



ZOHRAN K. MAMDANI
MAYOR

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



SHERENE CRAWFORD
INTERIM CHAIR

Executive Director's Monthly Report
July 2026
(Statistics for June 2026)

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	40

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 2026 included the following highlights:

- 1) Of the cases in the CCRB active investigations docket, 45% have been open for 4 months or fewer, and 58% have been open for 7 months or fewer (page 10). In June, the CCRB opened 504 new cases (page 4), and currently has a total open docket of 3,210 cases (page 11).
- 2) The CCRB substantiated allegations in 40% of its fully investigated cases in June (page 17).
- 3) The CCRB fully investigated 26% of the cases it closed in June (page 14).
- 4) For June, investigations using video evidence resulted in substantiated allegations in 40% 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, 40-46).
- 6) In June the Police Commissioner finalized 13 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 26 trials against members of the NYPD year-to-date; 5 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 2026, the CCRB initiated 504 new complaints.

Figure 1: Total Intake by Month (January 2025 - June 2026)




Figure 2: New CCRB Complaints by Month (January 2025 - June 2026)





Figure 3: New CCRB Complaints by Year (YTD 2010 - YTD 2026)



CCRB Cases Received by Borough and Precinct

Figure 4: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (June 2026)




Figure 5: CCRB Complaints Received By Borough of Occurrence (YTD 2026)




Figure 6: CCRB Complaints Received By Precinct of Occurrence (June 2026)


NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints	NYPD Precinct of Occurrence*	Number of Complaints
0	4	67	10
1	14	68	1
5	17	69	3
6	3	70	7
7	6	71	4
9	2	72	7
10	4	73	13
13	4	75	23
14	30	76	1
17	3	77	4
18	6	78	7
19	8	79	5
20	1	81	8
22	1	83	8
23	7	84	10
24	3	88	3
25	9	90	2
28	7	94	4
30	1	101	4
32	7	102	6
33	3	103	9
34	6	104	3
40	11	105	3
41	14	106	2
42	7	107	1
43	10	108	1
44	11	109	4
45	4	110	7
46	10	111	2
47	8	112	4
48	3	113	2
49	5	114	7
50	4	115	4
52	8	116	3
60	8	120	13
61	4	121	5
62	1	122	6
63	2	Unknown	37
66	5		

*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 2025 vs. June 2026)




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

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

	June 2025		June 2026		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	234	51%	233	46%	-1	0%
Abuse of Authority (A)	340	74%	333	66%	-7	-2%
Discourtesy (D)	100	22%	91	18%	-9	-9%
Offensive Language (O)	21	5%	23	5%	2	10%
Total FADO Allegations	695		680		-15	-2%
Total Complaints	461		504		43	9%

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 2025 vs. YTD 2026)



*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 2025		YTD 2026		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Complaints	Count	% of Total Complaints		
Force (F)	1389	50%	1330	47%	-59	-4%
Abuse of Authority (A)	2057	74%	1988	70%	-69	-3%
Discourtesy (D)	666	24%	609	21%	-57	-9%
Offensive Language (O)	153	5%	126	4%	-27	-18%
Total FADO Allegations	4265		4053		-212	-5%
Total Complaints	2782		2848		66	2%

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 2025		June 2026		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	662	34%	548	39%	-114	-17%
Abuse of Authority (A)	1092	56%	732	51%	-360	-33%
Discourtesy (D)	154	8%	114	8%	-40	-26%
Offensive Language (O)	33	2%	28	2%	-5	-15%
Total Allegations	1941		1422		-519	-27%
Total Complaints	461		504		43	9%

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

	YTD 2025		YTD 2026		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Force (F)	3806	33%	3332	34%	-474	-12%
Abuse of Authority (A)	6606	57%	5523	56%	-1083	-16%
Discourtesy (D)	981	8%	811	8%	-170	-17%
Offensive Language (O)	198	2%	169	2%	-29	-15%
Total Allegations	11591		9835		-1756	-15%
Total Complaints	2782		2848		66	2%

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

CCRB Docket

As of the end of June 2026, 45% of active CCRB cases are fewer than five months old, and 58% active cases have been open for fewer than eight months.

Figure 13: Age of Active Cases Based on Received Date (June 2026)

Case Age Group	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1444	45.1%
Cases 5-7 Months	427	13.3%
Cases 8-11 Months	717	22.4%
Cases 12-18 Months*	597	18.7%
Cases Over 18 Months**	16	0.5%
Total	3201	100%

*12-18 Months: 12 cases that were reopened; 0 cases that were on DA Hold; 0 cases that were on FID Hold.

**Over18 Months: 4 cases that were reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold; 1 case that was on FID Hold.

Figure 14: Age of Active Cases Based on Incident Date (June 2026)

	Count	% of Total
Cases 0-4 Months	1310	40.9%
Cases 5-7 Months	426	13.3%
Cases 8-11 Months	717	22.4%
Cases 12-18 Months*	717	22.4%
Cases Over 18 Months**	31	1.0%
Total	3201	100%

*12-18 Months: 16 cases that were reopened; 0 cases that were on DA Hold; 0 cases that were on FID Hold.

**Over18 Months: 4 cases that were reopened; 1 case that was on DA Hold; 1 case that was on FID Hold.

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

Figure 15: Number of Active Investigations (January 2025 - June 2026)




Figure 16: Open Docket Analysis




Figure 17: Open Docket Analysis with % Change

	May 2026		June 2026		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total		
Investigations	1398	44%	1363	42%	-35	-3%
Pending Board Review	1782	56%	1838	57%	56	3%
Mediation	9	0%	5	0%	-4	-44%
On DA / FID Hold	5	0%	4	0%	-1	-20%
Total	3194		3210		16	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 Business Days To Recieve Positive Return on Unredacted BWC Requests (January 2025 - June 2026)




Figure 19: Average Business Days To Recieve Positive Return on Redacted BWC Requests (January 2025 - June 2026)






Figure 20: Pending Requests for BWC Footage

Days Pending	BWC Requests	% of Total
00 <= Days < 30	95	69.3%
30 <= Days < 60	10	7.3%
60 <= Days < 90	6	4.4%
90 >= Days	26	19.0%
Total	137	100%

**Figure 21: Percentage of Open Investigations Docket with Pending BWC Requests
(January 2025 - June 2026)**




**Figure 22: Fulfilled BWC Requests
(January 2025 - June 2026)**



Closed Cases

In June 2026, the CCRB fully investigated 26% of the cases it closed.

Figure 23: Case Resolutions (January 2025 - June 2026) (%)



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 after the resolution of a child custody dispute in which the subject officer was one of the responding officers, she left the area with her child and was stopped by the subject officer who told her she couldn't leave. The subject officer did not give the individual a business card at the conclusion of the stop. The incident was captured on BWC. It showed that the subject officer activated his police vehicle sirens to stop the individual as she was leaving in her vehicle. She stopped and after speaking with her for a few minutes, he told her that she could leave. He did not provide her with a business card. The subject officer stated that he had stopped the individual because he wanted her to fully understand the court order – he did not consider it a street stop. The investigation found that the individual had already been stopped because the child custody matter was being investigated and that the subject officer continued to enforce the stop when he arrived at the location and took over the child custody investigation from the other responding officers at the scene. The investigation found that since the individual was under investigation, the Patrol Guide mandated that she be given a business card once the investigation concluded without the issuance of a summons or arrest. The Board substantiated the Abuse of Authority allegation.

2. Unable to Determine

An individual stated that while he was at a precinct stationhouse to collect his belongings from an arrest, the subject officer did not have on his body worn camera and called him a “loser”. The subject officer stated that he did not recall seeing the individual at the precinct or calling him a loser. The investigation found that without independent witnesses, it could not be confirmed that the subject officer interacted with individual at the stationhouse or called him “loser”. The Board closed the Abuse of Authority and Discourtesy allegations as Unable to Determine.

3. Unfounded

An individual stated that while he was being placed in a holding cell he asked the subject officer for her name and badge number and she grabbed him by his neck, choking him with both of her hands which restricted his breathing. The incident was captured on stationhouse cameras. The individual was intoxicated while at the precinct – as officers watched the individual, he put his own hands around his neck, miming being choked. No officer touched the individual's neck for the entire interaction. The investigation found that the subject officer did not choke the individual. The Board closed the Use of

Force allegation as Unfounded.

4. Within NYPD Guidelines

An individual stated that while in a subway station, he was smoking a vape when he was approached by the subject officer who told him he could not smoke in the station. The individual nodded and continued walking. The subject officer followed him and repeated that he could not smoke by tapping him on the shoulder. The individual stopped vaping and told the subject officer not to touch him. He tried to get on the train and the subject officer blocked his path by putting his arm on his chest and pushed him multiple times. The incident was captured on BWC and surveillance video. It showed the individual standing on the subway platform and the subject officer placed his hand on the individual's chest and asked him to stop and for his identification. The individual attempted to walk away multiple times, and the subject officer pushed the individual in his chest and repeated his instructions and the individual continued to walk away. The individual then got on the train and the subject officer followed him onto the train and repeated the instructions. The investigation found that the force used by the subject officer was of an amount necessary to implement the issuance of a smoking violation summons to the individual who had walked away multiple times from the subject officer and repeatedly refused to follow police instructions. The Board closed the Use of Force allegation as being Within NYPD Guidelines.

5. Officer Unidentified

An individual stated that as she walked into a subway turnstile, paid her fare and walked through a door. As she walked through the door, she was surrounded by three plainclothes officers who issued her a summons. The individual had a general description of the officers. The investigation found that there was no BWC footage of the incident, and the individual could not provide a copy of the summons. Without any additional pertinent evidence, the investigation could not identify the subject officers. The Board closed the Abuse of Authority 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 24: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (June 2026)





Figure 25: Disposition Counts of Full Investigations (YTD 2026)



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 (2025 vs 2026)

	Jun 2025		Jun 2026		YTD 2025		YTD 2026	
Full Investigations	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Substantiated	58	40%	51	40%	554	49%	392	43%
Within NYPD Guidelines	26	18%	21	17%	138	12%	128	14%
Unfounded	29	20%	23	18%	196	17%	181	20%
Unable to Determine	24	16%	29	23%	199	18%	175	19%
MOS Unidentified	9	6%	3	2%	43	4%	29	3%
Total - Full Investigations	146		127		1130		905	
Mediation Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Mediated	3	100%	3	100%	16	100%	25	100%
Total - Mediation Closures	3		3		16		25	
Unable to Investigate / Other Closures	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Complaint Withdrawn	17	5%	27	7%	117	7%	100	6%
Closed - Pending Litigation	53	16%	59	16%	298	18%	279	17%
Unable to Investigate*	256	77%	278	76%	1218	74%	1246	76%
Officer Retired/Resigned**	5	2%	1	0%	17	1%	9	1%
Administrative Closure***	1	0%	1	0%	5	0%	2	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	332		366		1655		1636	
Total - Closed Cases	481		496		2801		2566	

*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 (2025 vs 2026)

	Jun 2025		Jun 2026		YTD 2025		YTD 2026	
Fully Investigated Allegations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	198	18%	176	19%	1895	23%	1205	19%
Unable to Determine	170	16%	174	19%	1408	17%	1037	16%
Unfounded	215	20%	200	22%	1625	20%	1467	23%
Within NYPD Guidelines	433	40%	350	38%	2983	36%	2413	38%
MOS Unidentified	70	6%	25	3%	420	5%	257	4%
Total - Full Investigations	1086		925		8331		6379	

Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	7	100%	10	100%	50	100%	74	100%
Total - Mediation Closures	7		10		50		74	

Unable to Investigate / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint Withdrawn	32	4%	54	6%	338	8%	248	6%
Unable to Investigate*	522	65%	626	72%	2733	62%	2742	67%
Closed - Pending Litigation	189	24%	174	20%	1006	23%	886	22%
Officer Retired/Resigned**	54	7%	16	2%	335	8%	185	5%
Administrative Closure***	1	0%	5	1%	8	0%	28	1%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	798		875		4420		4089	

Total - Closed Allegations	1891		1810		12801		10542	
-----------------------------------	-------------	--	-------------	--	--------------	--	--------------	--

*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 (June 2026)

	Substantiated	Unable to Determine	Within NYPD Guidelines	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	10 4%	35 13%	146 55%	71 27%	5 2%	267 100%
Abuse of Authority	149 25%	118 20%	191 33%	111 19%	18 3%	587 100%
Discourtesy	14 24%	13 22%	13 22%	17 29%	2 3%	59 100%
Offensive Language	3 25%	8 67%	0 0%	1 8%	0 0%	12 100%
Total	176 19%	174 19%	350 38%	200 22%	25 3%	925 100%

Figure 29: Disposition of FADO Allegations by FADO Category (YTD 2026)

	Substantiated	Unable to Determine	Within NYPD Guidelines	Unfounded	Officers Unidentified	Total
Force	82 5%	204 11%	1005 57%	435 25%	48 3%	1774 100%
Abuse of Authority	934 24%	674 17%	1312 34%	821 21%	170 4%	3911 100%
Discourtesy	151 27%	114 21%	95 17%	167 30%	28 5%	555 100%
Offensive Language	38 27%	45 32%	1 1%	44 32%	11 8%	139 100%
Total	1205 19%	1037 16%	2413 38%	1467 23%	257 4%	6379 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	June 2025		June 2026			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
False official statement	3	43%	2	67%	-1	-33%
Impeding an investigation	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Inaccurate official statement	0	0%	1	33%	1	NA
Misleading official statement	4	57%	0	0%	-4	-100%
Total Allegations	7		3		-4	-57%

Figure 31: Substantiated Untruthful Statement Allegations YTD with % Change

Untruthful Statement Allegations	YTD 2025		YTD 2026			
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations	Change	% Change
False official statement	17	71%	7	41%	-10	-59%
Impeding an investigation	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Inaccurate official statement	0	0%	1	6%	1	NA
Misleading official statement	7	29%	9	53%	2	29%
Total Allegations	24		17		-7	-29%

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/Racial Profiling Allegations with % Change

	June 2025		June 2026		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Bias-Based Policing (Age)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Disability)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Gender)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Housing Status)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Immigration Status)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Intersectional)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Religion)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Sexual Orientation)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Racial Profiling (Intersectional)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Racial Profiling* (Color)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Racial Profiling* (National Origin)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Racial Profiling* (Race)	0	0%	1	100%	1	NA
Total Allegations	0		1		1	NA

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

	YTD 2025		YTD 2026		Change	% Change
	Count	% of Total Allegations	Count	% of Total Allegations		
Bias-Based Policing (Age)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Disability)	2	11%	0	0%	-2	-100%
Bias-Based Policing (Gender)	0	0%	3	30%	3	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Housing Status)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Immigration Status)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Intersectional)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Religion)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Bias-Based Policing (Sexual Orientation)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Racial Profiling (Intersectional)	0	0%	0	0%	0	NA
Racial Profiling* (Color)	1	6%	0	0%	-1	-100%
Racial Profiling* (National Origin)	0	0%	3	30%	3	NA
Racial Profiling* (Race)	15	83%	4	40%	-11	-73%
Total Allegations	18		10		-8	-44%

*Prior to 10/2025 "Racial Profiling" allegations involving Race, Color and National Origin were reported as "Bias-Based Policing" allegations. "Racial Profiling" counts include allegations previously reported as "Bias-Based Policing."

Substantiation Rates

The June 2026 case substantiation rate was 40%.

Figure 34: Percentage of Cases Substantiated (January 2025 - June 2026)





Figure 35: Disposition of Substantiated Complaints* (2026)



* 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 2025 - Jun 2026)
(% substantiated shown)





Figure 37: Substantiation Rates for Full Investigations with Video (Jan 2025 - Jun 2026)
(% 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*
(Jun 2025, Jun 2026, YTD 2025, YTD 2026)

Disposition	June 2025		June 2026		YTD 2025		YTD 2026	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Charges	32	30%	21	23%	241	24%	173	26%
Command Discipline B	12	11%	18	20%	191	19%	113	17%
Command Discipline A	35	33%	35	39%	386	38%	246	36%
Formalized Training	26	25%	16	18%	206	20%	146	22%
Total	105		90		1024		678	

* 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 ≥ 11) 2. Command Discipline B ($6 \leq \text{penalty days} \leq 10$) 3. Command Discipline A ($1 \leq \text{penalty days} \leq 5$) 4. Formalized Training ($0 < \text{penalty days} < 1$)

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

	Jun 2025	Jun 2026	YTD 2025	YTD 2026
PSA Complaints	16	16	110	102
Total Complaints	481	496	2801	2566
PSA Complaints as % of Total	3.3%	3.2%	3.9%	4.0%

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

	Jun 2025	Jun 2026	YTD 2025	YTD 2026
PSA 1	9	0	22	17
PSA 2	13	3	39	34
PSA 3	12	3	43	28
PSA 4	4	2	28	19
PSA 5	2	7	44	50
PSA 6	1	2	13	12
PSA 7	0	2	22	15
PSA 8	0	9	9	24
PSA 9	1	0	15	5
Total	42	28	235	204

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

	Jun 2025		Jun 2026		YTD 2025		YTD 2026	
	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total	Count	% of Total
Force (F)	20	38%	11	33%	119	38%	131	48%
Abuse of Authority (A)	27	51%	19	58%	147	47%	116	43%
Discourtesy (D)	4	8%	3	9%	35	11%	19	7%
Offensive Language (O)	2	4%	0	0%	10	3%	4	1%
Untruthful Statement (U)	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	1	0%
Total	53	101%	33	100%	313	100%	271	99%

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 (2025 vs 2026)

	Jun 2025		Jun 2026		YTD 2025		YTD 2026	
Full Investigations	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Substantiated	9	47%	5	45%	49	35%	31	27%
Within NYPD Guidelines	5	26%	4	36%	33	24%	41	36%
Unfounded	3	16%	2	18%	37	26%	28	25%
Unable to Determine	2	11%	0	0%	19	14%	14	12%
MOS Unidentified	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%
Total - Full Investigations	19		11		140		114	
Mediation Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Mediated	1	100%	0	0%	3	100%	4	100%
Total - Mediation Closures	1		0		3		4	
Unable to Investigate / Other Closures	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total	Count	%of Total
Complaint withdrawn	0	0%	1	6%	8	9%	4	5%
Unable to Investigate*	11	50%	12	71%	41	45%	59	69%
Closed - Pending Litigation	11	50%	3	18%	34	37%	17	20%
Officer Retired/Resigned**	0	0%	1	6%	9	10%	6	7%
Administrative Closure***	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total - Other Case Dispositions	22		17		92		86	
Total - Closed Cases	42		28		235		204	

*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 43: Mediated Complaints Closed

	June 2026	YTD 2026
Mediated Complaints	3	25

Figure 44: Mediated FADO Allegations Closed

	June 2026	YTD 2026
Force	1	7
Abuse of Authority	3	48
Discourtesy	2	11
Offensive Language	4	8
Total	10	74

Figure 45: Mediated Complaints By Borough (June 2026)

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

Figure 46: Mediated Allegations By Borough (June 2026)

	Mediations
Bronx	3
Brooklyn	6
Manhattan	1
Queens	0
Staten Island	0

**Figure 47: Mediated Complaints By Precinct
(Jun 2026 - YTD 2026)**

Precinct	Jun 2026	YTD 2026	Precinct	Jun 2026	YTD 2026
14	0	1	78	0	1
20	0	1	79	0	1
28	0	1	84	1	1
34	1	3	90	0	3
40	0	1	104	0	1
44	1	3	107	0	1
48	0	1	109	0	1
60	0	1	114	0	1
75	0	1	115	0	1
			NA	0	1

**Figure 48: Mediated Allegations By Precinct
(Jun 2026 - YTD 2026)**

Precinct	Jun 2026	YTD 2026	Precinct	Jun 2026	YTD 2026
14	0	6	78	0	2
20	0	4	79	0	4
28	0	2	84	6	6
34	1	10	90	0	6
40	0	4	104	0	1
44	3	5	107	0	2
48	0	12	109	0	2
60	0	2	114	0	1
75	0	1	115	0	3
			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	Jun 2026	YTD 2026
Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial but Discipline Imposed	0	0
	Guilty after trial-PC Approved	0	6
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. A imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Comm. Disc. B imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Formalized Training imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict dismissed by PC, Instructions imposed	0	0
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Guilty	0	0
	Resolved by plea	10	177
	Plea Renegotiated by PC	0	0
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. B	0	1
	Plea set aside, Comm. Disc. A	0	1
	Plea set aside, Formalized Training	0	3
	Plea set aside, Instructions	0	0
	*Retained, with discipline	1	1
	Disciplinary Action Total	11	189
No Disciplinary Action	Not guilty after trial-PC Approved	2	13
	Trial verdict reversed by PC, Final verdict Not Guilty	0	0
	Plea set aside, Without discipline	0	3
	**Retained, without discipline	0	1
	Dismissed by Police Commissioner	0	0
	No Disciplinary Action Total	2	17
Not Adjudicated	Dismissed by APU	3	3
	Department adjudication in process	1	1
	***Previously adjudicated, discipline not reported	0	4
	***Previously adjudicated, with discipline	0	9
	MOS Retired	0	8
	MOS Resigned	2	4
	Terminated	0	1
	SOL Expired in APU	1	1
	Not Adjudicated Total	7	31
	Total Closures	20	237

*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 %
2024	26.48	45.71	30.34
2025	85.56	77.03	83.95
2026 YTD	92.13	89.32	91.39

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*	June 2026	YTD 2026
Terminated	0	0
Forced Separation	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 31 or more days and/or Dismissal Probation	0	1
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 21 to 30 days	0	0
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 11 to 20 days	1	10
Suspension for or loss of vacation time of 1 to 10 days	7	118
Command Discipline B	0	1
Command Discipline A	0	1
Formalized Training**	3	58
Warned & Admonished/Reprimanded	0	0
Disciplinary Action† Total	11	189
No Disciplinary Action†	2	17
Adjudicated Total	13	206
Discipline Rate	85%	92%
Not Adjudicated† Total	7	31
Total Closures	20	237

*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 49 on the previous page.

Figure 52: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Non-APU Cases

Disposition	Disposition Type*	May 2026	YTD 2026
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	9	82
	Command Discipline A	48	217
	Formalized Training**	16	169
	Closed Administratively (With Discipline) †	11	30
	Total	84	498
No Disciplinary Action	Department Unable to Prosecute ††	3	17
	Department Unable to Prosecute (Short SOL) †††	0	25
	Closed Administratively (No penalty reported) †	0	0
	Total	3	42
Not Adjudicated	Retired	0	0
	Resigned	0	1
	SOL Expired	0	1
	Abated by Death	0	1
	Total	0	3
	Discipline Rate	97%	92%
	DUP Rate	3%	8%

*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.

† "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: NYPD Discipline Imposed for Allegations - Non-APU Cases (May 2026)

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation(s)	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Reginald Hinds	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	14	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Renzo Ulloa	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	14	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Alexander Ascani	D: Word	18	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.25 days) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Frank Galia	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	18	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.25 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Christopher Freudenberg	D: Other; A: Forcible Removal to Hospital	19	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B (Formalized Training)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Grant Pulgarin	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	26	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Justin Senese	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	26	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Christopher Valverde	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	26	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	LT Juan Cabrera	A: Frisk	28	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Sean Sloman	A: Vehicle search	28	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Erick Estrada	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	32	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Robert Bianco	A: Refusal to provide shield number	32	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Albert Fernandez	A: Refusal to obtain medical treatment	33	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Michael Quinones	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; D: Word	34	Manhattan	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 1 day) / Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Dalmin Vasquez	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	34	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Instructions)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Paris Giddins	D: Word	34	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Michael Amundsen	A: Frisk; A: Search (of person); A: Stop	40	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Formalized Training)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Jesus Llubes	A: Stop; A: Frisk; A: Search (of person)	40	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Formalized Training)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Adina Restaino	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Kelly Tuechler	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx	Formalized Training

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation(s)	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Jerry Lafortune	A: Frisk	40	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Leonardo Rios	D: Action	42	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Louis Morizio	D: Word	42	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Ahmed Abdo	D: Word	42	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Jerelme Herasme	A: Refusal to provide shield number; A: Failure to provide RTKA card	43	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Jerelme Herasme	A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Improper use of body-worn camera	43	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO James Garcia	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; A: Failure to provide RTKA card	43	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Edgar Diaz	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	43	Bronx	Closed Administratively (Vacation: 1 day) / Command Discipline - A (InstructionsInstructions)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Felix Jimenez	A: Frisk; A: Stop	43	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Formalized Training)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Ricardo Urena	A: Entry of Premises	43	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Kevin Navarro	D: Word; O: Race	44	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Alfred Maldonado	A: Refusal to provide shield number; D: Word; A: Refusal to provide name; A: Threat of arrest	44	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Patrick Cordones	D: Word	44	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Patrick Cordones	F: Hit against inanimate object	44	Bronx	No penalty
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Jaiden Bonet	A: Refusal to provide shield number	45	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Jesus Ramos	A: Refusal to provide shield number	45	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Crystal Dones	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Ariel Cruz	A: Vehicle search	46	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Anthony Ford	A: Threat of force (verbal or physical)	46	Bronx	No penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Christopher Hernandez	A: Refusal to provide shield number; A: Refusal to provide name	47	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation(s)	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Amar Abbas	A: Refusal to obtain medical treatment	47	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Miyorquis Rumaldo	A: Refusal to obtain medical treatment	48	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Liron Sinanaj	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	49	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.13 days) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT John Migliaccio	A: Refusal to provide name; A: Failure to provide RTKA card	49	Bronx	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 3 days) / Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Julio Espinal	A: Entry of Premises	49	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Spardley Jeanbaptiste	D: Other	52	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Klorentin Nokaj	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; A: Unlawful Arrest; A: Improper use of body-worn camera; D: Word; A: Failure to provide RTKA card	52	Bronx	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 3 days)
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Timothy Thatcher	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	60	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Derek Gilson	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	60	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Meir Benishai	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Umar Cheema	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Alvin Nieves	D: Word	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DT3 Damir Vukosa	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	60	Brooklyn	Closed Administratively (Command Discipline - A) / Vacation: 1 day
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Edgar Guerrero	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; A: Refusal to provide name	60	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DT3 Alex Mills	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	60	Brooklyn	Closed Administratively (Command Discipline - A) / Vacation: 1 day
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DT3 Rochoael Vasquez	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	60	Brooklyn	Closed Administratively (Command Discipline - A) / Vacation: 1 day
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	DTS Frank Russo	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	60	Brooklyn	Closed Administratively (Command Discipline - A) / Vacation: 1 day
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Ruben Cespedes	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	60	Brooklyn	Closed Administratively (Command Discipline - A) / Vacation: 1 day
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	LT Nikolaos Stefopoulos	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	60	Brooklyn	Closed Administratively (Command Discipline - A) / Warned and Admonished

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation(s)	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Matthew Portoles	A: Refusal to obtain medical treatment	67	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Anthony Serrano	A: Refusal to obtain medical treatment	67	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Delilah Beniquez	D: Word	68	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Kingsley Okafor	A: Question; A: Question; A: Question; A: Failure to provide RTKA card	69	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Matthew Salzman	A: Vehicle search; A: Search (of person)	69	Brooklyn	No penalty
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Joseph Mele	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; A: Failure to Explain; A: Frisk	71	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 9 days) / Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Daneshwar Sukhra	A: Refusal to provide name; A: Refusal to provide shield number	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Adam Rodriguez	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; A: Refusal to provide name; A: Refusal to provide shield number	75	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 1 day)
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Michael Zaki	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	76	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Demitrious Peterson	A: Search (of person)	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Demitrious Peterson	A: Vehicle search; A: Failure to provide RTKA card	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 3 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Troy Driscoll	A: Vehicle search; A: Failure to provide RTKA card	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - B (Vacation: 3 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Nayely Torresbautista	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	79	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Thaddeus Rutledge	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	79	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	SGT Matthew Arvelo	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	83	Brooklyn	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Craig Finlay	A: Stop	88	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.25 days) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Jianliu Sze	A: Entry of Premises; A: Improper use of body-worn camera	90	Brooklyn	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.50 days)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Jonathan Batista	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	90	Brooklyn	Closed Administratively (Instructions)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Akbar Khan	A: Refusal to obtain medical treatment	104	Queens	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Christian Colon	A: Refusal to obtain medical treatment	104	Queens	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation(s)	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Dexter Jackson	A: Failure to provide RTKA card	113	Queens	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO John Romero	D: Word	113	Queens	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished) / Instructions
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Anthony Riccardi	F: Physical force	114	Queens	Closed Administratively (Command Discipline - B) / Vacation: 5 days
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Angelo Bonilla	A: Search of Premises	114	Manhattan	Command Discipline - A (Vacation: 0.25 days)
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Abdoul Dicko	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	115	Queens	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT John Veloz	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	120	Staten Island	Command Discipline - A (Warned and Admonished)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Allison Oconnell	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	121	Staten Island	Closed Administratively (Instructions)
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Christopher Struthers	A: Improper use of body-worn camera	121	Staten Island	Closed Administratively (Instructions)

Figure 54: NYPD Discipline Imposed for APU Adjudicated Cases (June 2026)

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation(s)	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Daniel Noonan	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; O: Other; D: Word; O: Other; D: Word	13	Manhattan	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	PO David Salvo	O: Other; D: Word	13	Manhattan	Forfeit vacation 1 days
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Christopher Crain	A: Unlawful Arrest; A: Bias-Based Policing (Race); A: Search (of person); A: False official statement; A: Stop; A: Frisk	40	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	POM Tracy Newland	A: Forcible Removal to Hospital	42	Bronx	Formalized Training
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Juan Acostavilla	A: Question; A: Frisk; A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Vehicle search	48	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 9 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Phong Le	A: Frisk; U: False official statement; A: Stop; A: False official statement; A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Search (of person); A: Failure to Explain; A: False official statement	48	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 15 days
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Aidan Murphy	A: Unlawful Summons; U: False official statement; A: Unlawful Summons; U: Misleading official statement	49	Bronx	Forfeit vacation 10 days / Command Discipline B
Substantiated (Charges)	POM John Sikora	U: False official statement; F: Physical force	75	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 5 days / Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Conrade Joseph	O: Gender; D: Word; D: Word; D: Word; O: Gender; A: Refusal to provide name; D: Word; D: Word	94	Brooklyn	Forfeit vacation 5 days / Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	DT3 Jason Ribeiro	A: Search of Premises; A: Failure to provide RTKA card; A: Entry of Premises	120	Staten Island	Forfeit vacation 5 days / Command Discipline A
Substantiated (Charges)	POM Michael Ustick	O: Other; D: Word	121	Staten Island	Formalized Training

Figure 55: NYPD No Discipline Imposed for APU Adjudicated Cases (June 2026)

Board Disposition Recommendation	Officer	Allegation	Precinct	Borough	NYPD Discipline
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Christopher Crain	A: Improper use of body-worn camera; F: Physical force	40	Bronx	Closed: Not guilty after trial-PC Approved
Substantiated (Charges)	PO John Nunziata	A: Strip-searched	110	Queens	Closed: Not guilty after trial-PC Approved

Figure 56: Substantiated Allegations By Borough and NYPD Precinct (June 2026)

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 Zachary Palladino	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	7	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Andy Wu	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	7	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Zachary Palladino	Discourtesy	Word	7	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Thomas Walsh	Discourtesy	Word	9	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Thomas Walsh	Discourtesy	Word	9	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Thomas Walsh	Discourtesy	Word	9	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Andy Luna	Discourtesy	Word	14	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Hector Rosado	Discourtesy	Word	17	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Larry Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Larry Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Arrest	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Larry Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Larry Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	False official statement	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Larry Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	False official statement	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO William McCain	Abuse of Authority	Inaccurate official statement	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Larry Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	23	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Arhenis Lopezestevez	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Ruby Esparza	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Raymond Perez	Abuse of Authority	Threat of arrest	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Raymond Perez	Abuse of Authority	Seizure of property	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Arhenis Lopezestevez	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Arhenis Lopezestevez	Abuse of Authority	Question	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Arhenis Lopezestevez	Abuse of Authority	Question	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Ruby Esparza	Abuse of Authority	Question	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Raymond Perez	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Arhenis Lopezestevez	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Arhenis Lopezestevez	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	LT SA Vicente Perez	Abuse of Authority	Interference with recording	25	Manhattan

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Joseph Hunt	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Caroline Solano	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Arhenis Lopezestevez	Abuse of Authority	Racial Profiling (Race)	25	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	LT Bryant Harinarain	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Arrest	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	LT Bryant Harinarain	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Arrest	30	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lowell Tapia	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lowell Tapia	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lowell Tapia	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lowell Tapia	Discourtesy	Word	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lowell Tapia	Discourtesy	Word	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lowell Tapia	Force	Physical force	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lowell Tapia	Force	Physical force	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Lowell Tapia	Offensive Language	Race	33	Manhattan
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Eric Arcangel	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Eric Arcangel	Abuse of Authority	Question	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	SGT Anthony Perlmutter	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Arrest	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Jorge Ortiz	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Arrest	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Carlos Cuesta	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Francis Pusateri	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DTS Jayther Liriano	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Lorangy Vasquez	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Matthew Miret	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	40	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Carmelo Ayala	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	DTS John Echevarria	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Michael Bowman	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Sammy Figueroa	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Sammy Figueroa	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	DTS John Echevarria	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Michael Bowman	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	41	Bronx

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Sammy Figueroa	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	DTS John Echevarria	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Carmelo Ayala	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Sammy Figueroa	Force	Physical force	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	DTS John Echevarria	Force	Physical force	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	LT Michael Bowman	Force	Physical force	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Carmelo Ayala	Force	Physical force	41	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Sammy Figueroa	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Carmelo Ayala	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Carmelo Ayala	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Sammy Figueroa	Abuse of Authority	Stop	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Carmelo Ayala	Abuse of Authority	Stop	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	DTS Bory Echanique	Abuse of Authority	Stop	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Sammy Figueroa	Abuse of Authority	Question	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	DTS Bory Echanique	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gabriel Vargas	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Arrest	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gabriel Vargas	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gabriel Vargas	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gabriel Vargas	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	DTS Bory Echanique	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Sammy Figueroa	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Carmelo Ayala	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gabriel Vargas	Discourtesy	Word	42	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Santo Villar	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Santo Villar	Offensive Language	Race	43	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Michael Gargallo	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Maura Delohery	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Michael Gargallo	Force	Physical force	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Michael Gargallo	Force	Physical force	44	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Wichers	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	46	Bronx

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Wichers	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Omely Rodriguezcesar	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Omely Rodriguezcesar	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Wichers	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Wilson Carbucia	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Omely Rodriguezcesar	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Joel Ayala	Force	Physical force	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Charges)	SGT Robert Wichers	Force	Restricted Breathing	46	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Sara Bassford	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Natalia Nunez	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	47	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Robert Viera	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Joseph Licata	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Dante Pulido	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Dante Pulido	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Dante Pulido	Abuse of Authority	Stop	48	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	LT Michael Dunlavey	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Adam Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Adam Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Luis Avila	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Luis Avila	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	49	Bronx
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Natalia Gutierrez	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Christopher Oconnor	Discourtesy	Word	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Christopher Oconnor	Discourtesy	Word	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Christopher Oconnor	Offensive Language	Disability	52	Bronx
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	LT CD Daniel Lacalamita	Abuse of Authority	Entry of Premises	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Michael Moran	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Jamaal Thomas	Discourtesy	Word	60	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Enrique Thenespaillat	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	61	Brooklyn

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Ryan Pruden	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Anthony Porcelli	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DTS Dennis Wu	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Brian Williams	Discourtesy	Word	67	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Mariam Ruiz	Abuse of Authority	Question	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Mariam Ruiz	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	69	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Devon Langford	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Solomon Sowell	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Henry Alvarado	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	73	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	DTS Neil Narayan	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Bryan Gross	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Bryan Gross	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gregory Mcfarlane	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gregory Mcfarlane	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gerard Duffy	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gerard Duffy	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gerard Duffy	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gerard Duffy	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Nicholas Rossides	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gerard Duffy	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Joanna Romano	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	DTS Neil Narayan	Abuse of Authority	Stop	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Faisal Elwan	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DT3 Rochael Vasquez	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gregory Mcfarlane	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gerard Duffy	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Joanna Romano	Abuse of Authority	Unlawful Summons	75	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	DT3 Krystopher Valentin	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to show search warrant	77	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Marcella Shamblee	Abuse of Authority	Sex Miscon (Humiliation: fail to cover)	77	Brooklyn

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Christopher Francis	Abuse of Authority	Threat of force (verbal or physical)	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Lela Banks	Discourtesy	Action	79	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Lovepreet Singh	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gurasees Singh	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Domonique Hall	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to process civilian complaint	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Michael Mancilla	Abuse of Authority	Question	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Lovepreet Singh	Abuse of Authority	Question	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gurasees Singh	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Charges)	PO Gurasees Singh	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	81	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Estefany Hernandez	Abuse of Authority	Improper use of body-worn camera	88	Brooklyn
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	LT Veronica Clark	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	100	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Daniel Grossman	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	100	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Umer Zulfqar	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	100	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Tamika Dorvil	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide name	100	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Daniel Grossman	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	100	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Umer Zulfqar	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	100	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Tamika Dorvil	Abuse of Authority	Refusal to provide shield number	100	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Raymond Drewes	Abuse of Authority	Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	103	Queens
Substantiated (Formalized Training)	PO Alisa Greene	Abuse of Authority	Failed to Obtain Language Interpretation	103	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Ruth Florville	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Sharon Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Jerry Brown	Abuse of Authority	Frisk	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Sharon Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Ruth Florville	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Jerry Brown	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Anthony Salomone	Abuse of Authority	Search (of person)	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Sharon Jimenez	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Anthony Salomone	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	107	Queens

Board Disposition	Officer	FADO&U Category	Allegation	Precinct of Occurrence	Borough of Occurrence
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Jerry Brown	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline B)	PO Ruth Florville	Abuse of Authority	Forcible Removal to Hospital	107	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Sasha Rosen	Abuse of Authority	Search of Premises	109	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	SGT Michael Delia	Abuse of Authority	Vehicle search	114	Queens
Substantiated (Command Discipline A)	PO Mohammad Zubair	Abuse of Authority	Failure to provide RTKA card	121	Staten Island