



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](http://www.nyc.gov/ccrb)



FREDERICK DAVIE  
CHAIR

**Executive Director's Monthly Report**  
**February 2021**  
**(Statistics for January 2021)**

## Contents

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

# Executive Summary

The Civilian Complaint Review Board (“CCRB”) is an independent municipal Agency that investigates complaints of NYPD misconduct. Every month, the CCRB prepares an Executive Director report for its public meeting. Data for January 2021 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 44% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 62% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In January, the CCRB opened 337 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 2,894 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 37% of its fully investigated cases (page 16).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 16% of the cases it closed in January (page 13) and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or attempted mediation) 16% of the cases it closed (page 17). The Agency's truncation rate was 61% (page 13). This is primarily driven by uncooperative complainants/alleged victims, or witnesses.
- 4) For January, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 40% of cases - compared to 17% of cases in which video was not available (page 21-22).
- 5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6, 26).
- 6) In January the Police Commissioner did not finalize any decisions against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases (page 32). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 1 trial against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 1 trial was conducted against respondent officers in January.

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 January 2021, the CCRB initiated 337 new complaints.


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



**Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2020 - January 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 40th Precinct had the highest number at 17 incidents.

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



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



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


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
0	2	67	10
1	4	68	3
5	2	70	1
6	1	71	3
7	2	72	2
9	1	73	14
10	1	75	15
13	4	76	3
14	12	77	5
18	5	78	2
19	2	79	7
20	3	81	5
23	1	83	5
24	2	84	4
25	4	88	7
26	3	90	2
28	6	100	1
30	2	101	9
32	2	102	3
33	7	103	5
34	3	104	8
40	17	105	5
41	5	106	5
42	6	107	1
43	5	108	1
44	6	109	2
45	1	110	3
46	3	111	1
47	6	112	4
48	4	113	7
49	1	114	9
50	2	115	2
52	6	120	7
60	9	121	2
61	6	122	2
62	3	Unknown	19
63	4		

\*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 January 2020 to January 2021, the number of complaints containing an allegation of Force is up, 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 up, Abuse of Authority are down, Discourtesy are down and Offensive Language are down.

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



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


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

	January 2020		January 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	147	45%	155	46%	8	5%
Abuse of Authority (A)	252	77%	235	70%	-17	-7%
Discourtesy (D)	100	30%	59	18%	-41	-41%
Offensive Language (O)	23	7%	20	6%	-3	-13%
Total FADO Allegations	522		469		-53	-10%
Total Complaints	328		337		9	3%

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)	147	45%	155	46%	8	5%
Abuse of Authority (A)	252	77%	235	70%	-17	-7%
Discourtesy (D)	100	30%	59	18%	-41	-41%
Offensive Language (O)	23	7%	20	6%	-3	-13%
<b>Total FADO Allegations</b>	<b>522</b>		<b>469</b>		<b>-53</b>	<b>-10%</b>
<b>Total Complaints</b>	<b>328</b>		<b>337</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>

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

**Figure 11: Total Allegations (% of Total Allegations)**

	January 2020		January 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	335	23%	363	31%	28	8%
Abuse of Authority (A)	950	64%	693	59%	-257	-27%
Discourtesy (D)	157	11%	83	7%	-74	-47%
Offensive Language (O)	31	2%	27	2%	-4	-13%
Total Allegations	1473		1166		-307	-21%
Total Complaints	328		337		9	3%

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

	YTD 2020		YTD 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	335	23%	363	31%	28	8%
Abuse of Authority (A)	950	64%	693	59%	-257	-27%
Discourtesy (D)	157	11%	83	7%	-74	-47%
Offensive Language (O)	31	2%	27	2%	-4	-13%
Total Allegations	1473		1166		-307	-21%
Total Complaints	328		337		9	3%

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

# CCRB Docket

As of the end of January 2021, 44% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 62% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

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

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1089	44.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	453	18.3%
Cases 8-11 Months	572	23.1%
Cases 12-18 Months*	313	12.6%
Cases Over 18 Months**	49	2.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2476</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*12-18 Months: 11 cases that were reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.

\*\*Over18 Months: 12 cases that were reopened; 3 cases that were on DA Hold.

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


	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	955	38.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	405	16.4%
Cases 8-11 Months	646	26.1%
Cases 12-18 Months*	397	16.0%
Cases Over 18 Months**	73	2.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2476</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*12-18 Months: 13 cases that were reopened; 2 cases that were on DA Hold.


\*\*Over18 Months: 12 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 - January 2021)**



**Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis**



**Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change**

	December 2020		January 2021		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	1943	69%	2038	70%	95	5%
Pending Board Review	482	17%	438	15%	-44	-9%
Mediation	378	13%	413	14%	35	9%
On DA Hold	7	0%	5	0%	-2	-29%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2810</b>		<b>2894</b>		<b>84</b>	<b>3%</b>

# 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	77	83.7%
30 <= Days < 60	4	4.3%
60 <= Days < 90	3	3.3%
90 <= Days	8	8.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>100%</b>

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




# Closed Cases

## Resolving Cases

In January 2021, the CCRB fully investigated 16% of the cases it closed, and resolved (fully investigated, mediated or mediation attempted) 16% of the cases it closed.

**Figure 20: Case Resolutions (January 2020 - January 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 called 911 and requested both EMS and NYPD to respond to his home. In his call he stated that his wife had not been taking her medication and was screaming, trashing her room, and starting fights. Two NYPD officers arrived at the home and spoke to the individual. BWC footage captured the entire incident. The officers told her that they were waiting for EMS as she paced. The wife then insisted that she needed to use the bathroom and the officers told her that she couldn't leave the bedroom until EMS arrived. The wife kicked at the ankle of one of the officers and they moved to place the wife in handcuffs. An officer stated that the wife was "act (ing) like an animal." The officers restrained her on the couch for over 20 minutes until EMS arrived. In that time the wife made several profane and rational statements. When EMS arrived, she refused to leave the couch, so the officers carried her out to a waiting stretcher. Once in the ambulance the wife told the officers repeatedly to "suck {her} dick," and one of the officers responded by saying, "how are you a girl if you have a dick?", "just shut the fuck up already. It's been an hour; shut up."

Per Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 requires that officers interact with member of the public in a professional manner and Patrol Guide Procedure 203-10 prohibits officers from making discourteous or disrespectful remarks regarding a person's gender or gender identify/expression.

At the time that the officers were handcuffing the wife and she physically resisted, the remark of likening her to an animal did not aid the officers in physically securing her – it was made to demean her. The same sentiment marks the remarks made by the officer once the wife was in the ambulance. For these reasons, the investigation determined that the officers spoke discourteously to the wife. The Board substantiated the discourteous allegations.

### 2. Unsubstantiated

An individual was sitting in a park with a friend discussing a wanted poster that stated that the individual was wanted for grand larceny. As she spoke two officers approached her. The incident from this point on was captured on BWC. She told the officers that she did not steal the items but returned them to the owner was a pastor in the neighborhood. She stated that they could go to the pastor's house to confirm that she had returned his possessions. The officers placed a hand on the woman as she stood up from the bench and

handcuffed her without incident. The BWC footage ends and the woman is taken to the precinct. She was placed in a holding cell for approximately 10 minutes and was released by one of the officers who had arrested her – he had confirmed with a superior officer that the woman’s arrest had been voided. As the woman was at the front desk being processed for release, she asked an officer for paperwork relating to her arrest, the officer whom had let her out of the holding cell said, “get out, get out, you are not getting anything, get out before I make up a charge.” The woman let the precinct not wanting to argue with any officers. The officer stated that he did not recall making the statement to the woman or giving the woman any paperwork regarding her arrest. Without any independent witnesses to hear the officer threaten to arrest the woman as she was being processed at the front desk, the investigation was unable to reach a conclusive finding. The Board unsubstantiated the abuse of authority allegation.

### **3. Unfounded**

An individual who had been walking his dog in a park and got into a dispute with another individual whom was also walking their dog. The individual called 911 and EMS and NYPD responded. The individual sitting inside an ambulance getting an injury bandaged up when an officer approached the ambulance with his BWC on. The officer approached the individual and explained to him that he was to be placed under arrest for allegedly assaulting the other dog walker and taken to the precinct. The individual alleged that the officer grabbed him above his bandaged elbow and squeezed it and said, “we can do this the easy way or the hard way.” The BWC shows the officer explaining to the individual why he must come to the precinct and at no point did the officer make the statement or squeeze the individual’s elbow. The individual was then placed in handcuffs without incident. As a result, the investigation found by a preponderance of the evidence that the officer did not make the threatening remark to the individual or squeeze the individual’s elbow. The Board unfounded the allegation.

### **4. Exonerated**

An individual was driving his vehicle and had his girlfriend, her friend, and his uncle with him. He was pulled over by officers. The incident was captured on BWC. The individual was asked for his driver’s license and registration and the individual produced the documents from his wallet. The officer saw that the wallet also contained a gun permit and the officer asked the individual if he had a gun in the car and the individual responded that there were no weapons in the car. The individual and the vehicle occupants were ordered out of the vehicle. The individual and his uncle were frisked. The individual asked why he was stopped and an officer responded that he noticed that the individual’s vehicle had a defective license plate and that after pulling the vehicle over, he smelled a strong odor of marijuana coming from the vehicle. Other officers begin to search the vehicle and the individual stated that they didn’t have his permission to search the vehicle. The search of the vehicle yielded two bags of marijuana which belonged to the individual’s girlfriend and her friend. The individual was issued a summons for the license plate infraction. The investigation showed by the preponderance of the evidence that the officers smelled the odor of marijuana coming from the vehicle when they had pulled it over therefore there was probable cause that the individual was guilty of a crime which justified the frisk of the individual for weapons as a safety measure. The odor of marijuana also provided justification to search the occupants of the vehicle and conduct a search of the vehicle for evidence of the source of the marijuana odor. The Board exonerated the allegations.


### **5. Officer Unidentified**

An individual reported that she saw an incident of police misconduct recorded on an Instagram account. She could not identify the date or time of the incident nor any specific officer. She alleged that video showed an officer waving his baton like a toy and that another officer had been disrespectful and rude. She identified two videos on the Instagram page. One video showed groups of protestors around a park chanting and an automated NYPD message telling them to stay on the sidewalk. The other video showed an unidentified police officer telling protestors to get back with a line of officers forming a line to stop protestors from moving forward. Police records did not yield any evidence which aided in the identification of the subject officers. CCRB received negative results for BWC footage. Without any witnesses or documentation of an incident, the investigation was unable to identify the subject officers in this case. The Board closed the allegations as officer unidentified.




## Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 21: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (January 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)**

	Jan 2020		Jan 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
<b>Full Investigations</b>								
Substantiated	23	25%	15	37%	23	25%	15	37%
Exonerated	23	25%	5	12%	23	25%	5	12%
Unfounded	8	9%	4	10%	8	9%	4	10%
Unsubstantiated	34	37%	11	27%	34	37%	11	27%
MOS Unidentified	3	3%	6	15%	3	3%	6	15%
<b>Total - Full Investigations</b>	<b>91</b>		<b>41</b>		<b>91</b>		<b>41</b>	
<b>Mediation Closures</b>	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	17	100%	0	0%	17	100%	0	0%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total - ADR Closures</b>	<b>17</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>17</b>		<b>0</b>	
<b>Resolved Case Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>Truncations / Other Closures</b>	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint withdrawn	46	20%	39	18%	46	20%	39	18%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	114	50%	69	32%	114	50%	69	32%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	35	15%	46	21%	35	15%	46	21%
Alleged Victim unidentified	4	2%	4	2%	4	2%	4	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	27	12%	59	27%	27	12%	59	27%
Miscellaneous	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	3	1%	1	0%	3	1%	1	0%
<b>Total - Other Case Dispositions</b>	<b>230</b>		<b>218</b>		<b>230</b>		<b>218</b>	
<b>Total - Closed Cases</b>	<b>338</b>		<b>259</b>		<b>338</b>		<b>259</b>	

\*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 26% for the month of January 2021, and the allegation substantiation rate is 26% year-to-date. The type of allegation the CCRB is most likely to substantiate is – substantiating 100% of such allegations during January 2021, and 100% for the year.

**Figure 24: Disposition of Allegations (2020 vs 2021)**

	Jan 2020		Jan 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
<b>Fully Investigated Allegations</b>	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	67	15%	40	26%	67	15%	40	26%
Unsubstantiated	135	30%	33	22%	135	30%	33	22%
Unfounded	50	11%	13	9%	50	11%	13	9%
Exonerated	162	36%	49	32%	162	36%	49	32%
MOS Unidentified	34	8%	17	11%	34	8%	17	11%
<b>Total - Full Investigations</b>	<b>448</b>		<b>152</b>		<b>448</b>		<b>152</b>	
<b>Mediation Closures</b>	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	36	100%	0	0%	36	100%	0	0%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total - ADR Closures</b>	<b>36</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>36</b>		<b>0</b>	
<b>Truncations / Other Closures</b>	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	114	18%	82	14%	114	18%	82	14%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	348	55%	165	28%	348	55%	165	28%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	80	13%	120	20%	80	13%	120	20%
Alleged Victim unidentified	7	1%	9	2%	7	1%	9	2%
Closed - Pending Litigation	71	11%	204	34%	71	11%	204	34%
Miscellaneous	6	1%	12	2%	6	1%	12	2%
Administrative closure	7	1%	3	1%	7	1%	3	1%
<b>Total - Other Case Dispositions</b>	<b>633</b>		<b>595</b>		<b>633</b>		<b>595</b>	
<b>Total - Closed Allegations</b>	<b>1117</b>		<b>747</b>		<b>1117</b>		<b>747</b>	

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	6 16%	4 11%	14 38%	4 11%	9 24%	37 100%
Abuse of Authority	19 22%	23 26%	35 40%	7 8%	4 5%	88 100%
Discourtesy	12 55%	5 23%	0 0%	1 5%	4 18%	22 100%
Offensive Language	2 50%	1 25%	0 0%	1 25%	0 0%	4 100%
Total	39 26%	33 22%	49 32%	13 9%	17 11%	151 100%

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

	Substantiated	Unsubstantiated	Exonerated	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	6 16%	4 11%	14 38%	4 11%	9 24%	37 100%
Abuse of Authority	19 22%	23 26%	35 40%	7 8%	4 5%	88 100%
Discourtesy	12 55%	5 23%	0 0%	1 5%	4 18%	22 100%
Offensive Language	2 50%	1 25%	0 0%	1 25%	0 0%	4 100%
Total	39 26%	33 22%	49 32%	13 9%	17 11%	151 100%

## 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 (January 2021)**

Untruthful Statement Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Administrative Closure		Other	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
False official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Misleading official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inaccurate official statement	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Impeding an investigation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>


**Figure 28: Disposition of Untruthful Statement Allegations (YTD 2021)**

Untruthful Statement Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Administrative Closure		Other	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
False official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Misleading official statement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inaccurate official statement	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Impeding an investigation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

## Substantiation Rates

The January 2021 case substantiation rate was 37%.

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



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

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



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

## Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Complaints

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

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

**Figure 32: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints\***  
(Jan 2020, Jan 2021, YTD 2020, YTD 2021)


Disposition	January 2020		January 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	1	4%	1	7%	1	4%	1	7%
Command Discipline	6	26%	7	47%	6	26%	7	47%
Formalized Training	8	35%	4	27%	8	35%	4	27%
Instructions	8	35%	3	20%	8	35%	3	20%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>		<b>15</b>		<b>23</b>		<b>15</b>	

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

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



**Figure 33: Board Discipline Recommendations For Substantiated Complaints\* (2021)**



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

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

## Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations

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

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

**Figure 34: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations\***  
(Jan 2020, Jan 2021, YTD 2020, YTD 2021)

Disposition	January 2020		January 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Charges	1	2.9%	1	4.8%	1	2.9%	1	4.8%
Command Discipline	9	26.5%	9	42.9%	9	26.5%	9	42.9%
Formalized Training	13	38.2%	6	28.6%	13	38.2%	6	28.6%
Instructions	11	32.4%	5	23.8%	11	32.4%	5	23.8%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>		<b>21</b>		<b>34</b>		<b>21</b>	

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 (January 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 (Formalized Training)	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	9	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	17	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	17	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	17	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	17	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Physical force	17	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Physical force	17	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	24	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Discourtesy	Action	24	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Action	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Action	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Force	Physical force	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Threat to damage/seize property	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	Discourtesy	Word	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Offensive Language	Gender	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	78	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Question	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Abuse of Authority	Question	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Action	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	Discourtesy	Action	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle stop	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Abuse of Authority	Obstructed Shield Number	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Force	Physical force	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	Untruthful Statement	Inaccurate official statement	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	120	Staten Island
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Discourtesy	Word	120	Staten Island
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	Offensive Language	Gender	120	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 (January 2021)**

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0
Force	11	51	48	3	113
Abuse of Authority	56	90	58	5	209
Discourtesy	15	17	12	1	45
Offensive Language	0	7	2	0	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>376</b>

**Figure 37: Truncated CCRB Complaints (January 2021)**

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>158</b>

**Figure 38: Truncated Allegations (YTD 2021)**

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0
Force	11	51	48	3	113
Abuse of Authority	56	90	58	5	209
Discourtesy	15	17	12	1	45
Offensive Language	0	7	2	0	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>376</b>

**Figure 39: Truncated CCRB Complaints (YTD 2021)**

	Withdrawn	Uncooperative	Unavailable	Civilian Unidentified	Total
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>158</b>

## 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**

	Jan 2020	Jan 2021	YTD 2020	YTD 2021
PSA Complaints	13	9	13	9
Total Complaints	338	259	338	259
PSA Complaints as % of Total	3.8%	3.5%	3.8%	3.5%

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**

	Jan 2020	Jan 2021	YTD 2020	YTD 2021
PSA 1	1	0	1	0
PSA 2	2	4	2	4
PSA 3	0	2	0	2
PSA 4	0	0	0	0
PSA 5	0	0	0	0
PSA 6	7	0	7	0
PSA 7	13	8	13	8
PSA 8	4	0	4	0
PSA 9	4	0	4	0
Total	31	14	31	14

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**

	Jan 2020		Jan 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	17	40%	9	50%	17	40%	9	50%
Abuse of Authority (A)	19	44%	8	44%	19	44%	8	44%
Discourtesy (D)	6	14%	1	6%	6	14%	1	6%
Offensive Language (O)	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
Total	43	100%	18	100%	43	100%	18	100%

## Dispositions of Officers Assigned to PSAs

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

**Figure 43: Disposition of PSA Officers (2020 vs 2021)**

Full Investigations	Jan 2020		Jan 2021		YTD 2020		YTD 2021	
	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	4	22%	0	0%	4	22%	0	0%
Exonerated	12	67%	3	75%	12	67%	3	75%
Unfounded	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Unsubstantiated	2	11%	1	25%	2	11%	1	25%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total - Full Investigations</b>	<b>18</b>		<b>4</b>		<b>18</b>		<b>4</b>	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Mediation Attempted	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total - ADR Closures</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>0</b>	
<b>Resolved Case Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>29%</b>
Truncations / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness uncooperative	5	42%	1	10%	5	42%	1	10%
Complainant/Alleged Victim/Witness unavailable	3	25%	4	40%	3	25%	4	40%
Alleged Victim unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Closed - Pending Litigation	3	25%	5	50%	3	25%	5	50%
Miscellaneous	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Administrative closure*	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total - Other Case Dispositions</b>	<b>12</b>		<b>10</b>		<b>12</b>		<b>10</b>	
<b>Total - Closed Cases</b>	<b>31</b>		<b>14</b>		<b>31</b>		<b>14</b>	

\*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 January and this year.

**Figure 44: Mediated Complaints Closed**

	January 2021			YTD 2021		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Mediated Complaints	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Figure 45: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed**

	January 2021			YTD 2021		
	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total	Mediated	Mediation Attempted	Total
Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Abuse of Authority	0	0	0	0	0	0
Discourtesy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Offensive Language	0	0	0	0	0	0
Untruthful Statement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Figure 46: Mediated Complaints By Borough (January 2021)**

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

**Figure 47: Mediated Allegations By Borough (January 2021)**

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

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

Precinct	Jan 2021	YTD 2021
----------	----------	----------

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

Precinct	Jan 2021	YTD 2021
----------	----------	----------



# 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	Jan 2021	YTD 2021
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	0	0
	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
	<b>Disciplinary Action Total</b>		<b>0</b>
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	0	0
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	0
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	0
	**Retained, without discipline	0	0
	Dismissed by APU	0	0
	SOL Expired in APU	0	0
	<b>No Disciplinary Action Total</b>		<b>0</b>
Not Adjudicated	Charges not served	0	0
	Deceased	0	0
	Other	0	0
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	1	1
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	0
	†Reconsidered by CCRB Board	0	0
	Retired	0	0
	SOL Expired prior to APU	0	0
	<b>Not Adjudicated Total</b>		<b>1</b>
	<b>Total Closures</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

\*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*	January 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	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	0
Command Discipline B	0	0
Command Discipline A	0	0
Formalized Training**	0	0
Instructions***	0	0
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
<b>Disciplinary Action† Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
No Disciplinary Action†	0	0
<b>Adjudicated Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Discipline Rate</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Not Adjudicated† Total	1	1
<b>Total Closures</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

\*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**

<b>Disposition</b>	<b>Disposition Type*</b>	January 2021	YTD 2021
Disciplinary Action	Terminated	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	0	0
	Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	0	0
	Command Discipline B	1	1
	Command Discipline A	6	6
	Formalized Training**	2	2
	Instructions***	7	7
	Warned & admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>
No Disciplinary Action	Filed ††	2	2
	SOL Expired	0	0
	Department Unable to Prosecute†††	0	0
	No Finding ††††	4	4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Discipline Rate</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>73%</b>
	<b>DUP Rate</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>

\*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 (January 2021)**

Board Disposition	FADO Type	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Property damaged	13	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	18	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Word	18	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	28	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Physical force	32	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	32	Manhattan	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	34	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	34	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	34	Manhattan	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Seizure of property	34	Manhattan	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to obtain medical treatment	44	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	44	Bronx	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	D	Word	46	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	46	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Search (of person)	46	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	46	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	46	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	46	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	F	Restricted Breathing	46	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Refusal to provide name	46	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Retaliatory summons	52	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Stop	52	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Frisk	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Search (of person)	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Stop	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	78	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	78	Brooklyn	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Action	83	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	D	Action	83	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Question	83	Brooklyn	No Discipline

<b>Board Disposition</b>	<b>FADO Type</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Precinct</b>	<b>Borough</b>	<b>NYPD Discipline</b>
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Question	83	Brooklyn	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	A	Failure to provide RTKA card	90	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle stop	106	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Vehicle search	106	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	106	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	A	Frisk	106	Queens	No Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	D	Word	110	Queens	Instructions
Substantiated (Command Lvl Instructions)	D	Word	123	Staten Island	Instructions

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

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

# Appendix

Over the years, the CCRB has made many types of data publicly available. In reorganizing the Monthly Report, we do not intend to remove any valuable information from the public domain. However, the Agency believes that some information is essential to place in the main body of the Monthly Report, while more granular charts and figures are better suited to the Appendix. We welcome you to contact the CCRB at [www.nyc.gov](http://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**

	January 2021		December 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1014	35.1%	956	34.1%	58	6.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	472	16.3%	669	23.9%	-197	-29.4%
Cases 8 Months	294	10.2%	177	6.3%	117	66.1%
Cases 9 Months	175	6.1%	181	6.5%	-6	-3.3%
Cases 10 Months	176	6.1%	156	5.6%	20	12.8%
Cases 11 Months	150	5.2%	139	5.0%	11	7.9%
Cases 12 Months	133	4.6%	103	3.7%	30	29.1%
Cases 13 Months	97	3.4%	101	3.6%	-4	-4.0%
Cases 14 Months	86	3.0%	84	3.0%	2	2.4%
Cases 15 Months	70	2.4%	60	2.1%	10	16.7%
Cases 16 Months	56	1.9%	54	1.9%	2	3.7%
Cases 17 Months	49	1.7%	40	1.4%	9	22.5%
Cases 18 Months	37	1.3%	22	0.8%	15	68.2%
Cases Over 18 Months	80	2.8%	61	2.2%	19	31.1%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>2889</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2803</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>3.1%</b>

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

	January 2021		December 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	1159	40.1%	1099	39.2%	60	5.5%
Cases 5-7 Months	520	18.0%	665	23.7%	-145	-21.8%
Cases 8 Months	237	8.2%	170	6.1%	67	39.4%
Cases 9 Months	168	5.8%	172	6.1%	-4	-2.3%
Cases 10 Months	163	5.6%	165	5.9%	-2	-1.2%
Cases 11 Months	163	5.6%	111	4.0%	52	46.8%
Cases 12 Months	106	3.7%	103	3.7%	3	2.9%
Cases 13 Months	94	3.3%	92	3.3%	2	2.2%
Cases 14 Months	76	2.6%	63	2.2%	13	20.6%
Cases 15 Months	50	1.7%	42	1.5%	8	19.0%
Cases 16 Months	36	1.2%	49	1.7%	-13	-26.5%
Cases 17 Months	47	1.6%	20	0.7%	27	135.0%
Cases 18 Months	18	0.6%	20	0.7%	-2	-10.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	52	1.8%	32	1.1%	20	62.5%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>2889</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2803</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>3.1%</b>



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

	January 2021		December 2020		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Cases 0-4 Months	761	37.3%	696	35.8%	65	9.3%
Cases 5-7 Months	358	17.6%	498	25.6%	-140	-28.1%
Cases 8 Months	214	10.5%	133	6.8%	81	60.9%
Cases 9 Months	131	6.4%	121	6.2%	10	8.3%
Cases 10 Months	111	5.4%	92	4.7%	19	20.7%
Cases 11 Months	93	4.6%	85	4.4%	8	9.4%
Cases 12 Months	75	3.7%	58	3.0%	17	29.3%
Cases 13 Months	52	2.6%	53	2.7%	-1	-1.9%
Cases 14 Months	51	2.5%	53	2.7%	-2	-3.8%
Cases 15 Months	48	2.4%	35	1.8%	13	37.1%
Cases 16 Months	35	1.7%	39	2.0%	-4	-10.3%
Cases 17 Months	35	1.7%	29	1.5%	6	20.7%
Cases 18 Months	24	1.2%	14	0.7%	10	71.4%
Cases Over 18 Months	50	2.5%	37	1.9%	13	35.1%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>2038</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1943</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>4.9%</b>

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

	January 2021	
	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1	20.0%
Cases 5-7 Months	1	20.0%
Cases 8 Months	1	20.0%
Cases 9 Months	1	20.0%
Cases 10 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 11 Months	0	0.0%
Cases 12 Months	1	20.0%
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	0	0.0%
Cases 18 Months	0	0.0%
Cases Over 18 Months	0	0.0%
NA	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Figure 59: Disposition of Force Allegations (YTD 2021)**

Force Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Pointed	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gun fired	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton)	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	66.7%	0	0%
Gun as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Radio as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Flashlight as club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Police shield	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Vehicle	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other blunt instrument as a club	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hit against inanimate object	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Chokehold	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Pepper spray	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Physical force	4	14.3%	12	42.9%	3	10.7%	2	7.1%	7	25%	0	0%
Handcuffs too tight	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nonlethal restraining device	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Animal	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Restricted Breathing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>37.8%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>24.3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

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

Abuse of Authority Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gun Drawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Entry of Premises	1	14.3%	5	71.4%	1	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Strip-searched	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle stop	1	25%	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Vehicle search	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of summons	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of arrest	2	22.2%	5	55.6%	2	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat to notify ACS	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat of force (verbal or physical)	1	12.5%	2	25%	0	0%	4	50%	1	12.5%	0	0%
Threat to damage/seize property	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Property damaged	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to process civilian complaint	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Retaliatory arrest	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Retaliatory summons	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Refusal to obtain medical treatment	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Improper dissemination of medical info	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Seizure of property	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to show search warrant	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Frisk	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Search (of person)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Stop	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
Question	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to show arrest warrant	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Interference with recording	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
Search of recording device	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Electronic device information deletion	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Forcible Removal to Hospital	5	45.5%	6	54.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Threat re: removal to hospital	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Threat re: immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Disseminated immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Questioned immigration status	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Search of Premises	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Verbal)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual Misconduct (Sexual Humiliation)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexual/Romantic Proposition)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Arrest)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Frisk)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Strip-Search)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Vehicle Stop)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motiv Photo/Video)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Summons)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Photography/Videography	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Body Cavity Searches	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Refusal to provide name	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Refusal to provide shield number	2	33.3%	0	0%	4	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Failure to provide RTKA card	1	14.3%	0	0%	6	85.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sex Miscon (Sexually Motivated Question)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Obstructed Shield Number	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Obstructed Rank Designation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

<b>Total</b>	19	21.6%	35	39.8%	23	26.1%	7	8%	4	4.5%	0	0%
--------------	----	-------	----	-------	----	-------	---	----	---	------	---	----

**Figure 61: Disposition of Discourtesy Allegations (YTD 2021)**

Discourtesy Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Word	7	58.3%	0	0%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	3	25%	0	0%
Gesture	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Demeanor/tone	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Action	5	55.6%	0	0%	4	44.4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>54.5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>22.7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

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

Offensive Language Allegation	Substantiated		Exonerated		Unsubstantiated		Unfounded		Officer Unidentified		Miscellaneous	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Race	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Ethnicity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Religion	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sexual orientation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Physical disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Gender Identity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gender	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>



**Figure 63: Administrative Prosecutions Unit Open Docket (January 2021)**

<b>Case Stage</b>	<b>Cases</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Trial commenced	0	0%
Awaiting filing of charges	4	4%
Charges filed, awaiting service	7	7%
Charges served, CORD/SoEH/DCS pending	57	59%
Charges served, Conference Date Requested	6	6%
Calendared for court appearance	5	5%
Case Off Calendar - Subsequent Appearance Pending	5	5%
Trial scheduled	8	8%
Plea agreed - paperwork pending	4	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 (January 2021)**

<b>Case Stage</b>	<b>Cases</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Disposition modified, awaiting final disp.	2	13%
Plea filed - awaiting approval by PC	6	38%
Verdict rendered - awaiting approval by PC	6	38%
Verdict rendered - Fogel response due	0	0%
Trial completed, awaiting verdict	2	13%
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

Figure 65: Officers With CCRB Complaints Closed in 2021 by Command

Patrol Services Bureau	Substantiated MOS Jan 2021	Substantiated MOS YTD 2021	Total MOS Jan 2021	Total MOS YTD 2021
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total	2	2	7	7
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total	4	4	8	8
Patrol Borough Bronx Total	5	5	43	43
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total	1	1	27	27
Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total	3	3	41	41
Patrol Borough Queens South Total	1	1	16	16
Patrol Borough Queens North Total	0	0	10	10
Patrol Borough Staten Island Total	1	1	13	13
Special Operations Division Total	1	1	8	8
Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>173</b>
<b>Other Bureaus</b>				
Traffic Control Division Total	0	0	1	1
Transit Bureau Total	1	1	11	11
Housing Bureau Total	0	0	14	14
Organized Crime Control Bureau Total	1	1	10	10
Detective Bureau Total	1	1	5	5
Other Bureaus Total	0	0	4	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Other Commands</b>				
Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total	0	0	2	2
Undetermined	0	0	4	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>224</b>

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

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

<b>Manhattan South</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
001 Precinct	0	0	1	1
005 Precinct	0	0	0	0
006 Precinct	0	0	0	0
007 Precinct	0	0	0	0
009 Precinct	0	0	0	0
010 Precinct	0	0	0	0
013 Precinct	0	0	1	1
Midtown South Precinct	0	0	2	2
017 Precinct	2	2	2	2
Midtown North Precinct	0	0	0	0
<b>Precincts Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan South HQ	0	0	1	1
Patrol Borough Manhattan South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
<b>Patrol Borough Manhattan South Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>

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

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

<b>Manhattan North</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
019 Precinct	0	0	0	0
020 Precinct	0	0	0	0
023 Precinct	0	0	0	0
024 Precinct	0	0	3	3
025 Precinct	0	0	0	0
026 Precinct	1	1	1	1
Central Park Precinct	0	0	0	0
028 Precinct	3	3	3	3
030 Precinct	0	0	0	0
032 Precinct	0	0	0	0
033 Precinct	0	0	1	1
034 Precinct	0	0	0	0
<b>Precincts Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Manhattan North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Manhattan North Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
<b>Patrol Borough Manhattan North Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>

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

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

<b>Bronx</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
040 Precinct	0	0	2	2
041 Precinct	0	0	3	3
042 Precinct	2	2	15	15
043 Precinct	0	0	0	0
044 Precinct	1	1	4	4
045 Precinct	0	0	4	4
046 Precinct	0	0	2	2
047 Precinct	0	0	2	2
048 Precinct	1	1	3	3
049 Precinct	0	0	0	0
050 Precinct	0	0	0	0
052 Precinct	1	1	6	6
<b>Precincts Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>
Patrol Borough Bronx Task Force	0	0	2	2
Patrol Borough Bronx HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Bronx Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Bronx Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
<b>Patrol Borough Bronx Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43</b>

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

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

<b>Brooklyn South</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
060 Precinct	1	1	3	3
061 Precinct	0	0	5	5
062 Precinct	0	0	0	0
063 Precinct	0	0	2	2
066 Precinct	0	0	1	1
067 Precinct	0	0	2	2
068 Precinct	0	0	3	3
069 Precinct	0	0	2	2
070 Precinct	0	0	0	0
071 Precinct	0	0	0	0
072 Precinct	0	0	0	0
076 Precinct	0	0	0	0
078 Precinct	0	0	7	7
<b>Precincts Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Task Force	0	0	2	2
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn South Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
<b>Patrol Borough Brooklyn South Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>

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

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

<b>Brooklyn North</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
073 Precinct	0	0	0	0
075 Precinct	0	0	31	31
077 Precinct	0	0	0	0
079 Precinct	0	0	1	1
081 Precinct	0	0	1	1
083 Precinct	1	1	4	4
084 Precinct	1	1	2	2
088 Precinct	0	0	0	0
090 Precinct	0	0	1	1
094 Precinct	1	1	1	1
<b>Precincts Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>
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
<b>Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>

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

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

<b>Queens South</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
100 Precinct	0	0	0	0
101 Precinct	0	0	1	1
102 Precinct	0	0	1	1
103 Precinct	0	0	8	8
105 Precinct	0	0	3	3
106 Precinct	0	0	2	2
107 Precinct	1	1	1	1
113 Precinct	0	0	0	0
<b>Precincts Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>
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
<b>Patrol Borough Queens South Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>

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



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

<b>Queens North</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
104 Precinct	0	0	1	1
108 Precinct	0	0	0	0
109 Precinct	0	0	3	3
110 Precinct	0	0	0	0
111 Precinct	0	0	4	4
112 Precinct	0	0	0	0
114 Precinct	0	0	0	0
115 Precinct	0	0	2	2
<b>Precincts Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
Patrol Borough Queens North Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
<b>Patrol Borough Queens North Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

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

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

<b>Staten Island</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
120 Precinct	1	1	8	8
122 Precinct	0	0	2	2
123 Precinct	0	0	0	0
121 Precinct	0	0	3	3
<b>Precincts Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>
Patrol Borough Staten Island Task Force	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island HQ	0	0	0	0
Patrol Borough Staten Island Anti-Crime Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Housing Unit	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Court Section	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
<b>Patrol Borough Staten Island Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>

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

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

<b>Special Operations</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
Emergency Services Unit and Squads 1-10	1	1	2	2
Harbor Unit	0	0	0	0
Aviation Unit	0	0	0	0
Canine Team	0	0	0	0
Mounted Unit	0	0	0	0
2 SOD Strategic Response Group	0	0	6	6
Special Operations Division Headquarters	0	0	0	0
<b>Special Operations Division Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>

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

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

<b>Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
Chiefs Office	0	0	0	0
Special Operations Division Taxi Unit	0	0	0	0
<b>Other Patrol Services Bureau Commands Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

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

<b>Traffic Control Division</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
Traffic Control Division - Headquarters Command	0	0	0	0
Manhattan Traffic Task Force	0	0	1	1
Brooklyn Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Bronx Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Queens Traffic Task Force	0	0	0	0
Surface Transportation Enforcement Division (STED)	0	0	0	0
Bus Unit	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Parking Enforcement District	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Tow Units	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Summons Enforcement	0	0	0	0
Traffic Command Intersection Control	0	0	0	0
Traffic Control Intelligence Unit	0	0	0	0
Highway District	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #1	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #2	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #3	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #4	0	0	0	0
Highway Unit #5	0	0	0	0
Highway Safety Enforcement Unit	0	0	0	0
Movie and TV Unit	0	0	0	0
<b>Traffic Control Division Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

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

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

<b>Transit Bureau</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
Transit Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Authority Liaison	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Inspections	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Spec. Invest. Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Crime Analysis	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Patrol Operations	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
TB DT01	0	0	0	0
TB DT02	0	0	0	0
TB DT03	0	0	1	1
TB DT04	1	1	2	2
TB DT11	0	0	0	0
TB DT12	0	0	1	1
TB DT20	0	0	1	1
TB DT23	0	0	0	0
TB DT30	0	0	1	1
TB DT32	0	0	1	1
TB DT33	0	0	2	2
TB DT34	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Manhattan Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Bronx Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Queens Task Force	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Brooklyn Task Force	0	0	1	1
Transit Bureau Homeless Outreach Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Division Canine Unit	0	0	0	0
Transit Bureau Vandal Unit	0	0	1	1
Transit Bureau Special Operations Unit	0	0	0	0
TB Anti-Terrorism	0	0	0	0
Transportation Bureau and Transit Other Commands	0	0	0	0
<b>Transit Bureau Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>

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

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

<b>Housing Bureau</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
Housing Bureau (Office of the Chief Command Center)	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Special Operations Section	0	0	0	0
PSA 1	0	0	0	0
PSA 2	0	0	4	4
PSA 3	0	0	2	2
PSA 4	0	0	0	0
PSA 5	0	0	0	0
PSA 6	0	0	0	0
PSA 7	0	0	8	8
PSA 8	0	0	0	0
PSA 9	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Brooklyn/Staten Island	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Bronx/Queens	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Investigations	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Elevator Vandalism Unit	0	0	0	0
Housing Bureau Operations and Misc. Commands	0	0	0	0
<b>Housing Bureau Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>
Housing Borough Brooklyn Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Borough Manhattan Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
Housing Borough Bronx/Queens Impact Response Team	0	0	0	0
<b>Housing Bureau Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>

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

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

<b>Organized Crime Control Bureau</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
Queens Narcotics	0	0	3	3
Manhattan North Narcotics	1	1	4	4
Manhattan South Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Bronx Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Staten Island Narcotics	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn North Narcotics	0	0	2	2
Brooklyn South Narcotics	0	0	1	1
Narcotics Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Auto Crime Division	0	0	0	0
Vice Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Drug Enforcement Task Force	0	0	0	0
Organized Crime Headquarters	0	0	0	0
<b>Organized Crime Control Bureau Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

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



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

<b>Detective Bureau</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
Detective Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Central Investigation and Resource Division	0	0	0	0
Special Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Special Victims Division	0	0	0	0
Forensic Investigations Division	0	0	0	0
Fugitive Enforcement Division	0	0	0	0
Gang Division	0	0	0	0
Detective Borough Bronx	1	1	3	3
Detective Borough Manhattan	0	0	0	0
Detective Borough Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
Detective Borough Queens	0	0	2	2
Detective Borough Staten Island	0	0	0	0
DB Queens North Operations	0	0	0	0
DB Queens South Operations	0	0	0	0
<b>Detective Bureau Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>

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

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

<b>Other Bureaus</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
Internal Affairs Bureau				
Internal Affairs Bureau	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Bureau				
Court Division	0	0	4	4
Court Bureau	0	0	0	0
Court LMSI	0	0	0	0
Court Unit	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Headquarters	0	0	0	0
Support Services Bureau				
Property Clerk Division	0	0	0	0
Fleet Services	0	0	0	0
Central Records Division	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau				
Applicant Processing Division	0	0	0	0
Health Services	0	0	0	0
Personnel Bureau Headquarters	0	0	0	0
<b>Other Bureaus Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>

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

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

<b>Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Substantiated MOS YTD 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS Jan 2021</b>	<b>Total MOS YTD 2021</b>
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	1
Deputy Commissioner Training - In-service Training Section	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Management and Budget	0	0	0	0
Police Commissioner Office	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Division	0	0	0	0
Chief of Community Affairs	0	0	0	0
Community Affairs Juvenile Section	0	0	0	0
School Safety Bronx/Manhattan	0	0	0	0
School Safety Queens/Brooklyn	0	0	0	0
Office of Equal Employment	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Operations	0	0	0	0
DC Operations Financial Mgmt.	0	0	0	0
Intelligence Division	0	0	1	1
Chief of Department	0	0	0	0
Department Advocate	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Public Information	0	0	0	0
Crime Prevention	0	0	0	0
First Deputy Commissioner	0	0	0	0
Office of Management, Analysis and Planning	0	0	0	0
Quality Assurance Division	0	0	0	0
Deputy Commissioner Counterterrorism	0	0	0	0
Chief of Department Evaluation Section	0	0	0	0
<b>Deputy Commissioners and Miscellaneous Commands Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>

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