



ERIC L. ADAMS  
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)



DR. MOHAMMAD KHALID  
INTERIM CHAIR

**Executive Director's Monthly Report**  
**July 2025**  
**(Statistics for June 2025)**

## **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	14
Dispositions / Case Abstracts	15
Dispositions - Full Investigations	17
Dispositions - All CCRB Cases	18
Dispositions - Allegations	19
Substantiation Rates	23
Substantiation Rates and Video	24
Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Officers	25
Complaints by PSA	26
Mediation Unit	28
Administrative Prosecution Unit	30
NYPD Discipline	31
List of Substantiated Allegations	41

# **Executive Summary**

The Civilian Complaint Review Board (“CCRB”) is an independent municipal Agency that investigates complaints of NYPD misconduct. Every month, the CCRB prepares an Executive Director report for its public meeting. Data for June 2025 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 47% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 63% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In June, the CCRB opened 466 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 2,959 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 40% of its fully investigated cases in June (page 17).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 30% of the cases it closed in June (page 14).
- 4) For June, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 41% of cases - compared to 0% of cases in which video was not available (page 24).
- 5) The Monthly Report includes a breakdown of complaints and substantiations by NYPD precinct and borough of occurrence (pages 5-6, 41-48).
- 6) In June the Police Commissioner finalized 28 decision(s) against police officers in Administrative Prosecution Unit (APU) cases (page 30). The CCRB's APU prosecutes the most serious allegations of misconduct. The APU conducted 6 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 2 trials were conducted against respondent officers in June.

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 15 members. 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.

**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”.

**FADO&U:** A ballot measure revising the New York City Charter, which passed on November 5, 2019, authorized the CCRB to investigate the truthfulness of an official statement made by a subject officer during a CCRB investigation into a FADO allegation. This expanded jurisdiction—Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy, Offensive Language, and Untruthful Statements (FADO&U)—went into effect on March 31, 2020.

**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.

**Unable to Investigate:** A catch-all term, used for reporting purposes only, that refers to cases where the CCRB was unable to conduct an investigation, typically because no statement could be obtained from the complainant/alleged victim. “Unable to Investigate” incorporates the following CCRB dispositions: “Complainant/Alleged Victim Uncooperative”, “Complainant/Alleged Victim Unavailable”, “Witness Uncooperative”, “Witness Unavailable”, “Victim Unidentified”, “OMB PEG Directive Closure”, and “SRAD Closure.”


**Withdrawn:** When the complainant/alleged victim asks that their complaint be withdrawn, the case is closed as “Withdrawn.”

**Closed Pending Litigation:** When a complainant is involved in criminal or civil litigation, and declines to cooperate with an investigation on the advice of their attorney, the complaint disposition is “Closed Pending Litigation.”


# Complaints Received

The CCRB's Intake team processes misconduct complaints from the public and referrals from the NYPD. Under the New York City Charter, the CCRB's jurisdiction is limited to allegations of misconduct related to Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy and Offensive Language. All other complaints are referred to the appropriate agency. Figure 1 refers to all complaints that the CCRB receives and Figures 2 and 3 refer to new cases that remain with the Agency. In June 2025, the CCRB initiated 466 new complaints.


**Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2024 - June 2025)**



**Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2024 - June 2025)**



**Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (YTD 2010 - YTD 2025)**



## CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (June 2025)





Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2025)



**Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (June 2025)**


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
0	1	67	19
1	7	68	2
5	4	69	2
6	7	70	8
7	2	71	6
9	1	72	5
10	4	73	21
13	3	75	25
14	11	76	3
17	4	77	6
18	9	78	2
19	3	79	9
20	2	81	12
23	4	83	10
25	7	84	5
26	6	88	5
28	5	90	3
30	5	94	1
32	7	100	2
33	2	101	5
34	6	102	3
40	17	103	8
41	2	104	7
42	8	105	1
43	5	106	5
44	10	107	4
45	2	108	2
46	13	109	4
47	9	110	5
48	4	111	2
49	7	112	1
50	7	113	5
52	6	114	4
60	10	115	5
61	7	116	3
62	4	120	7
63	1	121	2
66	2	122	3
		123	2
		Unknown	28

\*These figures track where an incident occurred, not necessarily the Command of the officer.

# Allegations Received

As described in the previous section, the CCRB has jurisdiction over four categories of NYPD misconduct. The charts below show what types of allegations are contained in the CCRB complaints received.

**Figure 7: CCRB Complaints Received By Type of Allegation (June 2024 vs. June 2025)**



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


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

	June 2024		June 2025		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	265	51%	240	52%	-25	-9%
Abuse of Authority (A)	393	76%	329	71%	-64	-16%
Discourtesy (D)	131	25%	73	16%	-58	-44%
Offensive Language (O)	32	6%	12	3%	-20	-63%
Total FADO Allegations	821		654		-167	-20%
Total Complaints	519		466		-53	-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 2024 vs. YTD 2025)**



\*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 2024		YTD 2025		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	1364	48%	1398	50%	34	2%
Abuse of Authority (A)	2183	76%	2033	73%	-150	-7%
Discourtesy (D)	746	26%	618	22%	-128	-17%
Offensive Language (O)	189	7%	135	5%	-54	-29%
Total FADO Allegations	4482		4184		-298	-7%
Total Complaints	2866		2782		-84	-3%

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

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

	June 2024		June 2025		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	713	30%	581	38%	-132	-19%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1418	59%	846	55%	-572	-40%
Discourtesy (D)	220	9%	93	6%	-127	-58%
Offensive Language (O)	43	2%	18	1%	-25	-58%
Total Allegations	2394		1538		-856	-36%
Total Complaints	519		466		-53	-10%

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

	YTD 2024		YTD 2025		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	3651	29%	3584	33%	-67	-2%
Abuse of Authority (A)	7648	60%	6222	57%	-1426	-19%
Discourtesy (D)	1147	9%	846	8%	-301	-26%
Offensive Language (O)	261	2%	177	2%	-84	-32%
Total Allegations	12707		10829		-1878	-15%
Total Complaints	2866		2782		-84	-3%

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

# CCRB Docket

As of the end of June 2025, 47% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 63% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

**Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (June 2025)**

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1384	46.9%
Cases 5-7 Months	488	16.5%
Cases 8-11 Months	690	23.4%
Cases 12-18 Months*	385	13.0%
Cases Over 18 Months**	5	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2952</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*12-18 Months: 4 cases that were reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold; 0 cases that were on FID Hold.

\*\*Over18 Months: 1 case that was reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold; 2 cases that were on FID Hold.

**Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (June 2025)**


	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1244	42.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	511	17.3%
Cases 8-11 Months	722	24.5%
Cases 12-18 Months*	469	15.9%
Cases Over 18 Months**	6	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2952</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*12-18 Months: 6 cases that were reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold; 0 cases that were on FID Hold.


\*\*Over18 Months: 1 case that was reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold; 2 cases that were on FID Hold.

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

**Figure 15: Number of Active Investigations (January 2024 - June 2025)**



**Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis**



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


	May 2025		June 2025		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	1488	50%	1488	50%	0	0%
Pending Board Review	1475	50%	1464	49%	-11	-1%
Mediation	10	0%	4	0%	-6	-60%
On DA / FID Hold	3	0%	3	0%	0	0%
Total	2976		2959		-17	-1%

# 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: Average Days To Recieve Positive Return on BWC Requests  
(January 2024 - June 2025)**




**Figure 19: Pending Requests for BWC Footage**

Days Pending	BWC Requests	% of Total
00 <= Days < 30	122	63.5%
30 <= Days < 60	27	14.1%
60 <= Days < 90	12	6.3%
90 >= Days	31	16.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Figure 20: Percentage of Open Investigations Docket with Pending BWC Requests  
(January 2024 - June 2025)**




**Figure 21: Fulfilled BWC Requests  
(January 2024 - June 2025)**



# Closed Cases

In June 2025, the CCRB fully investigated 30% of the cases it closed.

**Figure 22: Case Resolutions (January 2024 - June 2025) (%)**



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

## Case Abstracts

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

### 1. Substantiated

An individual was arrested and taken to a precinct stationhouse. At the precinct, the individual was processed at the front desk and then taken by the subject officer to a cell where he removed the individual's sneakers, pulled down his underwear, exposing the individual's private parts. The subject officer stated that the strip-search of the individual was justified because of his body movements at the arrest location, during transport to the precinct, and at the precinct. The investigation found that the officers who transported the individual to the precinct did not report any unusual movements by the individual and on the precinct camera the individual was not making any unusual movements. The investigation found that the subject officer was not justified in strip-searching the individual. The Board substantiated the Abuse of Authority allegation.

### 2. Unable to Determine

An individual stated that he was walking on the street to his vehicle when he observed two unmarked vehicles at a stop light, one black in color and the other grey. The individual observed that there were officers in both vehicles. The grey vehicle sped up to the individual and the subject officer exited the vehicle. He ran up to the individual, stopped him and frisked his pockets. The subject officer then told the individual he could leave and returned to the grey vehicle. The individual had a partial license plate of the grey vehicle and the full incense plate of the black vehicle which was still nearby. The individual had a general description of the subject officer. The investigation was able to identify the subject officer and he stated that he did not interact with any pedestrians on the incident date and none of the other officers in the vehicle with him recalled stopping any pedestrians that day. Without further evidence, the investigation could not determine whether the subject officer was justified in stopping, frisking and failing to give the individual a business card. The Board closed the Abuse of Authority allegations as Unable to Determine.

### 3. Unfounded

An individual stated that when she was being arrested, the subject officers pulled her off her porch, causing her to fall and then failed to cover her breasts which were exposed when she was lifted off the ground. The incident was captured on BWC. When the individual's arms were placed behind her back to be handcuffed, an officer held on to the individual's elbow as she walked down the stairs off the porch, she was not pulled and did not fall. The individual fell later on closer to the police vehicle which was



where her breasts were exposed. An officer pulled the individual's shirt back down to cover her breasts from public view. The Board closed the Use of Force and Abuse of Authority allegation as Unfounded.

#### **4. Within NYPD Guidelines**

An individual stated that he was driving his vehicle when he was pulled over by the two subject officers. Subject officer 1 asked the individual if he knew why he was pulled over and the individual replied that it was because of his window tints. Subject officer 1 replied that it was because the individual failed to stop properly at a stop sign. Subject officer 1 asked if he had warrants or a clean license while he collected the individual's ID. After subject officer 1 returned the ID, subject officer 2 asked the individual to exit his vehicle, asked him if he had any weapons and asked to search the individual's vehicle. The individual questioned the legality of the search. The subject officers allowed the individual to return to his vehicle without searching his body or his vehicle. The incident was captured on BWC. Subject officer 1 told the individual he was being stopped for his window tints and for an improper stop at a stop sign. The individual admitted that his tints were dark and apologized for the improper stop. Both subject officers asked the questions as stated by the individual concerning weapons. The investigation found that the individual admitted to having the dark tints and did not contest the improper stop at the stop sign. New York Traffic law allowed the subject officers to stop him based on the traffic infractions. The investigation also found that the subject officers had a reasonable cause to question the individual about weapons because they observed a large bulge in the individual's pockets and that at the time they noticed it, the individual had his wallet and phone in his hands – they both asked the questions as soon as the individual exited the vehicle under their direction which credited their observation of a bulge and properly asked for consent to search. The Board closed the Abuse of Authority allegations as being Within NYPD Guidelines.

#### **5. Officer Unidentified**

An individual stated that an unknown officer took an unknown individual down to the ground during a protest at Columbia University's main campus. The investigation found that the university president sent a letter to the NYPD requesting assistance in clearing protestors from the campus. The incident was captured on BWC. An unidentified officer took down an unknown male individual to the ground. Other officers who recorded BWC at the incident location could not identify the officer that took the male individual to the ground. The investigation identified three officers who had a similar physical build to the subject officer – none of them were present at the incident location. Without additional pertinent information, the investigation could not identify the subject officer. The Board closed Use of Force allegation as Officer Unidentified.

\* Unable to determine is reported to the Commissioner as Unsubstantiated, meaning that there was insufficient evidence to establish whether or not there was an act of misconduct.

\*\* Within NYPD Guidelines is reported to the Commissioner as Exonerated, meaning there was a preponderance of the evidence that the acts alleged occurred but did not constitute misconduct.

## Dispositions - Full Investigations

Figure 23: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (June 2025)





Figure 24: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2025)



## Dispositions - All CCRB Cases

The following table lists all the CCRB case closures for the current month and year-to-date.

**Figure 25: Disposition of Cases (2024 vs 2025)**

	Jun 2024		Jun 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
<b>Full Investigations</b>	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Substantiated	59	37%	58	40%	398	35%	554	49%
Within NYPD Guidelines	31	19%	26	18%	177	15%	138	12%
Unfounded	32	20%	29	20%	264	23%	196	17%
Unable to Determine	35	22%	24	16%	251	22%	199	18%
MOS Unidentified	4	2%	9	6%	62	5%	43	4%
<b>Total - Full Investigations</b>	<b>161</b>		<b>146</b>		<b>1152</b>		<b>1130</b>	
<b>Mediation Closures</b>	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	1	100%	3	100%	24	100%	16	100%
<b>Total - Mediation Closures</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>24</b>		<b>16</b>	
<b>Unable to Investigate / Other Closures</b>	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint Withdrawn	26	16%	17	5%	141	9%	117	7%
Closed - Pending Litigation	42	25%	56	17%	275	17%	303	18%
Unable to Investigate*	95	58%	258	77%	1205	73%	1222	73%
Officer Retired/Resigned**	2	1%	5	1%	19	1%	17	1%
Administrative Closure***	0	0%	1	0%	3	0%	5	0%
<b>Total - Other Case Dispositions</b>	<b>165</b>		<b>337</b>		<b>1643</b>		<b>1664</b>	
<b>Total - Closed Cases</b>	<b>327</b>		<b>486</b>		<b>2819</b>		<b>2810</b>	

\*Unable to Investigate is catch-all term, used for reporting purposes only, that refers to cases where the CCRB was unable to conduct an investigation, typically because no statement could be obtained from the complainant/alleged victim. "Unable to Investigate" incorporates the following CCRB dispositions: "Complainant/Alleged Victim Uncooperative", "Complainant/Alleged Victim Unavailable", "Witness Uncooperative", "Witness Unavailable", "Victim Unidentified", "OMB PEG Directive Closure", and "SRAD Closure."

\*\*Officer Retired/Resigned: CCRB closes an investigation if it learns that the subject officer has left the Department. In a small number of cases, CCRB will also close an investigation against a subject officer who is on extended leave and who will not be available for interview until after the Statute of Limitations has expired. These cases are elsewhere reported as "Miscellaneous" closures.

\*\*\*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 - 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.

**Figure 26: Disposition of FADO Allegations (2024 vs 2025)**

	Jun 2024		Jun 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
<b>Fully Investigated Allegations</b>	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	229	23%	198	18%	1442	23%	1895	23%
Unable to Determine	175	17%	170	16%	1123	18%	1408	17%
Unfounded	232	23%	215	20%	1317	21%	1625	20%
Within NYPD Guidelines	316	31%	433	40%	2132	33%	2983	36%
MOS Unidentified	60	6%	70	6%	378	6%	420	5%
<b>Total - Full Investigations</b>	<b>1012</b>		<b>1086</b>		<b>6392</b>		<b>8331</b>	
<b>Mediation Closures</b>	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	7	100%	7	100%	75	100%	50	100%
<b>Total - Mediation Closures</b>	<b>7</b>		<b>7</b>		<b>75</b>		<b>50</b>	
<b>Unable to Investigate / Other Closures</b>	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint Withdrawn	89	16%	32	4%	414	9%	338	8%
Closed - Pending Litigation	144	26%	200	24%	942	21%	1028	23%
Unable to Investigate*	276	49%	530	65%	2856	63%	2743	62%
Officer Retired/Resigned**	51	9%	54	7%	277	6%	335	8%
Administrative Closure***	0	0%	1	0%	18	0%	8	0%
<b>Total - Other Case Dispositions</b>	<b>560</b>		<b>817</b>		<b>4507</b>		<b>4452</b>	
<b>Total - Closed Allegations</b>	<b>1579</b>		<b>1910</b>		<b>10974</b>		<b>12833</b>	

\*Unable to Investigate is catch-all term, used for reporting purposes only, that refers to cases where the CCRB was unable to conduct an investigation, typically because no statement could be obtained from the complainant/alleged victim. “Unable to Investigate” incorporates the following CCRB dispositions: “Complainant/Alleged Victim Uncooperative”, “Complainant/Alleged Victim Unavailable”, “Witness Uncooperative”, “Witness Unavailable”, “Victim Unidentified”, “OMB PEG Directive Closure”, and “SRAD Closure.”

\*\*Officer Retired/Resigned: CCRB closes an investigation if it learns that the subject officer has left the Department. In a small number of cases, CCRB will also close an investigation against a subject officer who is on extended leave and who will not be available for interview until after the Statute of Limitations has expired. These cases are elsewhere reported as “Miscellaneous” closures.

\*\*\*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.

**Figure 27: Disposition of FADO Allegations by FADO Category (June 2025)**

	Substantiated	Unable to Determine	Within NYPD Guidelines	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	21 7%	35 12%	164 55%	77 26%	3 1%	300 100%
Abuse of Authority	144 22%	104 16%	244 37%	106 16%	54 8%	652 100%
Discourtesy	28 27%	21 20%	25 24%	22 21%	9 9%	105 100%
Offensive Language	5 17%	10 34%	0 0%	10 34%	4 14%	29 100%
Total	198 18%	170 16%	433 40%	215 20%	70 6%	1086 100%

**Figure 28: Disposition of FADO Allegations by FADO Category (YTD 2025)**

	Substantiated	Unable to Determine	Within NYPD Guidelines	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	121 6%	245 12%	1079 54%	493 25%	50 3%	1988 100%
Abuse of Authority	1534 28%	931 17%	1738 32%	903 17%	287 5%	5393 100%
Discourtesy	202 26%	166 22%	164 21%	175 23%	60 8%	767 100%
Offensive Language	38 21%	66 36%	2 1%	54 30%	23 13%	183 100%
Total	1895 23%	1408 17%	2983 36%	1625 20%	420 5%	8331 100%

## Dispositions - Untruthful Statement Allegations

The CCRB investigates untruthful statement allegations under two different allegation categories. Official statements made directly to the CCRB are investigated under the “Untruthful Statement” allegation category. Official statements made in other contexts (e.g. in court) are investigated under the “Abuse of Authority” allegation category.

All the untruthful official statement allegations are mutually exclusive, meaning that the CCRB will not plead more than one untruthful statement allegation against an officer for the same untruthful act. There are four distinct types of untruthful statement allegation as follows: 1) False official statement, 2) Misleading official statement, 3) Inaccurate official statement and 4) Impeding an investigation.

**Figure 29: Substantiated Untruthful Statement Allegations with % Change**

Untruthful Statement Allegations	June 2024		June 2025			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
False official statement	2	50%	3	43%	1	50%
Impeding an investigation	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Inaccurate official statement	1	25%	0	0%	-1	-100%
Misleading official statement	1	25%	4	57%	3	300%
<b>Total Allegations</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>7</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>75%</b>

**Figure 30: Substantiated Untruthful Statement Allegations YTD with % Change**

Untruthful Statement Allegations	YTD 2024		YTD 2025			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
False official statement	10	63%	17	71%	7	70%
Impeding an investigation	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Inaccurate official statement	1	6%	0	0%	-1	-100%
Misleading official statement	5	31%	7	29%	2	40%
<b>Total Allegations</b>	<b>16</b>		<b>24</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>50%</b>

## Dispositions - Bias-Based Policing Allegations

The Racial Profiling and Bias Based Policing (“RPBP”) Unit is a unit at the CCRB focused on investigating civilian complaints of profiling/biased policing by uniformed (not civilian) members of the NYPD based on 10 different protected categories: race, national origin/ethnicity, color, religion, age, immigration or citizenship status, gender/gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, and housing status.

**Figure 31: Substantiated Bias-Based Policing Allegations with % Change**

Bias-Based Allegations	June 2024		June 2025		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Age	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Color	2	22%	0	0%	-2	-100%
Disability	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Gender	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Housing Status	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Immigration Status	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
National Origin	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Race	7	78%	0	0%	-7	-100%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Sexual Orientation	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
<b>Total Allegations</b>	<b>9</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>-9</b>	<b>-100%</b>


**Figure 32: Substantiated Bias-Based Policing Allegations YTD with % Change**

Bias-Based Allegations	YTD 2024		YTD 2025		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Age	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Color	2	5%	1	6%	-1	-50%
Disability	10	24%	2	11%	-8	-80%
Gender	1	2%	0	0%	-1	-100%
Housing Status	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Immigration Status	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
National Origin	5	12%	0	0%	-5	-100%
Race	23	56%	15	83%	-8	-35%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Sexual Orientation	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
<b>Total Allegations</b>	<b>41</b>		<b>18</b>		<b>-23</b>	<b>-56%</b>


## Substantiation Rates

The June 2025 case substantiation rate was 40%.

**Figure 33: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2024 - June 2025)**



**Figure 34: Disposition of Substantiated Complaints\* (2025)**




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




## Substantiation Rates and Video

In general, investigations relying on video evidence result in much higher substantiation rates.

**Figure 35: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations without Video (Jan 2024 - Jun 2025)**  
(% substantiated shown)



**Figure 36: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2024 - Jun 2025)**  
(% substantiated shown)



## Board Discipline Recommendations for Substantiated Officers

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

- “Charges and Specifications” are the most severe form of discipline. A decision to assign Charges commences a process that may result in an administrative trial in the NYPD Trial Room. An officer may lose vacation days, be suspended, or be terminated if the officer is found guilty.
- “Command Discipline B” and “Command Discipline A” are recommended for misconduct that is moderately serious. An officer can lose up to ten vacation days as a result of Command Discipline B and up to five vacation days as a result of Command Discipline A.
- “Formalized Training” are the least severe discipline, often recommended for officers who misunderstand a policy. This determination results in training at the Police Academy or NYPD Legal Bureau (Formalized Training).
- When the Board has recommended 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 37: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations\***  
(Jun 2024, Jun 2025, YTD 2024, YTD 2025)

Disposition	June 2024		June 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Charges	42	38%	32	30%	216	29%	241	24%
Command Discipline B	17	15%	12	11%	152	20%	191	19%
Command Discipline A	35	31%	35	33%	270	36%	386	38%
Formalized Training	18	16%	26	25%	113	15%	206	20%
Total	112		105		751		1024	

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

Prior to the CCRB’s adoption of the NYPD’s Disciplinary Matrix on 03/15/2021, the Board Discipline Recommendation for each officer was determined by the most severe disposition of the allegation(s) substantiated against the officer, with the order of severity as follows: 1. Charges 2. Command Discipline B 3. Command Discipline A 4. Formalized Training 5. Instructions. With the adoption of the NYPD Disciplinary Matrix on 03/15/2021, the CCRB no longer issues Instructions as a Board Discipline Recommendation.

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

## 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 38: PSA Complaints Closed as % of Total Complaints Closed**

	Jun 2024	Jun 2025	YTD 2024	YTD 2025
PSA Complaints	19	16	127	110
Total Complaints	327	486	2819	2810
PSA Complaints as % of Total	5.8%	3.3%	4.5%	3.9%

A single PSA complaint may contain multiple subject officers. The following table shows the number of officers assigned to each PSA against whom an allegation was made.

**Figure 39: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA**

	Jun 2024	Jun 2025	YTD 2024	YTD 2025
PSA 1	1	9	22	22
PSA 2	4	13	36	39
PSA 3	7	12	67	43
PSA 4	5	4	29	28
PSA 5	0	2	14	44
PSA 6	0	1	16	13
PSA 7	6	0	31	22
PSA 8	8	0	22	9
PSA 9	6	1	27	15
Total	37	42	264	235

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

**Figure 40: Closed Allegations Against Officers Assigned to a PSA by FADO&U Type**

	Jun 2024		Jun 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	15	30%	20	38%	106	31%	119	38%
Abuse of Authority (A)	20	40%	27	51%	181	52%	147	47%
Discourtesy (D)	12	24%	4	8%	46	13%	35	11%
Offensive Language (O)	3	6%	2	4%	11	3%	10	3%
Untruthful Statement (U)	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	2	1%
Total	50	100%	53	101%	345	99%	313	100%

## Dispositions of Officers Assigned to PSAs

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

**Figure 41: Disposition of PSA Officers (2024 vs 2025)**

	Jun 2024		Jun 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
<b>Full Investigations</b>	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	9	32%	9	47%	62	37%	49	35%
Within NYPD Guidelines	4	14%	5	26%	38	23%	33	24%
Unfounded	8	29%	3	16%	44	26%	37	26%
Unable to Determine	7	25%	2	11%	22	13%	19	14%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	2	1%
<b>Total - Full Investigations</b>	<b>28</b>		<b>19</b>		<b>167</b>		<b>140</b>	
<b>Mediation Closures</b>	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	1	100%	3	100%	3	100%
<b>Total - Mediation Closures</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>3</b>	
<b>Unable to Investigate / Other Closures</b>	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	2	22%	0	0%	9	10%	8	9%
Unable to Investigate*	3	33%	11	50%	56	60%	41	45%
Closed - Pending Litigation	4	44%	11	50%	28	30%	34	37%
Officer Retired/Resigned**	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	9	10%
Administrative Closure***	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total - Other Case Dispositions</b>	<b>9</b>		<b>22</b>		<b>94</b>		<b>92</b>	
<b>Total - Closed Cases</b>	<b>37</b>		<b>42</b>		<b>264</b>		<b>235</b>	

\*Unable to Investigate is catch-all term, used for reporting purposes only, that refers to cases where the CCRB was unable to conduct an investigation, typically because no statement could be obtained from the complainant/alleged victim. "Unable to Investigate" incorporates the following CCRB dispositions: "Complainant/Alleged Victim Uncooperative", "Complainant/Alleged Victim Unavailable", "Witness Uncooperative", "Witness Unavailable", "Victim Unidentified", "OMB PEG Directive Closure", and "SRAD Closure."

\*\*Officer Retired/Resigned: CCRB closes an investigation if it learns that the subject officer has left the Department. In a small number of cases, CCRB will also close an investigation against a subject officer who is on extended leave and who will not be available for interview until after the Statute of Limitations has expired. These cases are elsewhere reported as "Miscellaneous" closures.

\*\*\*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. The chart below indicates the number of mediations in June and this year.

**Figure 42: Mediated Complaints Closed**

	June 2025	YTD 2025
Mediated Complaints	3	16

**Figure 43: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed**

	June 2025	YTD 2025
Force	2	9
Abuse of Authority	2	26
Discourtesy	2	10
Offensive Language	1	5
Total	7	50

**Figure 44: Mediated Complaints By Borough (June 2025)**

	Mediations
Bronx	2
Brooklyn	0
Manhattan	1
Queens	0
Staten Island	0

**Figure 45: Mediated Allegations By Borough (June 2025)**

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

**Figure 46: Mediated Complaints By Precinct  
(Jun 2025 - YTD 2025)**

Precinct	Jun 2025	YTD 2025
6	0	1
18	1	2
19	0	1
23	0	1
32	0	1
40	0	1
46	1	1

**Figure 47: Mediated Allegations By Precinct  
(Jun 2025 - YTD 2025)**

Precinct	Jun 2025	YTD 2025
6	0	9
18	4	7
19	0	6
23	0	3
32	0	2
40	0	2
46	1	1

# Administrative Prosecution Unit

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

**Figure 48: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures**

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Jun 2025	YTD 2025
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial	0	2
	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	22	74
	Plea Renegotiated by PC	0	0
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. B	1	2
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. A	1	2
	Plea set aside, Formalized Training	0	2
	Plea set aside, Instructions	0	0
	*Retained, with discipline	2	13
	<b>Disciplinary Action Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>95</b>
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial	1	6
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	1
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	3
	**Retained, without discipline	1	7
	Dismissed by Police Commissioner	0	0
	<b>No Disciplinary Action Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>
Not Adjudicated	Other	0	4
	Department adjudication in process	0	3
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	1
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	1	3
	Retired	2	3
	Resigned	1	3
	Terminated	1	1
	<b>Not Adjudicated Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>18</b>
	<b>Total Closures</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>130</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. When the Police Commissioner issues the discipline recommended by the CCRB, we report it as discipline concurrence.

**Figure 49: NYPD-CCRB Discipline Concurrence**

Discipline Report Year	Non APU %	APU %	Total %
2023	55.53	57.69	55.90
2024	26.48	45.40	30.27
2025 YTD	76.62	71.55	75.87

The remaining charts in this section provide additional detail regarding NYPD-imposed discipline, both for cases brought by the APU (Charges) and for Non-APU cases referred to the Police Commissioner with a recommendation of Command Discipline or Formalized Training.

**Figure 50: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases**

Discipline*	June 2025	YTD 2025
Terminated	0	0
Forced Separation	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	9
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	19	60
Command Discipline B	1	1
Command Discipline A	1	5
Formalized Training**	5	19
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
<b>Disciplinary Action† Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>95</b>
No Disciplinary Action†	2	17
<b>Adjudicated Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Discipline Rate</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>85%</b>
Not Adjudicated† Total	5	18
<b>Total Closures</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>130</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.

† The case closure types that define the "Disciplinary Action", "No Disciplinary Action" and "Not Adjudicated" categories are listed in Figure 51 on the previous page.



**Figure 51: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases**

<b>Disposition</b>	<b>Disposition Type*</b>	<b>May 2025</b>	<b>YTD 2025</b>
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	20	78
	Command Discipline A	40	171
	Formalized Training**	12	164
	Closed Administratively (With Discipline) ††	3	8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>421</b>
No Disciplinary Action	Retired	0	1
	Resigned	0	3
	SOL Expired	0	0
	Department Unable to Prosecute †††	7	19
	Department Unable to Prosecute (Short SOL) ††††	0	128
	Closed Administratively (No penalty reported) ††	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>151</b>
	<b>Discipline Rate</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>74%</b>
	<b>DUP Rate</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>26%</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.

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

†† "Closed Administratively" is a term typically used by the police department to report on an incident of misconduct that has been previously adjudicated by the department itself prior to the receipt of a disciplinary recommendation from the CCRB.

††† 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.

†††† The Department did not pursue discipline because DAO felt that the Board's discipline recommendation was made too close to the expiration of the statute of limitations (SOL) period.

NYPD Penalty Departure Letters are posted on the CCRB website at: <https://www.nyc.gov/site/ccrb/complaints/redacted-departure-letter.page>

**Figure 52: “Short SOL”\* Decisions Returned by Days to SOL Expiration  
(May 2024, May 2025, YTD 2024, YTD 2025)**

Days to SOL at Close Group	May 2024		May 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
03 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 05		0%		N/A		0%		0%
05 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 10		0%		N/A		0%		0%
10 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 20		0%		N/A	8	3%		0%
20 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 30		0%		N/A	4	1%	33	26%
30 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 40	2	1%		N/A	10	3%	77	61%
40 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 50	11	7%		N/A	29	9%	17	13%
50 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 60	22	13%		N/A	39	12%		0%
60 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 90	128	79%		N/A	226	72%		0%
Total	163				316		127	

**Figure 53: “Short SOL”\* Decisions Returned by Days to SOL Expiration for  
Complaints Containing a Substantiated SQF Allegation  
(May 2024, May 2025, YTD 2024, YTD 2025)**

Days to SOL at Close Group	May 2024		May 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
03 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 05		0%		0%		0%		0%
05 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 10		0%		0%		0%		0%
10 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 20		0%		0%	2	4%		0%
20 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 30		0%		0%		0%		0%
30 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 40		0%		0%	1	2%	1	100%
40 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 50	1	4%		0%	1	2%		0%
50 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 60	6	22%		0%	9	20%		0%
60 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 90	20	74%		0%	32	71%		0%
Total	27				45		1	

\* "Short SOL" decisions are those where the NYPD decided not to pursue disciplinary proceedings against an officer because NYPD's Department Advocate's Office felt that the Board's discipline recommendation was made too close to the expiration of the statute of limitations (SOL) period.

**Figure 54: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (May 2025)**

<b>Board Disposition Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>Allegation(s)</b>	<b>Precinct</b>	<b>Borough</b>	<b>NYPD Discipline</b>
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Ruben Rivera	A: Search (of person)		Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Ailien Van	A: Question	5	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Saleem Hosein	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	5	Manhattan	Closed Administratively (Command Discipline - B) / Vacation: 1 day
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Roger Ordonez	A: Unlawful Arrest	7	Manhattan	No penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Salvatore Guardi	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	14	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.25 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	LT Burt Antoine	A: Forcible Removal to Hospital; A: Improper use of body-worn camera	14	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Jordan Crespo	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	14	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.25 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Jose Lopez	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	14	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.25 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Md Islamsarker	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	14	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO William Bilbao	A: Refusal to provide shield number	14	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	LT Jorge Tavarez	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	14	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Matthew Cizmarik	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	14	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Jose Toro	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	14	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Vito Lacerenza	A: Refusal to process civilian complaint	18	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO David Freund	A: Forcible Removal to Hospital	24	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Jonathan Guillen	A: Forcible Removal to Hospital	24	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Dawson Alvarez	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	24	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Seturah Blease	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	24	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DT2 Patrick Daly	A: Frisk	25	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Matthew Crudele	A: Vehicle search	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Sheldon Elliott	A: Obstructed Shield Number; A: Vehicle search	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Dicarlos Martinez	A: Stop; A: Frisk	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Juan Rodriguez	F: Physical force	26	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 5 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Erick Clarck	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Improper use of body-worn camera	32	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	LT Michael Bletcher	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	32	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Shpresa Centeno	A: Refusal to provide shield number	32	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A

<b>Board Disposition Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>Allegation(s)</b>	<b>Precinct</b>	<b>Borough</b>	<b>NYPD Discipline</b>
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Jennifer Perez	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	34	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Kristjan Tanushaj	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	34	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Matthew Barlow	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Kevin Weber	A: Other	41	Bronx	No penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Angel Suazopelaez	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; A: Refusal to provide shield number; A: Stop	43	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Mkanwar Hossain	A: Refusal to process civilian complaint	43	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Edwin Olivo	A: Entry of Premises; A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Search of Premises	43	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Brandon Bacalles	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Search of Premises; A: Entry of Premises	43	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Jose Rivera	A: Threat of force (verbal or physical)	44	Bronx	No penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Omar Aguilarmartinez	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	44	Bronx	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Jonathan Cancel	A: Threat of force (verbal or physical)	44	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Andrei Nijnic	A: Vehicle search; A: Frisk; A: Search (of person)	44	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Emilio Perez	F: Pepper spray; F: Pepper spray	45	Bronx	No penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Phong Le	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Improper use of body-worn camera	46	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Dante Pulido	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; A: Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 3 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Bryan Scheblein	A: Stop	48	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Brendan Reilly	A: Stop; A: Improper use of body-worn camera	48	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 3 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Jonathan Baptiste	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	52	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 3 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Patrick Jean	A: Failure to Explain; A: Vehicle search; A: Failure to provide RTKA card	52	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Nanakwame Mensah	A: Vehicle search; A: Failure to Explain; A: Failure to provide RTKA card	52	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 2 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DT3 Christopher Montera	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	52	Bronx	Closed Administratively (Command Discipline - A)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO German Rojas	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Darren Campbell	F: Physical force	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.25 days)

<b>Board Disposition Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>Allegation(s)</b>	<b>Precinct</b>	<b>Borough</b>	<b>NYPD Discipline</b>
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Sheldon Maxwell	A: Seizure of property	61	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Dean Perez	D: Word	63	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	DT3 Jason Zummo	A: Search of Premises	67	Brooklyn	No penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Michael Velasquez	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	70	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Mubbashar Zahid	A: Vehicle search	70	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Tracey Metoo	D: Word; A: Threat of arrest	72	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Meraj Chaudary	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	73	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Vladimir Nathaniel	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	73	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Manpreet Singh	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Refusal to provide shield number	73	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Konrad Zieba	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.25 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Mdabdul Halim	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.25 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Sergio Castillo	A: Stop	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Joseph Reyes	A: Frisk; A: Frisk	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Austin Kowalsky	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Mohammad Islam	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	LT Fakrul Islam	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 2 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT William Mcknight	A: Threat of force (verbal or physical)	78	Brooklyn	No penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Diane Hopkins	F: Physical force	78	Brooklyn	No penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Maricel Miele	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; D: Word; D: Word	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Mario Mohan	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Yuvraj Singh	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Lexie Napolitano	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Shunjie Lai	A: Question; D: Action; A: Interference with recording	84	Brooklyn	Formalized Training (Command Discipline - A)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Daniel Chin	D: Word; O: Gender	88	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 2 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Tejinder Singh	A: Refusal to provide shield number	90	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.25 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Brian Cohen	F: Physical force	101	Queens	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Shaun Healy	F: Physical force	101	Queens	Command Discipline - A

<b>Board Disposition Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>Allegation(s)</b>	<b>Precinct</b>	<b>Borough</b>	<b>NYPD Discipline</b>
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Imtiaz Mohamed	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	105	Queens	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO John Nunziata	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Refusal to provide shield number	110	Queens	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Matthew Traube	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Refusal to provide shield number	110	Queens	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT John Bonhomme	A: Frisk	113	Queens	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Dana Rota	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	120	Staten Island	Closed Administratively (Instructions)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO William Tagliaferro	A: Vehicle search	123	Staten Island	Command Discipline - A

**Figure 55: NYPD Discipline Imposed for APU Adjudicated Cases (June 2025)**

<b>Board Disposition Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>Allegation(s)</b>	<b>Precinct</b>	<b>Borough</b>	<b>NYPD Discipline</b>
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Anthony Sclafani	F: Physical force; A: Interference with recording	1	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 5 days / Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	DT3 Thomas Napolitano	U: Misleading official statement	1	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	SDS Keith Bryan	F: Pepper spray; F: Pepper spray; F: Pepper spray	18	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Adnan Hussain	F: Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton); A: Interference with recording; F: Physical force	19	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Adan Suazorodas	F: Nightstick as club (incl asp & baton); A: Interference with recording	19	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	DT3 Juan Rodriguez	U: False official statement	24	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 10 days
Substantiated (Charges)	PO John Peloso	O: Gender; D: Word	25	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 10 days
Substantiated (Charges)	POM John Peloso	F: Physical force	28	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 10 days
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Scott Isaacs	O: Gender; D: Word; F: Physical force	33	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Jean Germosen	A: Entry of Premises; F: Restricted Breathing; A: Threat of arrest; D: Word; D: Word; A: Threat of force (verbal or physical); F: Physical force; F: Physical force	41	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Carlos Herrera	A: Interference with recording; A: Threat of arrest; D: Word	43	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Kevin Coogan	D: Word; O: Gender	49	Bronx	Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	POM Rahat Rumel	A: Refusal to process civilian complaint	63	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Delton Ng	U: Misleading official statement	67	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Fei Lin	D: Action; D: Word; A: Threat of arrest	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	POM Samuel Maria	A: Refusal to process civilian complaint	69	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	POM Jia Lau	A: Refusal to process civilian complaint	69	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Christina Oconnor	D: Word; F: Physical force	75	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 5 days / Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Mario Valencia	F: Physical force; F: Physical force	75	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 5 days / Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Melendez	D: Word; F: Physical force	77	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Chandrapaul Temal	F: Physical force; D: Word	77	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 5 days / Command Discipline A

<b>Board Disposition Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>Allegation(s)</b>	<b>Precinct</b>	<b>Borough</b>	<b>NYPD Discipline</b>
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Sindy Sanchez	F: Pepper spray	78	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 5 days / Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Matthew Peters	F: Physical force; F: Physical force; F: Physical force	79	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Christopher Neun	F: Physical force	103	Queens	Command Discipline B 10 days
Substantiated (Charges)	DT3 Michael Sinclair	A: Search of Premises; A: Entry of Premises; A: Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	114	Queens	Forfeit vacation 5 days / Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	PO John Ogunmoyin	F: Physical force; F: Physical force; F: Physical force; F: Physical force	115	Queens	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B



**Figure 56: NYPD No Discipline Imposed for APU Adjudicated Cases (June 2025)**

<b>Board Disposition Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Precinct</b>	<b>Borough</b>	<b>NYPD Discipline</b>
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Michele Carrieri	A: Photography/Videography	19	Manhattan	Closed: Retained, without discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Osvaldo Nunez	A: Interference with recording; F: Physical force	101	Queens	Closed: Not guilty after trial

**Figure 57: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (June 2025)**

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

<b>Board Disposition</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>FADO&amp;U Category</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Precinct of Occurrence</b>	<b>Borough of Occurrence</b>
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Luigi Scalici	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search		Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Luigi Scalici	Abuse of Authority	Frisk		Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Luigi Scalici	Abuse of Authority	Question		Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Luigi Scalici	Abuse of Authority	Question		Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Luigi Scalici	Abuse of Authority	Question		Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Olivia Kania	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	0	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Olivia Kania	Discourtesy	Word	0	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Angel Ogando	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	DT3 Damir Vukosa	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jennifer Mariani	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Vinord Andrew	Discourtesy	Word	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Fernando Garcia	Discourtesy	Word	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Nikolaos Stefopoulos	Force	Physical force	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Fernando Garcia	Offensive Language	Disability	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Vincent Cavitolo	Discourtesy	Word	10	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Vincent Cavitolo	Discourtesy	Word	10	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Borodin	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	14	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Borodin	Abuse of Authority	Sexual Miscon (Inappropriate Touching)	14	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Yomairy Medina	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	14	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Fausto Munoz	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	14	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Richard Johannes	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Bryan Rogoobeer	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Richard Johannes	Discourtesy	Word	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Sheldon Elliott	Discourtesy	Word	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Sheldon Elliott	Offensive Language	Sexual orientation	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lorenzo Jones	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Bryan Gray	Abuse of Authority	False official statement	25	Manhattan

<b>Board Disposition</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>FADO&amp;U Category</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Precinct of Occurrence</b>	<b>Borough of Occurrence</b>
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Bryan Gray	Force	Physical force	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lorenzo Jones	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lorenzo Jones	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lorenzo Jones	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lorenzo Jones	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lorenzo Jones	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lorenzo Jones	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lorenzo Jones	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Yadadye Abramov	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	26	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Nicholas Mcdonough	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	26	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Santino Gonzalez	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Viola	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Viola	Discourtesy	Word	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Viola	Discourtesy	Word	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Dustin Levi	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Matthew Erbeta	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Matthew Erbeta	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Juan Martinezcabrera	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Ivan Cruz	Abuse of Authority	Question	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Tiago Gomes	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Willian Pachecocuzco	Force	Physical force	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Syeda Hussain	Abuse of Authority	Property damaged	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Harryson Cothias	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Bryan Toledo	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Harryson Cothias	Untruthful Statement	Misleading official statement	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Bryan Toledo	Untruthful Statement	Misleading official statement	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Felix Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Edwin Olivo	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Felix Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	43	Bronx

<b>Board Disposition</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>FADO&amp;U Category</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Precinct of Occurrence</b>	<b>Borough of Occurrence</b>
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Felix Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Felix Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Question	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Felix Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Question	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Felix Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Question	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Justin Bauman	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Justin Bauman	Discourtesy	Word	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Brian Estevez	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Edgard Delossantos	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Edgard Delossantos	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Edgard Delossantos	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Patrick Cordones	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Damir Vukosa	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Brian Estevez	Abuse of Authority	Question	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Damir Vukosa	Abuse of Authority	Question	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Gluth	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Gluth	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Gluth	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Gluth	Abuse of Authority	Failure to Explain	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Christopher Bello	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Gluth	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Queyshaun Jones	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Edgard Delossantos	Force	Physical force	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Alan Sable	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DT3 Michael Best	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DT3 Robert Morales	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DT3 Wayne Jenkins	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DT3 Michael Best	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DT3 Everton Smith	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	45	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DT3 Michael Best	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	45	Bronx

<b>Board Disposition</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>FADO&amp;U Category</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Precinct of Occurrence</b>	<b>Borough of Occurrence</b>
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Wichers	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Darian Wesler	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Wichers	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Wichers	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Vlora Gjeka	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Wichers	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Darian Wesler	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Wichers	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Vlora Gjeka	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Wichers	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Darian Wesler	Abuse of Authority	Question	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Aalijhaenle Vargas	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Wichers	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Vlora Gjeka	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Lee Arroyo	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Arrest	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Darian Wesler	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Wichers	Abuse of Authority	Failure to Explain	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Vlora Gjeka	Abuse of Authority	Failure to Explain	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Derrick Wright	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Lee Arroyo	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Vlora Gjeka	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Vlora Gjeka	Force	Physical force	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Christopher Hernandez	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Christopher Hernandez	Abuse of Authority	Stop	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Katherin Martinez	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Christopher Hernandez	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Anthony Ferrer	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Christopher Hernandez	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Isamar Alonzoramos	Discourtesy	Action	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Michael Smith	Abuse of Authority	Search of recording device	48	Bronx

<b>Board Disposition</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>FADO&amp;U Category</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Precinct of Occurrence</b>	<b>Borough of Occurrence</b>
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Michael Smith	Abuse of Authority	Electronic device information deletion	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Michael Smith	Abuse of Authority	Detention	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Michael Smith	Untruthful Statement	False official statement	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Matthew Guerrido	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Satinderpal Singh	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jose Guzman	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Timothy Thatcher	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jose Guzman	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Raymond Branca	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Cava	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Martin Dicostanzo	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Cava	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Cava	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jake Riley	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jake Riley	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jake Riley	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Cava	Force	Chokehold	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Timothy Thatcher	Force	Physical force	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Cava	Force	Physical force	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Martin Dicostanzo	Force	Physical force	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jose Guzman	Force	Physical force	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jose Guzman	Force	Physical force	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jake Riley	Offensive Language	Gender	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jose Guzman	Untruthful Statement	Misleading official statement	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jake Riley	Untruthful Statement	Misleading official statement	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Christian Perez	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Christian Perez	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Edwin Torres	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Adnan Hussain	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	69	Brooklyn

<b>Board Disposition</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>FADO&amp;U Category</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Precinct of Occurrence</b>	<b>Borough of Occurrence</b>
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Coffaro	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Coffaro	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Coffaro	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Coffaro	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Rafal Korycki	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Rafal Korycki	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Rafal Korycki	Abuse of Authority	Stop	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DT3 Frank Hernandez	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DT3 Jeffrey Goris	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Matthew Byrnes	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Rafal Korycki	Abuse of Authority	Failure to Explain	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Rafal Korycki	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Joseph Ancona	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Zachary Cachia	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Kevin Pereira	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Puja Negi	Abuse of Authority	Question	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Jerry Martins	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Puja Negi	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Joseph Ancona	Discourtesy	Word	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Zhane Walsh	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jeffrey Rosa	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Zhane Walsh	Discourtesy	Word	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Adam Dumelle	Discourtesy	Word	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Zhane Walsh	Offensive Language	Race	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Zhane Walsh	Offensive Language	Gender	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Christopher Puccio	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	78	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Brian Mccarthy	Abuse of Authority	Other	78	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Christopher Puccio	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	78	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Christopher Puccio	Discourtesy	Word	78	Brooklyn

<b>Board Disposition</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>FADO&amp;U Category</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Precinct of Occurrence</b>	<b>Borough of Occurrence</b>
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DTS Jason Gray	Force	Physical force	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Luigi Scalici	Abuse of Authority	False official statement	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Michael Dechiaro	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Keva Weaver	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Sheena Gray	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Duane Harper	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Michael Dechiaro	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Jeimmy Garrido	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Karim Mohamed	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Brian Estevez	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle stop	103	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Michael Boyle	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	103	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	DT3 Damir Vukosa	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	103	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT SA James Seder	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	103	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Evangellos Georgakis	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	103	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Brian Estevez	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	103	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Evangellos Georgakis	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	103	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Brian Estevez	Abuse of Authority	Question	103	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Brian Estevez	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	103	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Michael Palagonia	Discourtesy	Word	105	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Robert Wagner	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	107	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Anthony Mceniry	Abuse of Authority	Search of recording device	107	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Robert Wagner	Discourtesy	Word	107	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Robert Wagner	Discourtesy	Word	107	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Kevin Donohue	Force	Physical force	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Fuhad Hussain	Abuse of Authority	Other	108	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Evangellos Georgakis	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	110	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Nicholas Gluth	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	110	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Kyle Clavin	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	113	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Kyle Clavin	Force	Physical force	113	Queens



<b>Board Disposition</b>	<b>Officer</b>	<b>FADO&amp;U Category</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Precinct of Occurrence</b>	<b>Borough of Occurrence</b>
Substantiated (Charges)	DT3 Mark Domanick	Abuse of Authority	Strip-searched	115	Queens