	1	2.9%	12	34.3%	2	5.7%	9	25.7%	0	0%

Figure 62: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (June 2021)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Trial commenced	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	16	12%
Charges filed, awaiting service	30	23%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	59	45%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	6	5%
Calendared for court appearance	1	1%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	12	9%
Trial scheduled	3	2%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	1	1%
Previously adjudicated	2	2%
Total	130	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 63: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Cases Awaiting Final Disposition (June 2021)

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	1	4%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	9	35%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	15	58%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	1	4%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	0	0%
Total	26	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 64: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	2	11	13	75
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	4	10	14	81
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	15	29	61	225
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	3	10	33	146
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	8	19	45	226
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	0	1	11	124
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	3	3	26	69
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	3	6	51
Special Operations Division Total	1	2	4	16
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	1	1
Total	36	88	214	1014
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	4	20
Transit Bureau Total	2	5	22	71
Housing Bureau Total	1	3	15	86
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	1	7	33
Detective Bureau Total	2	8	9	41
Other Bureaus Total	4	8	10	31
Total	9	25	67	282
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	2	3	9	19
Undetermined	1	1	2	11
Total	48	117	292	1326

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

Figure 65A: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan South

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
001 Precinct	0	0	3	9
005 Precinct	0	0	0	2
006 Precinct	0	0	0	0
007 Precinct	0	1	4	13
009 Precinct	0	0	0	4
010 Precinct	0	0	0	4
013 Precinct	0	1	1	8
Midtown South Precinct	1	2	1	9
017 Precinct	1	4	3	12
Midtown North Precinct	0	0	0	5
Precincts Total	2	8	12	66
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	1	0	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	2	1	7
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	2	11	13	75

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

Figure 65B: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Manhattan North

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
019 Precinct	0	0	1	1
020 Precinct	0	0	0	3
023 Precinct	1	1	3	11
024 Precinct	0	0	0	6
025 Precinct	0	0	0	10
026 Precinct	0	1	0	2
Central Park Precinct	0	1	1	3
028 Precinct	0	3	2	11
030 Precinct	0	0	0	8
032 Precinct	0	0	1	5
033 Precinct	0	0	1	6
034 Precinct	2	2	4	13
Precincts Total	3	8	13	79
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	1	0	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	1	1	1	1
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	4	10	14	81

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

Figure 65C: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Bronx

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
040 Precinct	0	0	1	14
041 Precinct	3	3	10	19
042 Precinct	0	2	3	26
043 Precinct	0	0	1	6
044 Precinct	3	5	11	36
045 Precinct	2	2	4	10
046 Precinct	2	5	6	26
047 Precinct	0	2	4	22
048 Precinct	0	1	6	14
049 Precinct	1	1	2	9
050 Precinct	0	0	5	5
052 Precinct	4	8	7	27
Precincts Total	15	29	60	214
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	0	1	7
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	4
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	15	29	61	225

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

Figure 65D: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn South

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
060 Precinct	0	1	2	13
061 Precinct	0	0	5	12
062 Precinct	0	0	0	2
063 Precinct	0	0	3	9
066 Precinct	0	0	1	5
067 Precinct	1	1	5	19
068 Precinct	0	1	1	13
069 Precinct	0	0	2	10
070 Precinct	0	0	3	9
071 Precinct	0	3	4	17
072 Precinct	0	0	1	8
076 Precinct	0	0	1	10
078 Precinct	0	1	0	9
Precincts Total	1	7	28	136
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	2	3	4	9
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	1	1
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	3	10	33	146

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

Figure 65E: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Brooklyn North

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
073 Precinct	0	0	6	18
075 Precinct	0	1	5	108
077 Precinct	1	3	6	23
079 Precinct	4	6	9	18
081 Precinct	0	0	3	11
083 Precinct	0	1	4	16
084 Precinct	0	2	2	7
088 Precinct	0	1	2	7
090 Precinct	3	3	6	12
094 Precinct	0	2	2	6
Precincts Total	8	19	45	226
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	8	19	45	226

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

Figure 65F: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens South

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
100 Precinct	0	0	0	6
101 Precinct	0	0	1	16
102 Precinct	0	0	4	17
103 Precinct	0	0	0	30
105 Precinct	0	0	3	20
106 Precinct	0	0	2	16
107 Precinct	0	1	0	5
113 Precinct	0	0	1	14
Precincts Total	0	1	11	124
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	11	124

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

Figure 65G: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Queens North

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
104 Precinct	0	0	11	16
108 Precinct	0	0	0	2
109 Precinct	1	1	1	7
110 Precinct	0	0	2	7
111 Precinct	0	0	0	8
112 Precinct	0	0	5	8
114 Precinct	0	0	1	10
115 Precinct	2	2	4	9
Precincts Total	3	3	24	67
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	0	1	1
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	1	1
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	3	3	26	69

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

Figure 65H: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Patrol Borough Staten Island

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
120 Precinct	0	1	2	23
122 Precinct	0	0	3	9
123 Precinct	0	0	0	3
121 Precinct	0	2	0	13
Precincts Total	0	3	5	48
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	1	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	0
Staten Island Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	0	3	6	51

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

Figure 65I: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Special Operations Division

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	1	3	9
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	0
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	1	1	1	1
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	1	2	4	16

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

Figure 65J: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Chiefs Office	0	0	1	1
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	1	1

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

Figure 65K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	3	12
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	1	2
Highway Unit #3	0	0	0	5
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	1
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	4	20

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

Figure 65L: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Transit Bureau

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	1	0	1
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	1
TB DT02	0	0	0	9
TB DT03	0	1	0	6
TB DT04	0	1	0	8
TB DT11	0	0	3	5
TB DT12	0	0	6	7
TB DT20	0	0	1	5
TB DT23	0	0	0	0
TB DT30	0	0	6	8
TB DT32	0	0	0	2
TB DT33	0	0	1	10
TB DT34	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	1	1
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	0	0	1
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	2	2
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	2	2	2	4
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	2	5	22	71

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

Figure 65M: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Housing Bureau

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 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	1	1	3	7
PSA 2	0	0	0	19
PSA 3	0	0	2	4
PSA 4	0	0	0	3
PSA 5	0	0	0	9
PSA 6	0	0	0	0
PSA 7	0	2	4	24
PSA 8	0	0	5	16
PSA 9	0	0	1	3
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	1	3	15	86
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	0	1
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	1	3	15	86

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

Figure 65N: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Organized Crime Control Bureau

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Queens Narcotics	0	0	0	6
Manhattan North Narcotics	0	1	4	9
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Bronx Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Narcotics	0	0	1	1
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	0	5
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	0	2	6
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	2
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	4
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	0	1	7	33

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

Figure 650: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 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	1
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	2	2	11
Detective Borough Manhattan	2	2	5	11
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	4	1	9
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	0	8
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	1	1
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	2	8	9	41

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

Figure 65P: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Other Bureaus

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	3
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	4	8	8	24
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	1
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	1
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	0
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	2	2
Other Bureaus Total	4	8	10	31

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

Figure 65Q: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command - Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Jun 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jun 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	1	3
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	1	1	1	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	1	4	11
Chief of Department	1	1	1	2
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	1	1
Office of Management, Analysis and Planning	0	0	0	0
Quality Assurance Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Counterterrorism	0	0	1	1
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	2	3	9	19

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