CIVILIAN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD
100 CHURCH STREET 10th FLOOR
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10007 ♦ TELEPHONE (212) 912-7235
www.nyc.gov/ccrb

ERIC L. ADAMS
MAYOR

DR. MOHAMMAD KHALID
INTERIM CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report

October 2025

(Statistics for September 2025)

Contents

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 September 2025 included the following highlights:

1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 53% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 67% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In September, the CCRB opened 521 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 3,241 cases (page 11).

2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 47% of its fully investigated cases in September (page 17).

3) The CCRB fully investigated 36% of the cases it closed in September (page 14).

4) For September, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 48% of cases - compared to 29% 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, 41-47).

6) In September the Police Commissioner finalized 33 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 14 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; no trials were conducted against respondent officers in September.

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 September 2025, the CCRB initiated 521 new complaints.

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



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



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



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

NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
0	2
1	8
5	10
6	6
7	9
9	6
10	3
13	8
14	10
17	4
18	14
20	2
23	11
24	1
25	6
28	15
30	9
32	8
33	6
34	7
40	13
41	8
42	10
43	11
44	14
45	4
46	12
47	8
48	13
49	5
50	3
52	8
60	17
61	3
62	3
63	4
66	1

NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
67	17
68	1
69	3
70	2
71	5
72	4
73	14
75	20
76	1
77	9
79	13
81	1
83	5
84	7
88	4
90	3
100	2
101	5
102	3
103	14
105	3
106	5
107	5
109	5
110	9
111	1
112	2
113	5
114	6
115	7
116	6
120	11
121	2
122	2
123	4
1000	1
Unknown	32

*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 (September 2024 vs. September 2025)



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

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

	September 2024		September 2025			
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints	Change	% Change
Force (F)	246	52%	264	51%	18	7%
Abuse of Authority (A)	332	70%	350	67%	18	5%
Discourtesy (D)	115	24%	111	21%	-4	-3%
Offensive Language (O)	22	5%	34	7%	12	55%
Total FADO Allegations	715		759		44	6%
Total Complaints	474		521		47	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			
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints	Change	% Change
Force (F)	2093	49%	2219	51%	126	6%
Abuse of Authority (A)	3236	75%	3121	72%	-115	-4%
Discourtesy (D)	1114	26%	993	23%	-121	-11%
Offensive Language (O)	270	6%	227	5%	-43	-16%
Total FADO Allegations	6713		6560		-153	-2%
Total Complaints	4314		4348		34	1%

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)

	September 2024		September 2025			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	642	34%	653	37%	11	2%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1075	56%	943	53%	-132	-12%
Discourtesy (D)	171	9%	136	8%	-35	-20%
Offensive Language (O)	24	1%	40	2%	16	67%
Total Allegations	1912		1772		-140	-7%
Total Complaints	474		521		47	10%

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

	YTD 2024		YTD 2025			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Force (F)	5606	30%	5768	34%	162	3%
Abuse of Authority (A)	11026	59%	9673	57%	-1353	-12%
Discourtesy (D)	1696	9%	1379	8%	-317	-19%
Offensive Language (O)	363	2%	291	2%	-72	-20%
Total Allegations	18691		17111		-1580	-8%
Total Complaints	4314		4348		34	1%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of September 2025, 53% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 67% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

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

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1700	52.6%
Cases 5-7 Months	464	14.4%
Cases 8-11 Months	638	19.8%
Cases 12-18 Months*	423	13.1%
Cases Over 18 Months**	5	0.2%
Total	**3230**	**100%**

*12-18 Months: 11 cases that were reopened; 0 cases that were on DA Hold; 0 cases that were on FID Hold.
**Over18 Months: 2 cases that were 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 (September 2025)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1525	47.2%
Cases 5-7 Months	504	15.6%
Cases 8-11 Months	662	20.5%
Cases 12-18 Months*	532	16.5%
Cases Over 18 Months**	7	0.2%
Total	**3230**	**100%**

*12-18 Months: 15 cases that were reopened; 0 cases that were on DA Hold; 0 cases that were on FID Hold.
**Over18 Months: 2 cases that were 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 - September 2025)



Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis



Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	August 2025		September 2025			
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Change	% Change
Investigations	1521	49%	1503	46%	-18	-1%
Pending Board Review	1564	50%	1727	53%	163	10%
Mediation	11	0%	6	0%	-5	-45%
On DA / FID Hold	4	0%	5	0%	1	25%
Total	3100		3241		141	5%

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 Business Days To Recieve Positive Return on Unredacted BWC Requests (January 2024 - September 2025)



Figure 19: Average Business Days To Recieve Positive Return on Redacted BWC Requests (January 2024 - September 2025)



Figure 20: Pending Requests for BWC Footage

Days Pending	BWC Requests	% of Total
00 <= Days < 30	98	57.3%
30 <= Days < 60	34	19.9%
60 <= Days < 90	7	4.1%
90 >= Days	32	18.7%
Total	**171**	**100%**

Figure 21: Percentage of Open Investigations Docket with Pending BWC Requests (January 2024 - September 2025)



Figure 22: Fulfilled BWC Requests (January 2024 - September 2025)



Closed Cases

In September 2025, the CCRB fully investigated 36% of the cases it closed.

Figure 23: Case Resolutions (January 2024 - September 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 stated that she was at home when the subject officer knocked on her door. The individual spoke to the subject officer through the closed door, and he told her he would break down her door if she didn't open it. She opened it and the subject officer searched her apartment. The subject officer failed to activate his BWC and failed to provide a business card to the individual. The subject officer did not dispute that he told the individual that her would break down her door if she didn't open it. He told her he had an arrest warrant for a female individual who was unknown to the individual. The remainder of the incident was captured on BWC. The subject officer walked through the apartment looking for the individual on the arrest warrant and found only the individual's daughter. The investigation found that the subject officer failed to turn on his BWC when he knocked on the individual's door as he was engaged in police action which required the activation of the BWC and failed to give the individual his business card at the conclusion of the police action which resulted in neither an arrest nor summons. The Board substantiated the Abuse of Authority allegations.

2. Unable to Determine
An individual stated that as he was placed into an ambulance to be transported to a hospital, an officer was rude to him. The individual stated that at the hospital, he told the subject officer that he needed to use the bathroom and the subject officer responded, "you need to tie your ass." The incident was partially captured on BWC. While being loaded into the ambulance, the individual yelled a racial slur at an officer. An officer responded off camera, "man, suck my dick." The investigation determined that two of the three officers at the scene could have said the statement. The subject officer who was the only officer with the individual at the hospital stated that he did not tell the individual to "tie his ass." Without further evidence, the investigation could not determine which of the two officers said "man, suck my dick", to the individual and if the subject officer said "tie your ass" to the individual. The Board closed the Discourtesy allegations as Unable to Determine.

3. Unfounded
An individual stated that while he was at a police precinct station house, the two subject officers made him strip down to his underwear. The incident was captured on BWC and stationhouse cameras. The subject officers and the individual stood in front of the holding cell and subject officer 1 began to remove the drawstring from the individual's shorts. The individual told him not to remove the drawstring.

Subject officer 1 then asked about the laces on the individual's shoes and the individual replied that he did not want to remove the laces. The individual then removed his shorts and stepped out of his shoes. Subject officer 2 removed his handcuffs and told the individual to put his shorts back on and the individual told him that he didn't want them to remove the short's drawstrings and refused to put his shorts back on. The individual walked into the holding cell wearing his socks, boxer briefs and t-shirt. The investigation found that the subject officers were following procedure in removing strings (usually by cutting) from individuals being placed in holding cells. The individual told the subject officers that he would remove the clothing items with strings so that they would not be cut and the subject officers let him do so. The Board closed the Abuse of Authority allegations as Unfounded.

4. Within NYPD Guidelines

An individual stated that he was pushed in the chest by the subject officer. The incident was captured on BWC. It showed the individual standing next to an officer who was running a warrant check on the individual. Multiple officers told the individual to step back, and he refused to do so. The subject officer then pushed the individual away from the officer. The investigation found that the individual was standing close enough to the officer to cause a safety concern and that he refused directives to step back. The subject officer was justified in moving the individual away from the other officer with the minimal amount of force. The Board closed the Use of Force allegation as being Within NYPD Guidelines.

5. Officer Unidentified

An individual stated that he was walking on the street when a marked NYPD vehicle pulled up next to him. The vehicle had five officers in it and one of them asked the individual if he had any weapons on him. The officers then drove away and did not give the individual a business card. The individual had a general description of the officers, their vehicle number, and the precinct he believed the vehicle was from. NYPD records informed the investigation that the vehicle number was incomplete, hindering a search of the vehicle records. NYPD records found a vehicle that was a partial match in the identified precinct. The officers assigned to that vehicle did not recall interacting with the individual and one of the officers at the time of the incident was at another location. Without additional pertinent information, the investigation could not identify the subject officers. The Board closed the Abuse of Authority allegations 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 24: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (September 2025)



Figure 25: 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 26: Disposition of Cases (2024 vs 2025)

	Sep 2024		Sep 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
Full Investigations	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Substantiated	97	51%	66	47%	635	34%	785	48%
Within NYPD Guidelines	23	12%	15	11%	292	16%	199	12%
Unfounded	30	16%	32	23%	425	23%	307	19%
Unable to Determine	35	19%	19	14%	432	23%	289	18%
MOS Unidentified	4	2%	7	5%	93	5%	61	4%
Total - Full Investigations	189		139		1877		1641	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	2	100%	4	100%	37	100%	26	100%
Total - Mediation Closures	2		4		37		26	
Unable to Investigate / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint Withdrawn	13	3%	20	8%	202	8%	174	7%
Closed - Pending Litigation	58	14%	45	18%	406	16%	453	19%
Unable to Investigate*	336	82%	180	73%	1904	75%	1778	73%
Officer Retired/Resigned**	3	1%	1	0%	26	1%	20	1%
Administrative Closure***	0	0%	0	0%	4	0%	5	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	410		246		2542		2430	
Total - Closed Cases	601		389		4456		4097	

*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 27: Disposition of FADO Allegations (2024 vs 2025)

	Sep 2024		Sep 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	309	26%	171	18%	2253	22%	2584	22%
Unable to Determine	206	18%	143	15%	1920	18%	1936	16%
Unfounded	173	15%	217	23%	2098	20%	2355	20%
Within NYPD Guidelines	425	36%	381	40%	3561	34%	4415	37%
MOS Unidentified	62	5%	32	3%	613	6%	577	5%
Total - Full Investigations	1175		944		10445		11867	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	9	100%	22	100%	125	100%	92	100%
Total - Mediation Closures	9		22		125		92	
Unable to Investigate / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint Withdrawn	42	4%	50	8%	590	8%	474	7%
Unable to Investigate*	763	68%	339	58%	4439	64%	4016	61%
Closed - Pending Litigation	209	19%	161	27%	1418	20%	1560	24%
Officer Retired/Resigned**	102	9%	39	7%	474	7%	479	7%
Administrative Closure***	0	0%	0	0%	23	0%	8	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	1116		589		6944		6537	
Total - Closed Allegations	2300		1555		17514		18496	

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

	Substantiated	Unable to Determine	Within NYPD Guidelines	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	20	30	154	83	5	292
	7%	10%	53%	28%	2%	100%
Abuse of Authority	127	101	191	105	23	547
	23%	18%	35%	19%	4%	100%
Discourtesy	21	10	36	23	3	93
	23%	11%	39%	25%	3%	100%
Offensive Language	3	2	0	6	1	12
	25%	17%	0%	50%	8%	100%
	171	143	381	217	32	944
Total	18%	15%	40%	23%	3%	100%

Figure 29: Disposition of FADO Allegations by FADO Category (YTD 2025)

	Substantiated	Unable to Determine	Within NYPD Guidelines	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	190	350	1668	764	81	3053
	6%	11%	55%	25%	3%	100%
Abuse of Authority	2047	1283	2485	1278	391	7484
	27%	17%	33%	17%	5%	100%
Discourtesy	287	222	258	243	75	1085
	26%	20%	24%	22%	7%	100%
Offensive Language	60	81	4	70	30	245
	24%	33%	2%	29%	12%	100%
	2584	1936	4415	2355	577	11867
Total	22%	16%	37%	20%	5%	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 30: Substantiated Untruthful Statement Allegations with % Change

Untruthful Statement Allegations	September 2024		September 2025			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
False official statement	3	75%	1	50%	-2	-67%
Impeding an investigation	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Inaccurate official statement	1	25%	0	0%	-1	-100%
Misleading official statement	0	0%	1	50%	1	NA
Total Allegations	4		2		-2	-50%

Figure 31: 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	24	69%	20	69%	-4	-17%
Impeding an investigation	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Inaccurate official statement	2	6%	0	0%	-2	-100%
Misleading official statement	9	26%	9	31%	0	0%
Total Allegations	35		29		-6	-17%

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 32: Substantiated Bias-Based Policing Allegations with % Change

Bias-Based Allegations	September 2024		September 2025			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Age	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Color	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Disability	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Gender	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Housing Status	2	50%	0	0%	-2	-100%
Immigration Status	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
National Origin	2	50%	0	0%	-2	-100%
Race	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Sexual Orientation	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Total Allegations	4		0		-4	-100%

Figure 33: Substantiated Bias-Based Policing Allegations YTD with % Change

Bias-Based Allegations	YTD 2024		YTD 2025			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
Age	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Color	2	4%	1	5%	-1	-50%
Disability	10	20%	2	10%	-8	-80%
Gender	1	2%	0	0%	-1	-100%
Housing Status	3	6%	0	0%	-3	-100%
Immigration Status	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
National Origin	7	14%	0	0%	-7	-100%
Race	28	55%	17	85%	-11	-39%
Religion	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Sexual Orientation	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Total Allegations	51		20		-31	-61%

Substantiation Rates

The September 2025 case substantiation rate was 47%.

Figure 34: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2024 - September 2025)



Figure 35: 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 36: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations without Video (Jan 2024 - Sep 2025) (% substantiated shown)



Figure 37: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2024 - Sep 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 38: Board Discipline Recommendations for Officers with Substantiated Allegations* (Sep 2024, Sep 2025, YTD 2024, YTD 2025)

	September 2024		September 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
Disposition	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Charges	40	24%	18	18%	322	27%	328	23%
Command Discipline B	49	30%	24	24%	257	22%	278	20%
Command Discipline A	50	30%	33	32%	434	37%	507	36%
Formalized Training	25	15%	27	26%	176	15%	303	21%
Total	164		102		1189		1416	

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

Complaints Against Officers Assigned to Police Service Areas

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

Figure 39: PSA Complaints Closed as % of Total Complaints Closed

	Sep 2024	Sep 2025	YTD 2024	YTD 2025
PSA Complaints	23	13	187	166
Total Complaints	601	389	4456	4097
PSA Complaints as % of Total	3.8%	3.3%	4.2%	4.1%

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 40: Closed Complaints Against Officers Assigned to a PSA

	Sep 2024	Sep 2025	YTD 2024	YTD 2025
PSA 1	5	8	41	35
PSA 2	6	8	51	69
PSA 3	13	2	96	61
PSA 4	1	3	31	44
PSA 5	3	0	28	58
PSA 6	2	3	20	25
PSA 7	14	3	50	28
PSA 8	6	5	32	17
PSA 9	0	0	30	18
Total	50	32	379	355

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

	Sep 2024		Sep 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	18	31%	28	67%	153	31%	209	45%
Abuse of Authority (A)	34	58%	9	21%	257	52%	198	42%
Discourtesy (D)	5	8%	3	7%	65	13%	47	10%
Offensive Language (O)	1	2%	1	2%	20	4%	12	3%
Untruthful Statement (U)	1	2%	1	2%	3	1%	3	1%
Total	59	101%	42	99%	498	101%	469	101%

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 42: Disposition of PSA Officers (2024 vs 2025)

	Sep 2024		Sep 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
Full Investigations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	18	58%	2	14%	99	40%	60	31%
Within NYPD Guidelines	7	23%	10	71%	58	23%	58	30%
Unfounded	3	10%	1	7%	59	24%	49	25%
Unable to Determine	3	10%	1	7%	30	12%	26	13%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	2	1%
Total - Full Investigations	31		14		247		195	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	3	100%
Total - Mediation Closures	0		0		3		3	
Unable to Investigate / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	0	0%	2	11%	11	9%	10	6%
Unable to Investigate*	14	74%	10	56%	80	62%	78	50%
Closed - Pending Litigation	3	16%	6	33%	34	26%	59	38%
Officer Retired/Resigned**	2	11%	0	0%	4	3%	10	6%
Administrative Closure***	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	19		18		129		157	
Total - Closed Cases	50		32		379		355	

*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 September and this year.

Figure 43: Mediated Complaints Closed

	September 2025	YTD 2025
Mediated Complaints	4	26

Figure 44: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	September 2025	YTD 2025
Force	1	10
Abuse of Authority	21	67
Discourtesy	0	10
Offensive Language	0	5
Total	22	92

Figure 45: Mediated Complaints By Borough (September 2025)

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

Figure 46: Mediated Allegations By Borough (September 2025)

	Mediations
Bronx	7
Brooklyn	9
Manhattan	0
Queens	6
Staten Island	0

Figure 47: Mediated Complaints By Precinct (Sep 2025 - YTD 2025)

Precinct	Sep 2025	YTD 2025	Precinct	Sep 2025	YTD 2025
6	0	1	52	0	2
18	0	2	73	0	1
19	0	1	75	1	2
23	0	1	78	0	1
25	0	1	103	1	1
32	0	2	106	0	1
40	1	3	108	0	1
43	0	1	110	1	1
46	0	1	116	0	1
48	0	1	NA	0	1

Figure 48: Mediated Allegations By Precinct (Sep 2025 - YTD 2025)

Precinct	Sep 2025	YTD 2025	Precinct	Sep 2025	YTD 2025
6	0	9	52	0	4
18	0	7	73	0	1
19	0	6	75	9	13
23	0	3	78	0	1
25	0	2	103	2	2
32	0	3	106	0	4
40	7	11	108	0	3
43	0	2	110	4	4
46	0	1	116	0	9
48	0	6	NA	0	1

Administrative Prosecution Unit

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

Figure 49: Administrative Prosecution Unit Case Closures

Disposition Category	Prosecution Disposition	Sep 2025	YTD 2025
	***Previously adjudicated, discipline not reported	0	0
	Total	**0**	**0**
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial-PC Approved	1	3
	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	23	113
	Plea Renegotiated by PC	0	0
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. B	0	2
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. A	0	2
	Plea set aside, Formalized Training	1	5
	Plea set aside, Instructions	0	0
	*Retained, with discipline	1	18
	Disciplinary Action Total	**26**	**143**
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial-PC Approved	3	10
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	2
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	2	8
	**Retained, without discipline	2	9
	Dismissed by Police Commissioner	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total	**7**	**29**
Not Adjudicated	Other	0	4
	Department adjudication in process	1	5
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	1
	***Previously adjudicated, without discipline	0	3
	MOS Retired	3	6
	MOS Resigned	3	7
	Terminated	0	1
	Terminal Leave, Adjudication Pending	0	1
	Not Adjudicated Total	**7**	**28**
	Total Closures	**40**	**200**

*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 50: NYPD-CCRB Discipline Concurrence

Discipline Report Year	Non APU %	APU %	Total %
2023	55.53	58.06	55.96
2024	26.48	45.54	30.29
2025 YTD	82.26	70.83	80.29

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 51: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Adjudicated APU Cases

Discipline*	September 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	1	10
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	12	78
Command Discipline B	1	2
Command Discipline A	0	8
Formalized Training**	12	44
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	**26**	**143**
No Disciplinary Action†	7	29
Adjudicated Total	**33**	**172**
Discipline Rate	**79%**	**83%**
Not Adjudicated† Total	7	28
Total Closures	**40**	**200**

*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 52: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	Disposition Type*	August 2025	YTD 2025
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	23	140
	Command Discipline A	43	313
	Formalized Training**	19	227
	Closed Administratively (With Discipline) ††	3	12
	Total	**88**	**692**
No Disciplinary Action	Retired	0	2
	Resigned	0	3
	SOL Expired	0	4
	Department Unable to Prosecute †††	2	25
	Department Unable to Prosecute (Short SOL) ††††	0	129
	Closed Administratively (No penalty reported) ††	0	0
	Total	**2**	**163**
	Discipline Rate	**98%**	**81%**
	DUP Rate	**2%**	**18%**

*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 53: "Short SOL"* Decisions Returned by Days to SOL Expiration (Aug 2024, Aug 2025, YTD 2024, YTD 2025)

	August 2024		August 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
Days to SOL at Close Group	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	3	3%		N/A	11	2%		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		0%		N/A	15	3%	78	61%
40 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 50	39	33%		N/A	77	14%	17	13%
50 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 60	33	28%		N/A	106	19%		0%
60 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 90	43	36%		N/A	336	61%		0%
Total	118				549		128	

Figure 54: "Short SOL"* Decisions Returned by Days to SOL Expiration for Complaints Containing a Substantiated SQF Allegation (Aug 2024, Aug 2025, YTD 2024, YTD 2025)

	August 2024		August 2025		YTD 2024		YTD 2025	
Days to SOL at Close Group	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	2%		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%	2	2%	1	100%
40 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 50	5	28%		0%	10	12%		0%
50 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 60	7	39%		0%	25	31%		0%
60 <= Days from CCRB Case Closing to SOL Expiration < 90	6	33%		0%	42	52%		0%
Total	18				81		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 55: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (August 2025)

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation(s)	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Olivia Kania	D: Word; A: Refusal to provide shield number	0	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DT3 Damir Vukosa	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	1	Manhattan	Closed Administratively (Command Discipline - A)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Jennifer Mariani	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	1	Manhattan	Closed Administratively (Command Discipline - A)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	LT Nikolaos Stefopoulos	F: Physical force	1	Manhattan	Closed Administratively
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Vincent Cavitolo	D: Word; D: Word	10	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Haroon Hussain	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	13	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Maria Corbisiero	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	13	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Tyler Morales	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	24	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Randy Torres	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; D: Action; A: Threat of arrest	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DT3 Timothy Gaven	D: Word	25	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DT3 Timothy Donohue	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	25	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Jorge Lealenriquez	A: Refusal to provide name; A: Refusal to provide shield number	26	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Alyssa Trigueno	D: Word	26	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Justin Senese	A: Frisk; A: Failure to provide RTKA card; D: Word; A: Failure to Explain	26	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B (Formalized Training)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Osvaldo Garcia	A: Question; A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Vehicle search	26	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B (Formalized Training)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Emanuel Crespo	A: Threat re: removal to hospital	26	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	AC Ruel Stephenson	O: Gender; D: Word	26	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Nicholas Mcdonough	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	26	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Yadadye Abramov	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	26	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Edward Carrasco	A: Threat of arrest	30	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Matthew Erbetta	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Refusal to provide name	30	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Juan Martinezcabrera	A: Search (of person)	40	Bronx	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Ivan Cruz	A: Question	40	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Tiago Gomes	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.13 days)

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation(s)	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Juan Martinezcabrera	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Ryan Hennessy	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Keilly Hernandez	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Entry of Premises; A: Improper use of body-worn camera	41	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.13 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Bryan Toledo	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	41	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.13 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Adonis Rosario	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	41	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Syeda Hussain	A: Property damaged	41	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 5 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DI Miguel Iglesias	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	42	Bronx	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Justin Bauman	D: Word; A: Failure to provide RTKA card	43	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Mohsin Javid	D: Word	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Damir Vukosa	A: Question; A: Frisk	44	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 2 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Brian Estevez	A: Question; A: Vehicle search	44	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 2 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Joseph Rivera	O: Race; D: Word	44	Bronx	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Alan Sable	A: Entry of Premises	45	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 3 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Aalijhaenle Vargas	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Darian Wesler	A: Question	46	Bronx	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Gladwin Sato	D: Word	46	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Ruben Gonzalezvargas	D: Word	46	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	LT Wady Mata	A: Unlawful Summons	47	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 10 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Argenis Paulino	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Improper use of body-worn camera; A: Question	47	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Anyel Rijocedeno	A: Question; A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Improper use of body-worn camera	47	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Anthony Ferrer	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	47	Bronx	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Matthew Guerrido	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	52	Bronx	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Satinderpal Singh	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	52	Bronx	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Anoop Thomas	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; D: Word	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Michael Moran	D: Word; A: Failure to provide RTKA card	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation(s)	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Raymond Branca	D: Word	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Martin Dicostanzo	F: Physical force; D: Word	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 2 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Michael Farone	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; A: Frisk	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 2 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Matthew Sheridan	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; D: Word	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Jake Riley	A: Vehicle search	60	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Aaron Lee	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	61	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Ashur Morris	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	61	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Sebastian Villa	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	61	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Joseph Xiao	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	63	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.25 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Ali Salem	D: Word	63	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DTS David Mercado	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	70	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Matthew Regan	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	70	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Gregory Baluzy	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	70	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Darren Moore	A: Stop	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Reynaldo Nunez	A: Stop	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	LT Christopher Rinelli	A: Search (of person); A: Frisk	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Omar Delarosa	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Search of Premises	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Junaid Saeed	A: Entry of Premises	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Adam Elmaadawy	A: Search of Premises; A: Entry of Premises	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DT3 Mirsad Radoncic	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Search of Premises	71	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Omar Delarosa	A: Failure to Explain	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Joseph Galano	A: Refusal to obtain medical treatment	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	DTS Elijah Boyle	A: Vehicle search	71	Brooklyn	Closed Administratively (Command Discipline - B) / Vacation: 5 days
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Faisal Elwan	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Frisk	73	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Jared Delaney	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	73	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Thomas Marfoglio	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	73	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Puja Negi	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; A: Question	75	Brooklyn	No penalty

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation(s)	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Christopher Mcdonald	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	DT3 Christopher Giordano	A: Entry of Premises; A: Search of Premises; A: Entry of Premises; A: Search of Premises	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	DT3 Jared Pilkington	A: Threat to damage/seize property	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Sergiomonty Ang	A: Vehicle search; A: Refusal to provide shield number	81	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DTS Jason Gray	F: Physical force	81	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Ronny Claudiorodriguez	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	81	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Duane Harper	A: Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Jeimmy Garrido	A: Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Karim Mohamed	A: Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Keva Weaver	A: Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Sheena Gray	A: Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Michael Dechiaro	A: Refusal to provide name; A: Refusal to provide shield number	84	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Michael Palagonia	D: Word	105	Queens	Command Discipline - A
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Kevin Donohue	F: Physical force	107	Queens	No penalty
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Stephanie Delanuez	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	110	Queens	Formalized Training

Figure 56: NYPD Discipline Imposed for APU Adjudicated Cases (September 2025)

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation(s)	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Elena Stojanovski	A: Refusal to process civilian complaint; D: Word		Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Brian Ferguson	A: Bias-Based Policing (Housing Status); D: Action; D: Word; D: Word; F: Hit against inanimate object; A: Threat re: removal to hospital	6	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Joseph Orlando	F: Physical force; U: Misleading official statement	13	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Jose Santana	A: Interference with recording	18	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Eric Carricato	A: Forcible Removal to Hospital; A: Sex Miscon (Humiliation: fail to cover)	30	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 5 days / Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	POF Melanie Paganburgos	A: Interference with recording	32	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Dina Valentin	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Other; A: Stop	42	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 3 days / Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Vincent Galdo	O: Gender; D: Word	42	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 5 days / Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Enmanuel Diazsantana	F: Nonlethal restraining device; A: Improper use of body-worn camera	43	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Richard Castellano	D: Word; F: Physical force	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	PO John Tobin	F: Physical force	44	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Thomas Gerlich	A: Interference with recording; A: Seizure of property; A: Search (of person); A: Vehicle search	52	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Brian Henn	A: Threat of arrest; A: Interference with recording	61	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Joseph Buttigheri	A: Threat re: removal to hospital	61	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Richard Brown	D: Word; F: Physical force	61	Brooklyn	Command Discipline B 5 days
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Cox	A: Unlawful Arrest; A: Unlawful Arrest	67	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT DS Steven Zanca	A: Search of Premises; A: Entry of Premises	77	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Haris Ahmemulic	D: Word; A: Threat of force (verbal or physical)	79	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Haris Ahmemulic	A: Refusal to provide shield number; A: Refusal to provide name; O: Disability; D: Word	79	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Antonio Cantillo	O: Other; O: Other	81	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	POM David Damico	A: Threat of force (verbal or physical); F: Physical force; D: Word	83	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Haris Ahmemulic	D: Word; A: Threat of arrest	83	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation(s)	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Jonathan Pesce	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	105	Queens	Forfeit vacation 3 days
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Ganesh Persaud	O: Other; D: Word; A: Refusal to provide shield number; O: Other; D: Word; O: Religion; D: Word; A: Refusal to provide name	114	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Frederick Daley	D: Word; A: Threat of arrest; O: Other; A: Threat of arrest; A: Property damaged	121	Staten Island	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT John Iskaros	O: Gender; D: Action; O: Race; U: False official statement; D: Word; A: Sex Miscon (Sexual Harassment, Gesture)	121	Staten Island	Forfeit vacation 20 days

Figure 57: NYPD No Discipline Imposed for APU Adjudicated Cases (September 2025)

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Cam Ates	A: Interference with recording	1	Manhattan	Closed: Retained, without discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gerald Suam	F: Pepper spray	14	Manhattan	Closed: Not guilty after trial-PC Approved
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Marc Hummel	F: Physical force; F: Physical force; A: Threat of force (verbal or physical); D: Word	28	Manhattan	Closed: Plea set aside, Without discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Brian Fechtmann	A: Property damaged; A: Search of Premises	45	Bronx	Closed: Not guilty after trial-PC Approved
Substantiated (Charges)	PO John Ohagan	A: Search of Premises; A: Entry of Premises; A: Property damaged	45	Bronx	Closed: Not guilty after trial-PC Approved
Substantiated (Charges)	PO David Damico	A: Interference with recording	73	Brooklyn	Closed: Plea set aside, Without discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Cameron Deluise	F: Physical force; D: Word	103	Queens	Closed: Retained, without discipline

Figure 58: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (September 2025)

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

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Jongbin Lee	Discourtesy	Word	1	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Neil Pilgrim	Discourtesy	Word	13	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Chad Walker	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Jhosten Dejesusdilone	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	18	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Grant Pulgarin	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Crudele	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Crudele	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Cary Oliva	Abuse of Authority	Stop	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Crudele	Abuse of Authority	Stop	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Cary Oliva	Abuse of Authority	Failure to Explain	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Crudele	Abuse of Authority	Failure to Explain	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO David Freund	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	24	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO David Freund	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	24	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Mateusz Kopec	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	24	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO David Freund	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	24	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Grant Pulgarin	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Emanuel Crespo	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Barry Stokes	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	26	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Arun Prashad	Discourtesy	Action	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Jenna Crawford	Force	Physical force	28	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Pedro Ozuna	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Diganta Saha	Discourtesy	Word	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Diganta Saha	Discourtesy	Word	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Randy Delgado	Force	Hit against inanimate object	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Randy Delgado	Force	Hit against inanimate object	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Pedro Ozuna	Force	Physical force	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Daniel Estevez	Abuse of Authority	Stop	32	Manhattan

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Andrew Aiello	Abuse of Authority	Stop	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	LT Anthony Vazquez	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Andrew Aiello	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Daniel Estevez	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Raymond Perez	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Andrew Aiello	Abuse of Authority	Failure to Explain	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Daniel Estevez	Abuse of Authority	Failure to Explain	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Daniel Estevez	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	32	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Michael Serrano	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Connor Hayes	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Connor Hayes	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Michael Serrano	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	34	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT George Rivera	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Jovan Williams	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Jonas Miniernunez	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Juan Martinezcabrera	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Arrest	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Mayky Santos	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Arrest	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Matthew Rush	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Mejbah Ulum	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Santana Cruznunez	Force	Physical force	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Harmanjot Singh	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Harmanjot Singh	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Vincent Galdo	Discourtesy	Word	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	DT3 Steven Mednick	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Namel Holguin	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DTS Christina Moncion	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DTS Christina Moncion	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Namel Holguin	Abuse of Authority	Threat to damage/seize property	44	Bronx

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DTS Christina Moncion	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DTS Yoeldy Espinal	Abuse of Authority	Question	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Namel Holguin	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DTS Christina Moncion	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Namel Holguin	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DTS Christina Moncion	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Namel Holguin	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Todd Jacoby	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Todd Jacoby	Force	Physical force	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	LT SA Ray Sanchez	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	LT SA Ray Sanchez	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	LT SA Ray Sanchez	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	CPT Alberys Garcia	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	LT SA Ray Sanchez	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Osmairys Avila	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	LT SA Ray Sanchez	Abuse of Authority	Detention	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Bryant Fuentes	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Michael Lacondi	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Arrest	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO David Carlo	Discourtesy	Word	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO David Carlo	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Liam Ridge	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	50	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Iliana Quiles	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	50	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Iliana Quiles	Abuse of Authority	False official statement	50	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Satinderpal Singh	Abuse of Authority	Detention	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Ryan Odea	Abuse of Authority	Detention	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Kareem Benjamin	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Meir Benishai	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Brandon Anderson	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DT3 Zeshan Naeem	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Kareem Benjamin	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Jose Sinchi	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	62	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Justin Ruiz	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	62	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Justin Ruiz	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	62	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Justin Ruiz	Abuse of Authority	Failure to Explain	62	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Justin Ruiz	Abuse of Authority	Failure to Explain	62	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	LT Alan Myrthil	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Dennis Diaz	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Francesca Lovetro	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Derick Dejonge	Discourtesy	Word	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	LT Imad Beydoun	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Tashea Simsgaby	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Arrest	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Ayinde Mcburnie	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Arrest	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Ayinde Mcburnie	Discourtesy	Word	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Ayinde Mcburnie	Force	Physical force	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Mateusz Wybraniec	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Mateusz Wybraniec	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	70	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Thomas Trachta	Discourtesy	Word	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Thomas Trachta	Offensive Language	Gender	71	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Osman Ahmed	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	LT John Diaz	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	DTS Damir Vukosa	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Evangellos Georgakis	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	DTS Damir Vukosa	Abuse of Authority	Stop	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Evangellos Georgakis	Abuse of Authority	Stop	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DTS Frank Russo	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	DTS Damir Vukosa	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Evangellos Georgakis	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	73	Brooklyn

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	LT John Diaz	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Osman Ahmed	Abuse of Authority	Detention	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Faisal Elwan	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Fatima Monsour	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Faisal Elwan	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nadeem Khan	Discourtesy	Word	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Rafal Korycki	Force	Physical force	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Kevin Aquino	Force	Physical force	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nadeem Khan	Force	Physical force	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nadeem Khan	Offensive Language	Race	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nadeem Khan	Untruthful Statement	Misleading official statement	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Wegens Desiste	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Liam Colwell	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Brandon March	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Demesha Donaldsonricketts	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Jung Kim	Force	Restricted Breathing	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO John Peloso	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Michael Lettow	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Michael Lettow	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Michael Lettow	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Albert Barbosa	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Matthew Arvelo	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Michael Lettow	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Michael Lettow	Discourtesy	Word	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Michael Lettow	Discourtesy	Word	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Michael Lettow	Discourtesy	Word	83	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Justin Rivoli	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Rene Cortez	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Justin Rivoli	Discourtesy	Word	88	Brooklyn

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Frank Vetere	Discourtesy	Word	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Robert Bonilla	Discourtesy	Word	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Robert Bonilla	Discourtesy	Word	90	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Fabian Modesto	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	94	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Fabian Modesto	Abuse of Authority	Stop	94	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Fabian Modesto	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	94	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Reginald Lacroix	Force	Physical force	100	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Salvatore Alongi	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Cianfrocco	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Cianfrocco	Force	Gun fired	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Cianfrocco	Force	Gun fired	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Matthew Cianfrocco	Force	Gun fired	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Salvatore Alongi	Force	Gun fired	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Salvatore Alongi	Force	Gun fired	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Salvatore Alongi	Force	Nonlethal restraining device	102	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Vincent Dandraia	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	103	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Vincent Dandraia	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	103	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	DT3 Daniel Gukelberger	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	103	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Vincent Dandraia	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	103	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Sean Doyle	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	103	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	LT Nina Chao	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	105	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Joseph Tomlinson	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	105	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Douglas Mclaughlin	Force	Physical force	107	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jose Tavarez	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	113	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Jose Tavarez	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	113	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Michael Palagonia	Discourtesy	Word	113	Queens
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Michael Palagonia	Offensive Language	Gender	113	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	LT Elvin Pichardo	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	115	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Bryan Reyes	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	115	Queens

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Niecia Walker	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	115	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Maoda Lin	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	115	Queens