



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
January 2021
(Statistics for December 2020)

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Glossary	3
Complaints Received	4
CCRB Cases Received By Borough and Precinct	5
Allegations Received	7
CCRB Docket	10
Body Worn Camera Footage Requests	12
Closed Cases	13
Resolving Cases	13
Dispositions / Case Abstracts	14
Dispositions - Full Investigations	16
Dispositions - All CCRB Cases	17
Dispositions - Allegations	18
Substantiation Rates	21
Substantiation Rates and Video	22
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints	23
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Allegations	25
Truncations	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 December 2020 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 43% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 67% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In December, the CCRB opened 279 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 2,815 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 34% of its fully investigated cases (page 16).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 27% of the cases it closed in December (page 13) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 59% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency's truncation rate was 41% (page 13). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.
- 4) For December, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 39% 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, 26-27).
- 6) In December the Police Commissioner finalized 1 decision(s) against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases (page 33). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 12 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 1 trial was conducted against respondent officers in December.

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

Glossary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Complaints Received

The CCRB’s Intake team processes misconduct complaints from the public and referrals from the NYPD. Under the New York City Charter, the CCRB’s jurisdiction is limited to allegations of misconduct related to Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy and Offensive Language. All other complaints are referred to the appropriate agency. Figure 1 refers to all complaints that the CCRB receives and Figures 2 and 3 refer to new cases that remain with the Agency. In December 2020, the CCRB initiated 279 new complaints.

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




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





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



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

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

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




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




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


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
1	1	67	9
5	1	68	1
6	2	69	5
7	1	70	5
9	1	71	2
10	1	72	1
13	3	73	6
14	4	75	16
18	8	76	1
19	3	77	6
20	3	78	2
23	2	79	4
24	3	81	5
25	5	83	4
26	2	84	2
28	4	88	2
30	6	90	4
32	3	94	2
33	3	100	2
34	2	101	5
40	12	102	2
41	4	103	6
42	1	105	2
43	5	106	1
44	14	107	2
45	1	109	3
46	2	111	3
47	5	112	3
48	9	113	3
49	3	114	5
52	5	115	2
60	5	120	4
61	5	121	2
63	3	122	2
66	4	Unknown	19

*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 December 2019 to December 2020, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is down, Abuse of Authority complaints are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down. Figures for the year-to-date comparison show that in 2020, complaints containing an allegation of Force are down, Abuse of Authority are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down.

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




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

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

	December 2019		December 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	132	42%	124	44%	-8	-6%
Abuse of Authority (A)	239	77%	207	74%	-32	-13%
Discourtesy (D)	87	28%	55	20%	-32	-37%
Offensive Language (O)	28	9%	12	4%	-16	-57%
Total FADO Allegations	486		398		-88	-18%
Total Complaints	311		279		-32	-10%

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

Figure 9: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (YTD 2019 vs. YTD 2020)



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

Figure 10: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation YTD (% of Complaints)

	YTD 2019		YTD 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	1963	40%	1632	42%	-331	-17%
Abuse of Authority (A)	3854	78%	2872	74%	-982	-25%
Discourtesy (D)	1198	24%	1035	27%	-163	-14%
Offensive Language (O)	310	6%	277	7%	-33	-11%
Total FADO Allegations	7325		5816		-1509	-21%
Total Complaints	4962		3877		-1085	-22%

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

Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)

	December 2019		December 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	288	23%	243	25%	-45	-16%
Abuse of Authority (A)	766	61%	619	64%	-147	-19%
Discourtesy (D)	157	13%	87	9%	-70	-45%
Offensive Language (O)	38	3%	16	2%	-22	-58%
Total Allegations	1249		965		-284	-23%
Total Complaints	311		279		-32	-10%

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

	YTD 2019		YTD 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	4376	23%	4218	27%	-158	-4%
Abuse of Authority (A)	12109	65%	9634	61%	-2475	-20%
Discourtesy (D)	1854	10%	1577	10%	-277	-15%
Offensive Language (O)	408	2%	362	2%	-46	-11%
Total Allegations	18747		15791		-2956	-16%
Total Complaints	4962		3877		-1085	-22%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of December 2020, 43% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 67% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

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

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1035	42.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	583	24.0%
Cases 8-11 Months	475	19.5%
Cases 12-18 Months*	307	12.6%
Cases Over 18 Months**	31	1.3%
Total	2431	100%

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

**Over18 Months: 10 cases that were reopened; 5 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	906	37.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	586	24.1%
Cases 8-11 Months	513	21.1%
Cases 12-18 Months*	368	15.1%
Cases Over 18 Months**	58	2.4%
Total	2431	100%

*12-18 Months: 11 cases that were reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold.

**Over18 Months: 11 cases that were reopened; 5 cases that were on DA Hold.

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

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




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	November 2020		December 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	1922	67%	1949	69%	27	1%
Pending Board Review	479	17%	482	17%	3	1%
Mediation	475	16%	378	13%	-97	-20%
On DA Hold	6	0%	6	0%	0	0%
Total	2882		2815		-67	-2%

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	64	71.1%
30 <= Days < 60	10	11.1%
60 <= Days < 90	3	3.3%
90 <= Days	13	14.4%
Total	90	100%

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




Closed Cases

Resolving Cases

In December 2020, the CCRB fully investigated 27% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 59% of the cases it closed.

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



Dispositions

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

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

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

Case Abstracts

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

1. Substantiated

A teenager finished playing basketball with friends at a park and was walking home. He was wearing a red pair of sweatpants and sweatshirt carrying his basketball in his hands and had on a brown backpack. As he walked down the street he saw a marked SUV. The driver of the SUV stared at the teenager and the teenager kept on walking. The SUV turned the wrong way on the street and its occupants, three officers exited the vehicle and rushed the teenager. They did not identify themselves or make any statements to the teenager. All three officers were much larger in stature than the teenager. One of the officer's grabbed the teenager's arm and the teenager pushed his arm away. The officers then lifted the teenager in the air and brought him to the ground. A small group of people began to gather as the officers handcuffed the teenager. The officers took the teenager to their precinct where they issued him a summons for disorderly conduct.

Per Patrol Guide Procedure 221-02, officers may use only the reasonable force necessary to gain control or custody of a subject.

At the time that the teenager was surrounded by the officers, he was not a physical threat, was not fleeing and was surrounded by the officers who were markedly larger in stature than he was. The group of people also gathered only after the officers had already handcuffed the teenager who was then taken to a police vehicle. The investigation determined that the officers use of force was not reasonable given the circumstances and that the issuance of a summons was improper. The Board substantiated the use of force and abuse of authority allegations.

2. Unsubstantiated

An individual was arrested for menacing in the 3rd degree by two police officers at a residence. The individual was taken to the precinct stationhouse and began to experience a medical emergency. The two officers called for an ambulance and escorted the individual to the hospital. After receiving treatment, the individual was placed in handcuffs and leg shackles to be taken back to the precinct. Two officers escorted him out to the police vehicle and the individual tripped on his flip flops and one of the

officers reached out to steady him by his elbow. The individual alleged that the officer had pushed him. The officer denied pushing the individual. The BWC footage of one of the officers escorting the individual out of the hospital to a waiting police vehicle did not capture a push of the individual. It captured an officer holding onto the individual's elbow at approximately a foot away from the police vehicle. The other officer present was unable to be interviewed due to an ongoing medical leave. The conflicting testimonies of the individual and the subject officer, the video evidence not being dispositive, and with no independent witness to corroborate either version of events, the investigation was unable to reach a conclusive finding. The Board unsubstantiated the use of force allegation.

3. Unfounded

An individual reported to the CCRB that a friend (whom he referred to using a woman's pseudonym) told him that she was stopped and searched by police. She stated that the police took her phone from her pocket and searched through its contents. The individual then revealed that the friend was a man and he had his male friend reach out to the CCRB. The friend agreed to be interviewed and stated that on the date of the alleged incident, he had spent the entire day with the individual at his apartment. The friend stated that he had not been stopped or searched by police nor had they taken his phone. He stated that he was a longtime friend of the individual, and that the individual suffered from paranoia and delusions. He stated that on the date in question, the individual had made several calls to the police and that when the officers responded, the individual began filming them. The friend stated that the police were polite and did not commit any misconduct. As a result, the investigation found by a preponderance of the evidence the alleged misconduct did not occur. The Board unfounded the allegation.

4. Exonerated


An individual went into a retail store wearing a black bandana around her face. She began coughing and removed her bandana. Store employees noticed the individual coughing without wearing her face covering and informed the store's security about the situation. The store security tried to speak with the individual but she remained unresponsive. The store then called the police for assistance. Two officers responded and at this point the individual had made her way still unmasked to the store's register. The two officers spoke to the individual for over five minutes asking her to put her mask back on. The individual refused. The officers told her to leave the store and the individual refused. The officers held on to her arms and walked her out of the store. The officers let her arms go and stood in front of the store until the individual left the area. The investigation determined that the officers acted appropriately in using reasonable and minimal force to hold onto the individual's arms to escort her out of the store. The Board exonerated the allegation.

5. Officer Unidentified

An individual was barbecuing with friends in the evening when he was approached by approximately eight to ten police officers who had emerged from unmarked and marked vehicles. Some of the officers were in uniform and others were in plain clothes. One of the officers approached the individual and said that the individual was out past the city curfew that was in effect at that time and struck the individual with a baton on the individual's right wrist. The individual immediately packed up his barbecue equipment and left the area. After the individual left the area, the officers left the scene as well. The individual was able to provide a physical description of the officer and noted that the officer had a body worn camera; he did not provide the investigators with any contact information for the friends that he was barbecuing with at the time of the incident. Police records did not yield any evidence which aided in the identification of the subject officer. CCRB received negative results for requests for BWC footage of the incident. A nearby deli that was across the street from the incident was not responsive to requests for video footage. Without any witnesses or documentation of the incident, the investigation was unable to identify the subject officer in this case. The Board closed the allegation as officer unidentified.


Dispositions - Full Investigations

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



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

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



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

Dispositions - All CCRB Cases

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

Figure 23: Disposition of Cases (2019 vs 2020)

	Dec 2019		Dec 2020		YTD 2019		YTD 2020	
Full Investigations	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Substantiated	24	23%	32	34%	368	24%	293	30%
Exonerated	23	22%	12	13%	338	22%	200	20%
Unfounded	9	8%	8	8%	130	8%	93	9%
Unsubstantiated	41	39%	35	37%	597	39%	299	30%
MOS Unidentified	9	8%	8	8%	106	7%	96	10%
Total - Full Investigations	106		95		1539		981	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	18	38%	1	1%	187	44%	30	22%
Mediation Attempted	30	62%	109	99%	240	56%	109	78%
Total - ADR Closures	48		110		427		139	
Resolved Case Total	154	34%	205	59%	1966	41%	1120	34%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	40	13%	32	22%	552	20%	410	19%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	165	54%	49	34%	1338	47%	903	41%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	58	19%	35	24%	468	17%	396	18%
Alleged Victim unidentified	2	1%	2	1%	58	2%	38	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	39	13%	23	16%	383	14%	351	16%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	1	1%	9	0%	9	0%
Administrative closure**	0	0%	1	1%	22	1%	80	4%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	304		143		2830		2187	
Total - Closed Cases	458		348		4796		3307	

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

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

Dispositions - FADO Allegations

“Allegations” are different than “cases.” A case or complaint is based on an incident and may contain one or more allegations of police misconduct. The allegation substantiation rate is 20% for the month of December 2020, and the allegation substantiation rate is 15% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is – substantiating 100% of such allegations during December 2020, and 100% for the year.

Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2019 vs 2020)

	Dec 2019		Dec 2020		YTD 2019		YTD 2020	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Fully Investigated Allegations								
Substantiated	66	14%	81	20%	869	12%	741	15%
Unsubstantiated	168	35%	120	30%	2363	33%	1453	30%
Unfounded	40	8%	45	11%	627	9%	532	11%
Exonerated	165	34%	129	32%	2461	35%	1645	33%
MOS Unidentified	47	10%	27	7%	754	11%	548	11%
Total - Full Investigations	486		402		7074		4919	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	49	40%	2	1%	511	42%	78	21%
Mediation Attempted	74	60%	298	99%	701	58%	298	79%
Total - ADR Closures	123		300		1212		376	
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	127	14%	53	16%	1393	17%	1057	17%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	455	51%	127	39%	4120	50%	2656	43%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	153	17%	61	19%	1164	14%	923	15%
Alleged Victim unidentified	5	1%	6	2%	163	2%	90	1%
Closed - Pending Litigation	149	17%	59	18%	1320	16%	1180	19%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	18	6%	73	1%	101	2%
Administrative closure	0	0%	2	1%	47	1%	102	2%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	889		326		8280		6109	
Total - Closed Allegations	1498		1028		16566		11404	

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	20 19%	28 26%	41 39%	9 8%	8 8%	106 100%
Abuse of Authority	42 19%	63 28%	78 35%	30 13%	13 6%	226 100%
Discourtesy	15 27%	24 43%	10 18%	3 5%	4 7%	56 100%
Offensive Language	2 17%	5 42%	0 0%	3 25%	2 17%	12 100%
Total	79 20%	120 30%	129 32%	45 11%	27 7%	400 100%

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	56 6%	237 25%	426 46%	141 15%	74 8%	934 100%
Abuse of Authority	563 17%	956 29%	1146 34%	290 9%	375 11%	3330 100%
Discourtesy	109 21%	199 38%	72 14%	79 15%	67 13%	526 100%
Offensive Language	11 9%	61 48%	1 1%	22 17%	32 25%	127 100%
Total	739 15%	1453 30%	1645 33%	532 11%	548 11%	4917 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 (December 2020)

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	1	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 2020)

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	1	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%	66	100%	0	0%
Total	2	2.9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	66	97.1%	0	0%

Substantiation Rates

The December 2020 case substantiation rate was 34%.

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




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

Substantiation Rates and Video


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

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



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

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



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

Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints

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

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


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

Disposition	December 2019		December 2020		YTD 2019		YTD 2020	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	5	21%	4	12%	55	15%	26	9%
Command Discipline	5	21%	13	41%	137	37%	105	36%
Formalized Training	8	33%	8	25%	87	24%	72	25%
Instructions	6	25%	7	22%	89	24%	90	31%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	24		32		368		293	

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

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

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



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

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

Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations

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

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

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

Disposition	December 2019		December 2020		YTD 2019		YTD 2020	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	11	25%	4	8.2%	82	15.4%	35	7.9%
Command Discipline	9	20.5%	22	44.9%	190	35.6%	150	33.9%
Formalized Training	13	29.5%	13	26.5%	128	24%	106	23.9%
Instructions	11	25%	10	20.4%	134	25.1%	152	34.3%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	44		49		534		443	

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 (December 2020)

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

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Gun Drawn	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Gun Pointed	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	6	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	9	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	9	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Physical force	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Untruthful Statement	False official statement	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Untruthful Statement	Misleading official statement	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	19	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Force	Hit against inanimate object	19	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Force	Physical force	19	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	Force	Chokehold	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Word	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	63	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	63	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	63	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	63	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Race	63	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	67	Brooklyn

Board Disposition	FADO Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Stop	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Other	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Physical force	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Physical force	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Physical force	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	72	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Action	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	Offensive Language	Sexual orientation	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	78	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Word	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Handcuffs too tight	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat re: removal to hospital	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	94	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	94	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	94	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	94	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Pepper spray	100	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	102	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	102	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	104	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	104	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	110	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	113	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	113	Queens
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	121	Staten Island
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of summons	122	Staten Island
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	122	Staten Island

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 (December 2020)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Force	7	44	21	5	33	110
Abuse of Authority	35	66	30	1	26	158
Discourtesy	7	12	6	0	0	25
Offensive Language	4	5	4	0	0	13
Total	53	127	61	6	59	306

Figure 37: Truncated CCRB Complaints (December 2020)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	32	49	35	2	23	141

Figure 38: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2020)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Force	190	601	325	32	685	1833
Abuse of Authority	738	1750	491	52	433	3464
Discourtesy	97	246	79	5	50	477
Offensive Language	32	59	28	1	12	132
Total	1057	2656	923	90	1180	5906

Figure 39: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2020)

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Pending Litigation*	Total
Total	410	903	396	38	351	2098

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

Complaints Against Officers Assigned to Police Service Areas

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

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

	Dec 2019	Dec 2020	YTD 2019	YTD 2020
PSA Complaints	22	14	171	129
Total Complaints	458	348	4796	3307
PSA Complaints as % of Total	4.8%	4.0%	3.6%	3.9%

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

Figure 41: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

	Dec 2019	Dec 2020	YTD 2019	YTD 2020
PSA 1	1	6	30	20
PSA 2	11	1	54	36
PSA 3	5	3	15	26
PSA 4	6	1	57	19
PSA 5	0	2	30	19
PSA 6	0	1	22	22
PSA 7	13	6	42	77
PSA 8	3	5	29	18
PSA 9	0	1	26	11
Total	39	26	305	248

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

	Dec 2019		Dec 2020		YTD 2019		YTD 2020	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	22	42%	7	19%	141	36%	101	31%
Abuse of Authority (A)	26	49%	18	49%	201	52%	161	50%
Discourtesy (D)	5	9%	9	24%	36	9%	48	15%
Offensive Language (O)	0	0%	3	8%	10	3%	13	4%
Total	53	100%	37	100%	388	100%	323	100%

Dispositions of Officers Assigned to PSAs

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

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

Full Investigations	Dec 2019		Dec 2020		YTD 2019		YTD 2020	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	4	44%	0	0%	22	18%	22	22%
Exonerated	3	33%	6	100%	43	35%	41	41%
Unfounded	0	0%	0	0%	6	5%	10	10%
Unsubstantiated	2	22%	0	0%	52	42%	28	28%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	9		6		123		101	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	0	0%	10	29%	2	11%
Mediation Attempted	1	100%	16	100%	24	71%	16	89%
Total - ADR Closures	1		16		34		18	
Resolved Case Total	10	26%	22	85%	157	51%	119	48%
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	3	10%	0	0%	21	14%	20	16%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	20	69%	4	100%	74	50%	54	42%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	2	7%	0	0%	23	16%	23	18%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	2	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation*	4	14%	0	0%	29	20%	27	21%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	29		4		148		129	
Total - Closed Cases	39		26		305		248	

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

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

Mediation Unit

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

Figure 44: Mediated Complaints Closed

	December 2020			YTD 2020		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	1	109	110	30	109	139

Figure 45: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	December 2020			YTD 2020		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	1	18	19	2	18	20
Abuse of Authority	0	223	223	61	223	284
Discourtesy	1	50	51	12	50	62
Offensive Language	0	7	7	3	7	10
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	298	300	78	298	376

Figure 46: Mediated Complaints By Borough (December 2020)

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

Figure 47: Mediated Allegations By Borough (December 2020)

	Mediations
	0
Bronx	0
Brooklyn	0
Manhattan	2
Queens	0
Staten Island	0

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

Precinct	Dec 2020	YTD 2020	Precinct	Dec 2020	YTD 2020
18	1	1	62	0	1
19	0	1	67	0	1
23	0	1	71	0	1
24	0	1	75	0	1
28	0	2	78	0	3
34	0	1	81	0	1
43	0	1	84	0	1
44	0	1	103	0	1
45	0	1	104	0	1
47	0	1	107	0	1
50	0	2	110	0	1
52	0	1	121	0	1
61	0	1	122	0	1

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

Precinct	Dec 2020	YTD 2020	Precinct	Dec 2020	YTD 2020
18	2	2	62	0	1
19	0	5	67	0	2
23	0	1	71	0	9
24	0	1	75	0	8
28	0	4	78	0	4
34	0	2	81	0	3
43	0	3	84	0	1
44	0	1	103	0	4
45	0	1	104	0	1
47	0	5	107	0	2
50	0	2	110	0	1
52	0	9	121	0	3
61	0	2	122	0	1

Administrative Prosecution Unit

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

Figure 50: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Dec 2020	YTD 2020
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	1	11
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. A imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. B imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Formalized Training imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Instructions imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Guilty	0	0
	Resolved by plea	0	5
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. B	0	0
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. A	0	0
	Plea set aside, Formalized Training	0	0
	Plea set aside, Instructions	0	0
	*Retained, with discipline	0	6
	Disciplinary Action Total		1
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	0	10
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	3
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	0	1
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total		0
Not Adjudicated	Charges not served	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	2	4
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	0	0
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	Not Adjudicated Total		2
Total Closures		3	40

*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*	December 2020	YTD 2020
Terminated	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	1	1
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	3
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	12
Command Discipline B	0	2
Command Discipline A	0	3
Formalized Training**	0	0
Instructions***	0	1
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	1	22
No Disciplinary Action†	0	14
Adjudicated Total	1	36
Discipline Rate	100%	61%
Not Adjudicated† Total	2	4
Total Closures	3	40

*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*	December 2020	YTD 2020
Disciplinary Action	Terminated	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	1
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	1
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	1
	Command Discipline B	1	37
	Command Discipline A	1	81
	Formalized Training**	7	109
	Instructions***	13	212
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	Total	22	442
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	1	14
	SOL Expired	0	3
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	0	24
	No Finding ††††	0	11
	Total	1	52
	Discipline Rate	96%	89%
	DUP Rate	0%	5%

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

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

*** Instructions are conducted at the command level.

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

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

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

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

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

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Property damaged	9	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	9	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Action	9	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Interference with recording	9	Manhattan	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Other	24	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Other	24	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	30	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	30	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	30	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Vehicle search	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Vehicle search	46	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Refusal to process civilian complaint	47	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	47	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search of Premises	48	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	48	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	F	Physical force	49	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	49	Bronx	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Entry of Premises	50	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	50	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	63	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	63	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	63	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	68	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Search (of person)	104	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	105	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	114	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Forcible Removal to Hospital	114	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search (of person)	120	Staten Island	Formalized Training

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Entry of Premises	123	Staten Island	Command Discipline A

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

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Gun Pointed	71	Brooklyn	Dismissal Probation
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Gun Pointed	71	Brooklyn	Dismissal Probation
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Gun Pointed	71	Brooklyn	Dismissal Probation
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Gun Pointed	71	Brooklyn	Dismissal Probation
Substantiated (Charges)	F	Gun Pointed	71	Brooklyn	Dismissal Probation
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Other	71	Brooklyn	Dismissal Probation
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Other	71	Brooklyn	Dismissal Probation
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Other	71	Brooklyn	Dismissal Probation
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Other	71	Brooklyn	Dismissal Probation
Substantiated (Charges)	A	Other	71	Brooklyn	Dismissal Probation

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

	December 2020		November 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	961	34.2%	900	31.3%	61	6.8%
Cases 5-7 Months	664	23.6%	788	27.4%	-124	-15.7%
Cases 8 Months	178	6.3%	188	6.5%	-10	-5.3%
Cases 9 Months	183	6.5%	159	5.5%	24	15.1%
Cases 10 Months	158	5.6%	142	4.9%	16	11.3%
Cases 11 Months	138	4.9%	108	3.8%	30	27.8%
Cases 12 Months	103	3.7%	102	3.5%	1	1.0%
Cases 13 Months	101	3.6%	101	3.5%	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	84	3.0%	84	2.9%	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	60	2.1%	83	2.9%	-23	-27.7%
Cases 16 Months	54	1.9%	64	2.2%	-10	-15.6%
Cases 17 Months	40	1.4%	50	1.7%	-10	-20.0%
Cases 18 Months	22	0.8%	32	1.1%	-10	-31.3%
Cases Over 18 Months	63	2.2%	75	2.6%	-12	-16.0%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	2809	100.0%	2876	100.0%	-67	-2.3%

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

	December 2020		November 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1102	39.2%	1066	37.1%	36	3.4%
Cases 5-7 Months	665	23.7%	762	26.5%	-97	-12.7%
Cases 8 Months	170	6.1%	178	6.2%	-8	-4.5%
Cases 9 Months	173	6.2%	168	5.8%	5	3.0%
Cases 10 Months	166	5.9%	117	4.1%	49	41.9%
Cases 11 Months	111	4.0%	109	3.8%	2	1.8%
Cases 12 Months	103	3.7%	96	3.3%	7	7.3%
Cases 13 Months	92	3.3%	83	2.9%	9	10.8%
Cases 14 Months	63	2.2%	70	2.4%	-7	-10.0%
Cases 15 Months	42	1.5%	76	2.6%	-34	-44.7%
Cases 16 Months	49	1.7%	44	1.5%	5	11.4%
Cases 17 Months	20	0.7%	42	1.5%	-22	-52.4%
Cases 18 Months	20	0.7%	25	0.9%	-5	-20.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	33	1.2%	40	1.4%	-7	-17.5%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	2809	100.0%	2876	100.0%	-67	-2.3%

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

	December 2020		November 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	701	36.0%	658	34.2%	43	6.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	493	25.3%	588	30.6%	-95	-16.2%
Cases 8 Months	134	6.9%	124	6.5%	10	8.1%
Cases 9 Months	123	6.3%	101	5.3%	22	21.8%
Cases 10 Months	94	4.8%	91	4.7%	3	3.3%
Cases 11 Months	84	4.3%	62	3.2%	22	35.5%
Cases 12 Months	58	3.0%	55	2.9%	3	5.5%
Cases 13 Months	53	2.7%	54	2.8%	-1	-1.9%
Cases 14 Months	53	2.7%	40	2.1%	13	32.5%
Cases 15 Months	35	1.8%	46	2.4%	-11	-23.9%
Cases 16 Months	39	2.0%	33	1.7%	6	18.2%
Cases 17 Months	29	1.5%	19	1.0%	10	52.6%
Cases 18 Months	14	0.7%	11	0.6%	3	27.3%
Cases Over 18 Months	39	2.0%	40	2.1%	-1	-2.5%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
Total	1949	100.0%	1922	100.0%	27	1.4%

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

	December 2020	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1	16.7%
Cases 5-7 Months	2	33.3%
Cases 8 Months	1	16.7%
Cases 9 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	1	16.7%
Cases 12 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 13 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 14 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 15 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 16 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 17 Months	1	16.7%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%
Total	6	100.0%

Figure 59: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2020)

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	4	8.2%	15	30.6%	17	34.7%	8	16.3%	5	10.2%	0	0%
Gun fired	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	5	31.2%	2	12.5%	4	25%	1	6.2%	4	25%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Radio as club	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Flashlight as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Police shield	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle	1	12.5%	0	0%	4	50%	2	25%	1	12.5%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%
Hit against inanimate object	3	15.8%	2	10.5%	7	36.8%	5	26.3%	2	10.5%	0	0%
Chokehold	3	9.7%	0	0%	15	48.4%	8	25.8%	5	16.1%	0	0%
Pepper spray	2	14.3%	1	7.1%	11	78.6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical force	33	4.7%	375	54%	136	19.6%	102	14.7%	49	7.1%	0	0%
Handcuffs too tight	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	4	44.4%	2	22.2%	1	11.1%	0	0%
Nonlethal restraining device	0	0%	29	74.4%	7	17.9%	3	7.7%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Restricted Breathing	2	4.8%	0	0%	28	66.7%	7	16.7%	5	11.9%	0	0%
Total	56	6%	426	45.6%	237	25.4%	141	15.1%	74	7.9%	0	0%

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

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	1	7.7%	8	61.5%	4	30.8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Entry of Premises	48	14.4%	222	66.5%	41	12.3%	4	1.2%	18	5.4%	1	0.3%
Strip-searched	13	40.6%	2	6.2%	13	40.6%	4	12.5%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	2	1.7%	56	47.9%	47	40.2%	2	1.7%	10	8.5%	0	0%
Vehicle search	17	9.4%	73	40.6%	69	38.3%	12	6.7%	9	5%	0	0%
Threat of summons	2	7.7%	15	57.7%	8	30.8%	0	0%	1	3.8%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	22	8%	146	52.9%	65	23.6%	21	7.6%	22	8%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	0	0%	5	41.7%	3	25%	1	8.3%	3	25%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	25	16.8%	38	25.5%	48	32.2%	15	10.1%	23	15.4%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	0	0%	15	40.5%	13	35.1%	3	8.1%	6	16.2%	0	0%
Property damaged	9	11.4%	17	21.5%	22	27.8%	9	11.4%	21	26.6%	1	1.3%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	12	21.8%	1	1.8%	20	36.4%	1	1.8%	21	38.2%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory summons	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	4	44.4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	8	13.6%	1	1.7%	20	33.9%	24	40.7%	6	10.2%	0	0%
Improper dissemination of medical info	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Other	22	47.8%	14	30.4%	7	15.2%	1	2.2%	2	4.3%	0	0%
Seizure of property	4	6.7%	38	63.3%	12	20%	2	3.3%	4	6.7%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	19	67.9%	2	7.1%	5	17.9%	0	0%
Frisk	36	18.2%	60	30.3%	73	36.9%	4	2%	25	12.6%	0	0%
Search (of person)	23	15%	31	20.3%	64	41.8%	6	3.9%	29	19%	0	0%
Stop	51	23.8%	89	41.6%	41	19.2%	1	0.5%	32	15%	0	0%
Question	9	10.3%	24	27.6%	26	29.9%	9	10.3%	19	21.8%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0%	1	14.3%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0%
Interference with recording	11	15.5%	23	32.4%	15	21.1%	18	25.4%	4	5.6%	0	0%
Search of recording device	2	13.3%	0	0%	6	40%	5	33.3%	2	13.3%	0	0%
Electronic device information deletion	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	0	0%
Forcible Removal to Hospital	13	7%	150	80.6%	14	7.5%	3	1.6%	5	2.7%	1	0.5%
Threat re: removal to hospital	7	29.2%	7	29.2%	9	37.5%	1	4.2%	0	0%	0	0%

Threat re: immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Disseminated immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Questioned immigration status	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Search of Premises	19	12%	87	55.1%	35	22.2%	4	2.5%	13	8.2%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	0	0%	0	0%	5	45.5%	1	9.1%	5	45.5%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	4	36.4%	0	0%	5	45.5%	2	18.2%	0	0%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Arrest)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Frisk)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Strip-Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Vehicle Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Photo/Video)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Summons)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Photography/Videography	3	12.5%	7	29.2%	8	33.3%	2	8.3%	4	16.7%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	0	0%	1	16.7%	3	50%	2	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to provide name	15	8.8%	0	0%	83	48.5%	56	32.7%	17	9.9%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	29	15.3%	2	1.1%	82	43.4%	56	29.6%	19	10.1%	1	0.5%
Failure to provide RTKA card	138	54.8%	9	3.6%	49	19.4%	13	5.2%	43	17.1%	0	0%
Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	4	23.5%	0	0%	11	64.7%	1	5.9%	1	5.9%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Question)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Obstructed Shield Number	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Obstructed Rank Designation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Total	563	16.9%	1146	34.4%	956	28.7%	290	8.7%	375	11.2%	4	0.1%
--------------	-----	-------	------	-------	-----	-------	-----	------	-----	-------	---	------

Figure 61: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2020)

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	95	20.9%	70	15.4%	170	37.4%	61	13.4%	58	12.8%	0	0%
Gesture	1	25%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
Demeanor/tone	3	42.9%	0	0%	4	57.1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Action	8	13.8%	1	1.7%	23	39.7%	18	31%	8	13.8%	0	0%
Other	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	109	20.7%	72	13.7%	199	37.8%	79	15%	67	12.7%	0	0%

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

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	1	3.7%	0	0%	16	59.3%	4	14.8%	6	22.2%	0	0%
Ethnicity	2	15.4%	0	0%	1	7.7%	5	38.5%	5	38.5%	0	0%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sexual orientation	1	8.3%	0	0%	6	50%	1	8.3%	4	33.3%	0	0%
Physical disability	2	33.3%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%
Other	2	11.8%	1	5.9%	7	41.2%	4	23.5%	3	17.6%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%
Gender	3	6.7%	0	0%	26	57.8%	7	15.6%	9	20%	0	0%
Total	11	8.7%	1	0.8%	61	48%	22	17.3%	32	25.2%	0	0%

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

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Awaiting filing of charges	4	4%
Charges filed, awaiting service	9	9%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	62	63%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	2	2%
Calendared for court appearance	3	3%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	6	6%
Trial scheduled	7	7%
Trial commenced	2	2%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	3	3%
Total	98	100%

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

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

Case Stage	Cases	Percent
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	2	14%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	6	43%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	4	29%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	1	7%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	1	7%
Total	14	100%

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

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

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	8	20	24	237
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	2	27	41	296
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	3	82	57	559
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	9	68	67	503
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	8	77	47	434
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	4	16	30	313
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	5	22	22	204
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	6	30	15	151
Special Operations Division Total	0	7	4	39
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	3
Total	45	349	307	2739
Other Bureaus				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	1	5	35
Transit Bureau Total	2	18	13	159
Housing Bureau Total	0	21	25	247
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	1	18	7	108
Detective Bureau Total	0	13	14	105
Other Bureaus Total	0	13	9	112
Total	3	84	73	766
Other Commands				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	5	5	41
Undetermined	1	5	4	31
Total	49	443	389	3577

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

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

Manhattan South	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
001 Precinct	0	2	4	19
005 Precinct	0	1	0	15
006 Precinct	0	0	3	25
007 Precinct	3	3	3	22
009 Precinct	3	5	3	31
010 Precinct	0	0	0	15
013 Precinct	0	2	2	25
Midtown South Precinct	0	5	2	41
017 Precinct	0	0	2	11
Midtown North Precinct	0	0	2	23
Precincts Total	6	18	21	227
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	1	1	1	3
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	1	1	2	6
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	8	20	24	237

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

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

Manhattan North	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
019 Precinct	1	5	4	28
020 Precinct	0	2	3	10
023 Precinct	0	1	0	33
024 Precinct	0	1	7	28
025 Precinct	0	3	8	40
026 Precinct	0	2	5	15
Central Park Precinct	0	0	0	3
028 Precinct	0	0	2	26
030 Precinct	0	1	0	26
032 Precinct	0	1	2	29
033 Precinct	0	0	3	15
034 Precinct	1	10	7	41
Precincts Total	2	26	41	294
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	1	0	2
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	2	27	41	296

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

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

Bronx	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
040 Precinct	1	5	4	36
041 Precinct	0	1	5	32
042 Precinct	0	5	5	39
043 Precinct	0	4	2	45
044 Precinct	0	14	10	87
045 Precinct	0	0	4	25
046 Precinct	0	7	8	49
047 Precinct	2	17	9	84
048 Precinct	0	10	2	46
049 Precinct	0	2	4	16
050 Precinct	0	3	0	23
052 Precinct	0	5	4	61
Precincts Total	3	73	57	543
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	3	0	6
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	0	0	2
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	6	0	8
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	3	82	57	559

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

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

Brooklyn South	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
060 Precinct	0	3	4	34
061 Precinct	0	8	6	38
062 Precinct	0	6	1	23
063 Precinct	3	4	7	35
066 Precinct	0	0	1	16
067 Precinct	3	11	15	95
068 Precinct	0	4	3	36
069 Precinct	0	5	1	15
070 Precinct	0	12	5	68
071 Precinct	3	5	18	61
072 Precinct	0	2	1	38
076 Precinct	0	2	1	15
078 Precinct	0	3	4	20
Precincts Total	9	65	67	494
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	0	0	1
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	3	0	8
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	9	68	67	503

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

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

Brooklyn North	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
073 Precinct	1	11	7	75
075 Precinct	0	13	11	91
077 Precinct	0	10	4	56
079 Precinct	3	10	11	54
081 Precinct	1	5	1	8
083 Precinct	0	1	1	20
084 Precinct	0	4	2	30
088 Precinct	1	4	3	15
090 Precinct	0	14	3	63
094 Precinct	2	5	4	22
Precincts Total	8	77	47	434
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	77	47	434

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

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

Queens South	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
100 Precinct	0	0	0	8
101 Precinct	0	1	5	41
102 Precinct	1	1	5	24
103 Precinct	1	4	4	83
105 Precinct	1	4	6	32
106 Precinct	0	2	3	37
107 Precinct	0	1	4	24
113 Precinct	1	3	2	55
Precincts Total	4	16	29	304
Patrol Borough Queens South Task Force	0	0	1	7
Patrol Borough Queens South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	2
Queens South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	4	16	30	313

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

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

Queens North	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
104 Precinct	2	4	5	40
108 Precinct	2	3	2	16
109 Precinct	1	1	5	28
110 Precinct	0	2	0	26
111 Precinct	0	0	0	4
112 Precinct	0	2	0	17
114 Precinct	0	3	7	33
115 Precinct	0	7	3	33
Precincts Total	5	22	22	197
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	4
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	5	22	22	204

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

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

Staten Island	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
120 Precinct	1	8	4	43
122 Precinct	2	2	5	29
123 Precinct	0	10	0	31
121 Precinct	3	8	6	39
Precincts Total	6	28	15	142
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	2	0	4
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	0	3
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Housing Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Court Section	0	0	0	2
Staten Island Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	6	30	15	151

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

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

Special Operations	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	0	0	3	26
Harbor Unit	0	0	1	1
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	0	0	0
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	0
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	7	0	12
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Total	0	7	4	39

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

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

Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Chiefs Office	0	0	0	3
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	3

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

Figure 66K: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Traffic Control Division

Traffic Control Division	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	1	3	19
Brooklyn Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Bronx Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Queens Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Surface Transportation Enforcement Division (STED)	0	0	0	2
Bus Unit	0	0	0	3
Traffic Control Parking Enforcement District	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Tow Units	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Summons Enforcement	0	0	0	0
Traffic Command Intersection Control	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Intelligence Unit	0	0	0	0
Highway District	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #1	0	0	1	4
Highway Unit #2	0	0	1	2
Highway Unit #3	0	0	0	2
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	2
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	1
Traffic Control Division Total	0	1	5	35

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

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

Transit Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Authority Liaison	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Inspections	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Spec. Invest. Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Crime Analysis	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Patrol Operations	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	1	3	1	9
TB DT02	0	2	2	7
TB DT03	0	0	1	6
TB DT04	0	0	2	18
TB DT11	0	2	1	14
TB DT12	0	1	1	11
TB DT20	0	1	0	9
TB DT23	1	1	2	6
TB DT30	0	0	0	14
TB DT32	0	2	1	18
TB DT33	0	0	1	12
TB DT34	0	2	1	8
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	2	0	13
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	1
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	0
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	2	0	13
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Total	2	18	13	159

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

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

Housing Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	0	3	6	21
PSA 2	0	5	1	34
PSA 3	0	1	3	21
PSA 4	0	1	1	19
PSA 5	0	0	2	19
PSA 6	0	1	1	20
PSA 7	0	8	5	76
PSA 8	0	1	5	18
PSA 9	0	0	1	11
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	2
Housing Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Bronx/Queens	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Investigations	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Elevator Vandalism Unit	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Operations and Misc. Commands	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Total	0	21	25	247
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	1	0	4
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	0	0	1
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	1
Housing Bureau Total	0	21	25	247

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

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

Organized Crime Control Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Queens Narcotics	0	11	1	34
Manhattan North Narcotics	1	1	1	9
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	3
Bronx Narcotics	0	0	2	10
Staten Island Narcotics	0	5	1	16
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	0	21
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	1	0	10
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	0
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	1
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	2	4
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	1	18	7	108

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

Figure 660: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2020 by Command - Detective Bureau

Detective Bureau	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	1	4
Special Victims Division	0	1	0	3
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	1	1
Gang Division	0	3	0	12
Detective Borough Bronx	0	1	3	14
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	1	0	18
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	3	4	32
Detective Borough Queens	0	4	5	15
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	0	6
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
Detective Bureau Total	0	13	14	105

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

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

Other Bureaus	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	2	9
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	0	13	7	99
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	0
Fleet Services	0	0	0	1
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	1
Health Services	0	0	0	1
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	1
Other Bureaus Total	0	13	9	112

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

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

Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands	Substantiated MOS Dec 2020	Substantiated MOS YTD 2020	Total MOS Dec 2020	Total MOS YTD 2020
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - License Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Legal Matters - Legal Bureau	0	0	0	0
DC Training	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Training - Police Academy Training	0	0	0	7
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	1	0	2
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	0	1	0	1
Police Commissioner Office	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Division	0	0	0	0
Chief of Community Affairs	0	0	1	2
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	1	1
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	3	3	26
Chief of Department	0	0	0	0
Department Advocate	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Public Information	0	0	0	0
Crime Prevention	0	0	0	0
First Deputy Commissioner	0	0	0	0
Office of Management, Analysis and Planning	0	0	0	0
Quality Assurance Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Counterterrorism	0	0	0	2
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	5	5	41

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