CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS

----X

December 11, 2009 Start: 10:40 am Recess: 12:06 pm

HELD AT: Hearing Room

250 Broadway, 14th Floor

B E F O R E:

HELEN SEARS Chairperson

## COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Helen Sears
Inez E. Dickens
Erik Martin Dilan
Simcha Felder

Peter F. Vallone, Jr.

## APPEARANCES

William Heinzen Deputy Counselor Office of the Mayor

Christopher Dunn Associate Legal Director New York Civil Liberties Union

Steven Wasserman Legal Aid Society

DeNora Getachew
Director of Policy
Citizens Union

Rachel Fauss Policy and Research Associate Citizens Union

Cynthia Conti-Cook Stoll, Glickman & Bellina

Leo Glickman Stoll, Glickman & Bellina

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Good morning
everyone. We'll wait until everybody is adjusted.
Good morning. My name is Helen Sears and I'm
chair of the Government Operations Committee.
Before I go any further, we're joined by my
colleagues Simcha Felder from Brooklyn and Peter
Vallone from Queens. We also have Matt Gewolb who
is counsel to the committee and Josh Gerber, the
policy analyst to the committee.

Today the committee is going to consider Introduction 1025, a Local Law to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York in relation to requiring the Corporation Counsel to submit quarterly reports to the City Council detailing the number and disposition of civil actions filed against the New York City Police Department.

Intro 1025 would require the Law

Department to submit quarterly reports to the

Council regarding civil actions filed against the

New York Police Department. The purpose of the

bill is to allow for a better understanding of

whether there are policies and procedures that

could be put in place through legislation or

otherwise to help decrease the number of civil actions and the associated payments by the city.

This bill is sponsored by Council Member Peter Vallone, a member of this committee and chair of the Committee on Public Safety. I would like to here acknowledge his hard work on this piece of legislation. It's really a good bill.

The committee looks forward to hearing testimony on the merits of the legislation, particularly on how such a bill would be useful in improving oversight of the relevant departments and in helping the people of New York to better understand the type, quantity and ultimate disposition of civil actions filed against the city that involve the New York Police Department.

The committee is hopeful that Intro 1025 will help to identify opportunities for the Law Department to work together with the New York Police Department and the Civilian Review Board and to consider ways to implement more effective risk management practices and to examine the processes in place in other jurisdictions.

2.

Additionally, the committee, after
its examination of practices in other
jurisdictions is confident that civil actions
offer significant opportunities to identify
training and policy issues that if appropriately
examined and addressed might improve the safety of
police officers and all New Yorkers and such
opportunity should be welcomed.

Finally, the committee is hopeful that Intro 1025 might lead to better and more regular communication between the New York Police Department and the Civilian Review Board and the Law Department, a practice that has proven successful in other jurisdictions.

Before we proceed, I will ask
Councilman Vallone if he would like to say a few
words.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Thank you,
Madame Chair. Let me thank you for having this
hearing so quickly and with a minimal amount of
pestering. You and your committee really took the
ball on this and ran with it and I'm very thankful
for that.

This isn't just a bill about the

2	New	York	City	Council	getting	more	information
---	-----	------	------	---------	---------	------	-------------

3 We've done a lot of those bills. I've written

many of them when it comes to crime in parks,

5 crime in schools, you name it.

This is a bill that's addressing

two very serious problems right now; number one,

the fact that there are too many settlements by

the city in police cases, and number two, the fact

that too little is learned from those settlements.

When it comes to the first problem of too many settlements, now I'm a former trial attorney, I know of what I speak here. The word is on the street it's open season on the city, it's free money. New York City is like the armored car careening down the streets with the doors open and money flying out the back being followed by trial attorneys, drug dealers and scam artists of all sorts. It has to stop. It has to stop.

The theory at the Corporate Counsel now, and I've sat down with him. I like Mike Cardozo a lot. I think he's doing a great job. We disagree wholeheartedly on this topic and we've agreed to disagree. His theory is that you settle

these cases to avoid a much larger liability down the road. I think that's 100% wrong. That when you start settling these cases, the word gets on the street that it's easy money and then more cases get filed and then more payouts are made and it's a vicious cycle. That's exactly what the facts are showing right now. That has to stop number one. Stop with the payouts.

Number two, if you're going to payout then you have to learn from those payouts. Action has to be taken as a result of those payouts. What's happening now is that the city is paying millions and millions of dollars to all sorts of people, some legit, some not. I mean you've got a whole article here about drug dealers suing the city and making money. But when the city pays out there has to be ramifications.

Right now what's happening is the city is paying out. They're saying we're not the fault, no one is to blame. Then the trial attorneys and the so-called victims are making money. Everybody is happy but the taxpayers get fleeced millions and millions of dollars. Not one thing is learned from that.

Now if you're going to pay out
millions in taxpayers' money, somebody's head
better role. Somebody at the Police Department
was responsible for something wrong. If not,
don't pay the money. It's that simple. If you
are paying millions of dollars in taxpayers'
money, find out why and fix it. Is it a problem
with the system? Is it a problem with that police
officer?

Take a look at the statistics. As of just recently, just a month ago, no one was looking at the statistics. The Corporate Counsel was sending over the lawsuits, what was settled, what wasn't settled to the Police Department. The Police Department was doing nothing, absolutely nothing with those statistics.

Their position was basically my position, Corporate Counsel settles for the wrong reasons so we're not going to learn anything from those statistics. They are not wrong when it comes to that. Corporate Counsel settles for the wrong reasons. But if the Corporate Counsel is settling on cases brought against one cop 20 times, potentially there is something to learn

2 from that, but nothing was being done.

Just recently, as a result of our bill the Chairwoman scheduling this hearing, the Police Department did form a committee to look at these settlements to see if they could determine any trends, any problems with policies, any problems with any individual police officers.

That's a good thing and I want to learn about that committee today.

I'm still stalling until you get ready. Do you want me saying that again? You didn't hear me the first time. You want to make a quick opening.

Again, I want to thank Helen Sears for this hearing. The problem is two-fold.

Number one there are too many settlements. It's free money against the city. Number two, nothing is being learned from those settlements. No action is being taken to ensure it doesn't happen again. That needs to be fixed and that's what this bill does. So thank you Madame Chair and I look forward to the testimony.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. I think your comments are very timely

treasury that are presented by rampant litigation.

The Law Department specializes not only in

24

25

3

4 5

6

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23 24

25

defending against litigation but in risk management to avoid future litigation.

While we share absolutely the goal of reducing the number and amount of settlements, we believe that the reporting requirements mandated by Intro 1025 would not contribute significantly to accomplishing those goals but would instead impose burdensome requirements for collecting information that the Law Department does not currently collect. Additionally, the types of information sought wound not in fact yield constructive data.

Intro 1025 would amend Section 7109 of the Administrative Code which delineates the role of the Corporation Counsel in representing agencies and their officers and employees. subdivision B would be added that would require the Law Department to provide quarterly reports concerning all civil actions filed against the Police Department and its police officers.

These reports would be required to include the following information: the number of actions pending, the number of claims in each action, the amount of time each action has been

pending, the nature of each claim, the resolution of each claim, whether the resolution was achieved through settlement or trial and the amount of any settlement.

We do not believe that these new reporting requirements will further the goal of reducing the number or amount of claims against the Police Department or settlements paid on those claims.

The information required by this bill is not readily available. Although the Law Department tracks lawsuits as they are served on the city, it does not compile information about the number of individual claims contained in those lawsuits, either as a gross number of claims or by category of claim. Collecting this information would require significant additional legal staffing at the Law Department simply to review each complaint and to analyze and log each claim.

The Law Department has excellent administrative staff but the data analysis contemplated by this bill would not be a merely ministerial task. It would instead require extensive legal review. Nor would the burden of

2.

these reporting duties conclude following the
intake and analysis of the complaint. The bill
would require continued analysis of each claim
within each lawsuit as claims are amended,

abandoned or dismissed.

It would also require the updating of information about the length of time each action is pending and information about resolution by settlement or trial.

But the data sought would not further the goals of this bill. Each complaint is a unique document, varying in length, clarity and merit. By definition, at least half of the complaints served on the city are below average. Many are unusually organized with scattershot allegations that are poorly pleaded and duplicative. The actual claims are not always apparent on first read. Most complaints involve multiple claims, many of which overlap.

As many of you know, or as some of you know from your own legal practice, the number of claims in an action reveals very little about the merits of that action or even the action's actual scope.

To give an example of a lawsuit

against the Police Department, a typical complaint will generally be based on a single incident, an arrest. Yet that complaint may allege false arrest as well as allegations of excessive force and malicious prosecution. It will likely assert those allegations under both federal and state law and it will likely state those claims against both an individual officer and against the city.

Additionally, complaints often allege these claims against the mayor, the police commissioner, perhaps a prosecutor and various unknown or nonexistent John Does. These loose pleading practices give rise to several claims within one lawsuit, but they tell little about the actual merits of the case. Knowing the number of claims in a given year would reveal nothing about managing potential litigation risks for any city agency.

at intake, that is when complaints are served upon the Law Department will not only impose significant staffing burdens and insert another layer of process into the city's legal defense,

2 the data themselves will not provide meaningful 3 lessons or trends.

There are several reasons for this.

One is simply time, the delays inherent in our

overburdened legal system. Lawsuits are filed

months or years after the alleged wrongdoing.

Cases reach a conclusion through trial or

settlement years later. In the meantime, city

employees, including police officers, are

transferred or retire.

Thus, as the police commissioner has stated, the better source of data concerning individual officers is often the complaints filed with the Civilian Complaint Review Board, which are resolved more quickly than cases filed in the state or federal courts.

Another reason is that the mere fact of a settlement in any litigation is not an acknowledgement of wrongdoing or of the truth of the facts alleged. This is no less the case in actions involving allegations of police misconduct than it is in any other case.

Similarly, it is important to note that regardless of how many claims are alleged in

3

4

5

6

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

a particular lawsuit, settlements are typical negotiated to resolve all claims alleged in an entire action rather than just individual claims.

A further reason why settlement data do not provide instruction about potential litigation risks is simple economics. While some settlements seem unfair or even outrageous to us and to the public, the Law Department's decision to settle a matter is largely separate from the merits of the litigation.

It is a fact in the American legal system that most cases settle. The decision to settle reflects a business judgment based on the anticipated risks and costs of litigation. risks and costs include the limited human resources that the city can commit to defending against lawsuit. Even with hundreds of attorneys, they simply cannot afford to fully litigate each case filed against it.

Lawsuits against the city involve burdensome discovery in which depositions and document identification, review and production consume not only huge amounts of Law Department attorney time but also the time of agency

CHAIRPERSON SEARS:

your testimony. I'll ask a few questions and then

I'll turn it over to Councilman Vallone because he

Thank you for

23

24

25

Department and the New York Police Department

personnel? Maybe we might get to that point.

24

25

1	COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS 19
2	WILLIAM HEINZEN: I don't know, but
3	I assume there would be.
4	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Other
5	jurisdictions that we've examined, included some
6	large cities like Los Angeles, they have more
7	robust programs in place for examining civil
8	claims involving the police. Some have been
9	successful in lowering the number of claims or
LO	amount of money paid out to claimants. We have
11	cited some of these jurisdictions in our report.
12	Has this report been reviewed, really? Have you
13	reviewed any of these practices?
L4	WILLIAM HEINZEN: I just received a
15	copy of the report before I came in here this
L6	morning. So I just was able to glance through it.
L7	I saw that it mentions the city of Portland I
L8	believe.
L9	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Right.
20	WILLIAM HEINZEN: And some other
21	jurisdictions.
22	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: All right, so
23	perhaps you will read that.
24	WILLIAM HEINZEN: My understanding
25	from looking at that is that the review done in

training?

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that really taxes the emotions of people let alone the Police Department. I would suggest that if they don't then I would really suggest to Councilman Vallone that that is one of the things that absolutely must be put in place. With that I'll turn it over to Councilman Vallone.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Thank you Madame Chair. I'm very disappointed by this testimony. The second paragraph, the types of information sought would not in fact yield constructive data. You missed the point completely.

Four articles I grabbed this morning, "Crack Thug Sues City", "Same Dealers Score Many Times", that's from the news. From the Times, "Fewer Officers, More Lawsuits". From the news again, "Police Behaving Badly Costs the City \$35 million". The Post, "\$5.5 Million Payout to Injured Crackhead". This needs to stop.

The city needs to stop giving out taxpayer money unless the city is actually liable for something and that's not what's going on. city is paying out money for all sorts of reasons and no one is keeping track of it. You're giving

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

us all these reasons why it would be tough to have 2 this information to give to us. You should have 3 4 the information right now. That information 5 should be reviewed every day. There is no excuse

6 for what's going on right now.

> Increase in the amount of payouts from the city and we learn almost nothing from those payouts and it's a vicious cycle. attorneys are out there. They know it's free money to sue the city so they continually file new lawsuits. The Corporation Counsel gets many new lawsuits and says we can't take all these to trial so they just keep settling the lawsuits.

> The only person who loses is the taxpayer. The taxpayer keeps hearing about \$21 million settlements to this group, crack heads getting this money, other people getting different money and nothing is learned from it.

> You tell me that this information would not yield any constructive data. That's so wrong. That's why this bill is introduced because someone needs to look at this. If you're not going to do it, we'll do it. We don't want to do it. You're looking at our entire staff up here.

We don't have a huge budget. But if you're not going to learn and make changes then we will do it for you. That's what this bill does.

Now you said that you formed a committee and that accomplishes my goal. Well that accomplishes a small part of my goal. That committee you're talking about, which I want to hear about right now, is a committee formed by the Police Department to start looking at these settlements and learn things. Finally, you would have thought that would have been done a long, long time ago. But that's just part of my goal.

My goal is to learn from the settlements, the legitimate settlements. I'm not saying the city is never wrong and the police are never wrong that's for sure. When they are we need to learn and fix it. That's what this committee I assume would do.

The committee has no say and nothing to do with the ridiculous amount of settlements against the city and that's a whole other problem which that committee does not address. But let's start first with the committee. When was it formed? Who's on it?

б

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that they don't show up except for budget 2

hearings. So I'm kind of at a loss as to what I'm 3

supposed to ask you then if you don't know about 4

5 the Police Department's policy.

> WILLIAM HEINZEN: Well, with respect, Councilman, I was here to testimony on Intro 1025 and I did. Everything within that I was here to testify about. Not to say that I think you're going down the wrong path in terms of your goal, not to say we don't think settlements are a problem and that litigation is a problem but to say that I don't think that collecting this type of information in this way will actually be useful to you or to any of us.

> COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: I couldn't disagree any more. That doesn't get us anywhere with this hearing. I need to learn about what's being done with the information now. I've sat down and had meetings with Mike Cardozo so I happen to know some of the things already. That doesn't help the people in the room.

> When it comes to settlements being made in a manner brought against a police officer, do you know if the Corp Counsel discusses that

with the Corp Counsel which we cannot support at

25

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It goes to a much bigger problem here, the 2 all. lack of communication between the Corp Counsel and 3 4 the Police Department.

The Corp Counsel says they give all this information to the Police Department, in their defense. Every time they settled they do send it after they settle, not before, to the Police Department. So the Police Department can and does have the ability to learn from it.

The Police Department has not until just recently taken any action with regard to that information.

I'm trying to figure out what I can ask you that would be helpful here. I've got so many questions but they're for the Police Department and for the Corp Counsel.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Councilman Vallone, what I would suggest, because it's difficult when they don't come and I realize you have difficult in answering some of the questions because you're not here speaking for the Police Department. One of the ways I can tell you is getting at anybody is through their pocketbook. So if the Police Department and the Law Department

settlements that may seem outrageous to the
public. I agree. Again, I'm a former trial
attorney. I've done defense work. I've sued the
city when it comes to bad police officers. I
don't know if Chris knows that but I have defended
people against bad cops and sued the city when it
comes to bad cops back before I was a Council
Member.

So you're right, settlements in many cases are largely separate from the merits of the litigation, but they should not be when it comes to New York City. New York City should only settle if the police office is liable. If not, if they start handing out money to people to go away because the city doesn't want to spend the money defending it, what happens is more lawyers file suits. That's what's happening right now.

So why don't you tell us a little bit about what goes into settling a case outside of the merits of the litigation.

WILLIAM HEINZEN: Well, other than what's in my testimony?

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Your testimony only says that line. It doesn't say

3

4

5

б

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

what the settlement is based on that's outside the merits of the litigation. I'm sorry, it does say based on the anticipated risks and costs of litigation. That's obvious.

Again, that's a decision that Allstate can make when defending against in a car accident. Not that New York City should be making when it involves a police officer and his actions with the public.

You also mention here that a better source, according to Ray Kelly, of information regarding individual police officers is the Civilian Complain Review Board. I'm not disagreeing with that. But this is an additional source. If one police officer is costing the city 20 settlements at \$5 million a settlement, right now nothing is being done about that.

Now those settlements may be and he may not even be guilty of any of that which is another problem. But if one officer is being sued that many times, something needs to be done other than throwing taxpayer money at drug dealers. What's being done right now? What are we learning right now from the amount of settlements against

indimidual	noliao	officers	÷ +	anrething?
individual	police	officers	lΙ	anything?

WILLIAM HEINZEN: You know, I can comment on the Law Department's review of all the documents. I know that the Law Department obviously conducts a review of settlements. The comptroller also compiles settlement data and reports on it every year, analyzes trends that they see in settlement data.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Counsel was telling me and I wasn't even aware of this, that many times lawyers tell their clients not to file CCRB complaints until after the lawsuit so as not to give any notice to the city of the case or the existence of the case. Interesting, this is why we need to look at both the CCRB complaints against officers and the civil complaints.

Nobody knows better than I do that most of these civil complaints are complete bull. But many of those ridiculous cases get settled and shouldn't. The ones that are legitimate need to be learned from and they're not. We're definitely not learning anything today. I know it's not your fault. You were sent here. You're doing what you need to do. It's nothing personal, it's just I

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

can	't	learn	anything	unles	ss the	e Corp	Counse	el and
the	Po	olice	Department	are	here	. Thai	nk you,	Madame
Cha	ir.							

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

WILLIAM HEINZEN: May I comment?

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Yes, go ahead.

WILLIAM HEINZEN: I just want to

say Councilman Vallone and the entire committee; we're not saying that we don't share the goal of learning more about what is in litigation, what the settlements tell us about patterns in the litigation. What I am saying is that this information and collecting this information at this point in the process, at the intake process in Corp Counsel, is not going to provide you useful data. It's going to provide you a lot of junk. I really believe that.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: That's only part of what we're requesting the intake amount of cases. We're also requesting the settlements that occur after these cases are taken. We need to know how many frivolous lawsuits are being filed and why they're being filed for one purpose. And then another purpose,

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we need to know why they're being settled, how 2 many are being settled, why they're being settled 3 4 and what we're learning from it.

So the fact that the cases are being filed is relevant because we need to know the amount of cases that are being filed, why they're being filed, against whom they're being filed and maybe we can discover some trends that you haven't yet.

Number one trend, more cases will be filed when the city settles more cases. It's a vicious cycle and we're in it right now.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: If I may add to that for one moment. It might take some looks at some hospitals because Councilman Vallone I have learned that hospitals get sued as well and they get sued very heavily.

We know what happens and what the settlements are but what is very important is that there are meetings from everyone involved in that hospital from providing the health care to administration to counsel that we look at why that suit was filed, what was the reason and we follow after that to be certain that such an incident

2 doesn't happen again.

I can tell you in the hospitals that I have run; we have reduced them for the very reason of what Councilman Vallone is saying. It is one thing to get a suit, it's another thing to see what happens and how do you reduce it.

Maybe the administration has to look at some hospitals that are run well and look at what they do to reduce their suits because hospitals pay out a lot of money and it's not based on frivolity and it's not based on carelessness.

But there is a reduction in them and that reduction is because we have done exactly what Councilman Vallone is asking for. It's the only way you can reduce lawsuits is to take action and that action is with the staff. It's with the administration. It's with everybody to see that it doesn't happen again. I think that that's one of the fundamental of this bill.

I, as someone who has run a hospital, it's fundamental, it's necessary to do that very thing. I'm really surprised to hear that that's not done. So I think maybe you need

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

particular welcome to Peter who of course is a
good friend of the Civil Liberties Union. I'm
glad to hear Peter that you have a history of
suing the Police Department. I do take some
comfort in that.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Is that sarcasm?

CHRISTOPHER DUNN: No, no, that's not sarcasm. You made a point of pointing it out, so I want to acknowledge that. Peter, I also want to acknowledge that you don't often hear this but we fully support what you are doing here. You're on to something. Where there is smoke there is fire and there's a lot of smoke here.

I will tell you that we are a little less interested in the careening armored car and are a little more interested in the careening cops who may be engaged in misconduct.

While I recognize that you are particularly concerned about what you consider to be frivolous payouts, we are more concerned about the second point that you noted though did not emphasize which is what if anything is the city learning from these lawsuits.

a number of disparaging comments about the

CHRISTOPHER DUNN: I think you made

24

25

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

complaint.

lawsuits. But as you know, to file a lawsuit is a lot harder than to file a CCRB complaint. want to file a CCRB complaint, you pick up the phone, you call 311, and presto, you've got a CCRB

You want to file a lawsuit you've got to find a lawyer, you got through a lot of process. Lawyers have legal obligations and ethical obligations about what they can file. not suggesting all lawsuits are meritorious, Peter, you know that. But the fact of the matter is lawsuits are a telling indicator. The city should be looking at lawsuits. So I think you're absolutely right.

The lawsuits that the city is facing are costing the city a lot of money, as you pointed out. The committee's paper talks about some public reporting about the costs of lawsuits. I hope that you folks know the Comptroller's Office reports every year about claims, including the Police Department.

We know that over the last ten years there have been something like \$400 million paid out by the city for police misconduct

2

3

4

5

б

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

me. it would be better to be called Councilman Vallone, even by me. Second of all, if you want to have a private conversation with him, I don't mind and I'll leave. But we're all here and would like to hear what you have to say.

CHRISTOPHER DUNN: I apologize.

MALE VOICE: No problem.

2.

CHRISTOPHER DUNN: Let me give you
two indicators of what we see as a factual matter
of the lack of information that the city has and
the lack of any sort of system by which when a
lawsuit gets filed. What happens in the Police
Department when a lawsuit gets filed?

We in lawsuits that we file where we're challenging the Police Department about policies and practices, we oftentimes depose the police officers. A standard set of questions with a police officer is have you been sued before.

Frequently the police officer will say yes. We say, what the allegation was, you know, someone accused me of hitting them or falsely arresting them or racially profiling them. What was the outcome of the case? I can tell you that in 100% of instances the police officer says I do not know. They're never told. There is no connection.

From a different perspective, we recently tried to get from the New York City Law Department information about the number of lawsuits that were sued against school safety agents. There are now about 5,000 school safety

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

agents in the public schools, members of the Police Department and they generate a lot of complaints and some lawsuits. We FOIL'd the Law Department and we then had negotiations with very high level people in the Law Department about getting this information.

They said we can't get it, we don't have it. It does not exist. We don't have any system for identifying these sorts of cases. ultimately had to say to them well look, why don't you just send an email around to your lawyers and ask them to identify them which they ultimately did and they then produced to us information about lawsuits against school safety agents.

This is just to give you an indication. The Law Department has no system in place whatsoever for collecting information about lawsuits. It's not like the city of New York doesn't have systems in place for collecting this information.

So for instance, just to give you an idea, and I don't often say positive things about the CCRB, and the CCRB is here today by the way, I do want to make a little plug for them to

give you a sense of what sorts of things you can
be asking for.

annual report. It includes detailed factual information about complaints filed by the CCRB. It tells you information about who files the complains, demographics of the police officers, commands of the police officers, specific allegations, all kinds of information about complaints about misconduct by police officers. This is the CCRB and these are just complaints. They don't have any financial consequences for the city.

The Council has enacted two laws recently that have mandated very specific reporting about the Police Department and other areas. I think Council Member Vallone I think was largely responsible for this. This came out of Public Safety. There was a bill enacted by the entire Council this January that requires information about shooting practices by the department. NYPD shooting practices report for last year. Incredibly detailed information about Police Department shootings, and a much smaller

surprised what that map suggests. You might not

25

be hugely surprised to see a map of lawsuits filed against the NYPD.

So we think there should be a significant expansion of the types of information that is reported consistent with what you expect of the city agencies in other areas.

Secondly, we think that the reporting should be broad in terms of who it is going to. There has been discussion about the CCRB. They should certainly get these things because they should be looking at them. The Comptroller's Office should be getting this information. They should be looking at it.

It's very important from our perspective that the reporting that you mandate be as broad as possible, both in terms of the types of information that you're seeking and who is getting it so it can be used in a productive way.

Finally we have some technical corrections that are suggested in our testimony.

One thing that I would note in particular though is the bill only speaks to lawsuits in which the Law Department makes an appearance.

As you may be aware, there are many

2.

himself or herself.

instances in which the Law Department will choose	
not to represent a police officer because it	
decides the officer's conduct is so egregious.	
It's referred to in the vernacular they cut the	
officer loose. They make the officer defend	

Those are incidents that certainly should be included in your reporting because they may be the situations that suggest the greatest misconduct because the Law Department at some level has made a judgment that what's happened there is so bad they want nothing to do with it. That is still a problem the Police Department has and we should not be washing our hands of that in terms of the reporting about this.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I think that's an excellent recommendation. I'm sure that the Safety Committee will consider that.

CHRISTOPHER DUNN: I will just say in closing, and I apologize for having gone as long as I have, that we think this is an excellent first step in terms of developing an accountability system. But we want to be clear it's a first step. Given the enormous cost to the

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

city and given the cost and the threat to public
safety and to the integrity of the Police
Department. Lawsuits about police officer
misconduct are a serious matter. There needs to
be a comprehensive system. It needs to include
the U.S. Attorney's Office, the district
attorneys' offices, the Police Department, the
CCRB, the Comptroller's Office and the Council.
There needs to be a complete system.

We support this bill as a first step towards that but it is a first step. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. We'll hear from Mr. Wasserman and then we can have some questions.

STEVEN WASSERMAN: Good morning everybody. I'm Steven Wasserman. I'm with the criminal practice of the Legal Aid Society. It's my specific responsibility there to monitor incidents of police misconduct.

We are often the first agency that encounters individuals that have been arrested and we are very often the very first agency to observe and to receive the reports of police misconduct

that are causing these staggering expenditures.

We certainly welcome and salute the legislation that's being proposed here. We would suggest that the Comptroller's Office may also be a very important source of prompt and detailed data that you need.

One of the things that I do at

Legal Aid is that I help our clients who have been
beaten up or falsely arrested to reserve their

right to sue. There is a requirement that a

notice of claim to commence a civil action against
the city has to be filed within 90 days of the

incident. That notice of claim has to be

reasonable detailed. I mean very often it does

identify officers and commands and locations.

I myself in order to help to monitor police conduct and to gather impeachment material against police officers for criminal trials, I FOIL the notices of claim that are involving the Police Department ever two years. It has proven for us to be an enormous trove of information.

I would suggest though that above and beyond the notices of claim, I think the other

very important source of information that could help to really inform for Corp Counsel and the City Council is the information that is gathered at the 50H hearings. That after you file a notice of claim you are contacted fairly promptly, I would say about two or three weeks afterwards from a law firm that's hired by the Comptroller's Office. I have one of these in my hand right now. They actually do depose the claimants in anticipation of lawsuits.

The first that do this, do a fairly detailed job and you get a pretty good diagnosis of the nature and the quality of the claim. I think a lot of the settlements that take place are really based upon these 50H hearings.

It does seem to me respectfully that one of the things that you may want to be looking at is either a digest of these hearings or some sort of form that could be produced as part of the 50H process.

I do think this would address part of the problem that was raised by the lawyer for the Mayor's Office that the actual filing of these lawsuits, there is often a lag time of months and

want you to get the impression that I think

they're all frivolous. They're absolutely not all

24

25

2 | frivolous.

My point is that when they are meritorious, we need to learn and take action. If it's a policy problem with the NYPD, fix the policy. Train better maybe so they understand that policy and how to implement it. If it's an individual police officer, take action, whether it's discipline or whether it's removal. Learn from the meritorious cases. Don't settle the frivolous cases.

So both goals are very important to me. Stop the bleeding when it comes to taxpayer money during a budget and number two, learn and make changes from the NYPD. So maybe I didn't say it clearly enough but I agree with you. There are meritorious cases and there are frivolous cases. We may disagree as to the extent of both cases.

You bring up an interesting point about the times when the Corp Counsel won't even represent the police officers outside the scope of duty. They would be able to report to us I guess that they refused to represent, but would there be someplace else that we would be able to get more information regarding those cases? What do you

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

recommend in that situation?

CHRISTOPHER DUNN: I think that should be included in the cases that are reported. The way the bill is written right now it would almost expressly exclude those cases. But I think that might be a subset of cases you might want to pay particular attention to. The Law Department does not do that lightly. They only cut an officer loose after they make an assessment of the case and the egregiousness of the officer's misconduct.

If you can think of a category of cases that you would want to start with, setting aside what may be the merits of the balance of them, cases where it's reasonable something went wrong and seriously wrong, that's where you'd start because the Law Department has already made that judgment.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: We'd assume that in cases like that they're already learning but again we can't even make that assumption. That's the low hanging fruit. it's so bad that they're not even going to represent, hopefully some action is being take but

2 | we don't know.

CHRISTOPHER DUNN: Well I think we do know that they're not learning. Not only are they not learning, but they seem to be opposed to learning. You and I have talked about this. You have been trying for several years to get them to do what probably all of us would agree is just the basic commonsense thing to do.

If you're shelling out a half a billion dollars over ten years and there perhaps are a lot of people who for instance are the victims of police misconduct as part of the deal, most people would say, what are we going to do about that. It is no answer to say as the Police Department too often says a lot of these cases don't have merit. Maybe a lot of them don't have merit. A lot of them do have merit. I'm just astonished that they seem to be so adverse to thinking about this and trying to deal with it.

For Mr. Heinzen to come on behalf of the Administration and basically say in a very soft way we support your goal but they're not playing with you, they're not going along.

They're not producing the Police Department.

They're not producing the Law Department. All the signals to you are they are not taking this seriously. That's just hard to understand.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: We have been joined by Councilman Erik Dilan from Brooklyn. He was here just a minute ago. I guess he'll be back. Councilman Felder has a question.

COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: Thank you. With regard to those cases where you said that they're so egregious that they don't even want to handle, for whatever year you would have that information, how many cases out of how many cases are those?

CHRISTOPHER DUNN: I don't know that anybody knows, which, of course, is the problem. I will tell you anecdotally, I mean these are not the types of lawsuits that we do. But I certainly hear from people in the kind of police lawsuit area that it's not uncommon for officers to be cut loose. That is a significant even that people comment on because it is such an indictment if you will of the officer because of the fact that the Law Department is making a judgment not to appear.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I will tell you one thing that we
see all the time, the Law Department always asks
for more time at the beginning of a case because
they want to do an assessment whether or not they
should represent the officers.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Just to jump in, Simcha, if you don't mind. 8

> COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: Call me Councilman.

## COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE:

Councilman. Maybe I'm wrong but they don't represent if it's not in the scope of duty. So it could have been something that happened at a Christmas party which doesn't mean it's an indictment of the officer.

CHRISTOPHER DUNN: I almost said Peter, I apologize. Council Member Vallone, as you know, there are some things the issue is whether or not the person is completely off duty. There are also questions about whether or not they have done something so outside the scope of what they are supposed to be doing. That's where you really have problems.

But Council Member Felder, to get

2.

to your point, the Law Department in every single
case, there is a process by which they assess the
case to determine whether or not they are going to
represent the officer. So this is not a problem
where there is not a process in place by which the
Law Department is not collecting information.
They're just choosing not to aggregate it and
report it.

repeated that at least three or four times very, very well. So I got that point. But on the question that I asked you, which you don't have the information presumably because of the same reasons that we don't have other information, I would just say that without knowing the facts those cases are cases you read about in the papers where a case is so egregious that the Department doesn't want to get involved with it.

I don't know the numbers. I don't know the information. I may be speculating. But I would say I doubt very much that there are many of them. You don't want to speculate but I'm willing to speculate.

CHRISTOPHER DUNN: Okay, I'll

3

4

5

6

7

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

speculate also. I don't think there are a lot either. But in a city where there are thousands of lawsuits every year against the Police Department, let's say there are 100.

COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: That's where I differ. I don't think there are 100. But in any case, what I wanted to say is that as part of your testimony and I just want to add to what Council Member Vallone said earlier, the information that we need, and I know that this is critical to you and to your colleague from the Legal Aid Society, it is not only about getting information that proves the guilt of the officers.

The issue is that if the city in fact is paying out money to work out a deal which in the business world makes sense. Or, you know, sometimes if two cars, if there's a collision or something like that and two parties say we don't want to go through the insurance companies, but even if they do, no one's reputation is really tarnished as a result of that.

The issue with this it works the other way as well. I think you and Council Member Vallone made this clear is that when the city pays

3 4

5

6

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

out money just to make a deal there is clearly some reflection on this police officer, whether you like it or not. Somebody paid out a quarter of a million dollars even if the guy was very innocent and that's information that we need as well. Because if we have that information then it would be clear that sometimes officers are quilty, sometimes they're not. It's irrelevant. sits down and makes a business deal.

If an officer had one case where something like that was paid out and you have another officer where it happened ten times or five times or three times, there's in my mind a presumption maybe of some innocence whereas if somebody is a repeat offender maybe not. I thank you very much for your testimony.

CHRISTOPHER DUNN: For instance, that points to one specific piece of information you presume you would want to know. For every police officer who is identified as a defendant, has he or she been a defendant in prior lawsuits. So that's an example of the ways in which we think you could expand the reporting so you actually get more useful information to allow you to draw

3

4

5

6

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

judgments, not only about the problems with settlements but about what's happening with police officers.

COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: Finally, you mentioned about the Comptroller's Office, I'm very curious about that. At this hearing it's somewhat clear that the information that we're trying to get we're not able to get. But if the Comptroller's Office, if the responsibility, it sounds like a lot of the responsibility that we're talking about is the audit process, it's the audit function.

I didn't understand clearly. sounded like you were not satisfied with what they provide. Did I read into that? It sounded like you were just saying that it's sort of general numbers. If that's the case, would you be satisfied with the Comptroller's Office given more powers to be able to get the information that you want somehow?

CHRISTOPHER DUNN: Understand, what the Comptroller's Office gets right now is they get this so-called notice of claim. Then they get something about the settlement at the end of the

day. They don't get anything about the lawsuit

that gets filed itself, and of course they get the

50H hearing which give them some information about

the complainant, the claimant. They don't depose

6 the police officer though.

Our position is that the sort of information you want to have the Law Department produce which I think has unique perspective on the lawsuits should also go to the Comptroller's Office because they're kind of in the business of doing these audits as you know. Therefore they're kind of already geared up to look at this sort of information, as is the CCRB. So that's our thinking behind that.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: If I may, Mr.

Wasserman also said that when the Comptroller's

Office gets involved in some of the reports,

they're quite detailed and that would be extremely
helpful. I believe you stated that they get into
details as to what we cannot get in this hearing.

STEVEN WASSERMAN: Well I represented quite a number of potential plaintiffs at these 50H hearings and they are really put through their paces. They illicit very detailed

information about identifying officers and incidents.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Can you go into the detail, just the categories, what are the specifics that they do when they do the details?

narrative of the event. Sometimes they ask me to supplement with information that's contained in court papers and arrest data. There is quite a significant trove of information about each incident at this pre-litigation stage. It's available very promptly and they have a certain protocol that they go through. I'm sure that they could expand upon it to provide data that might be necessary for your purposes.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Do you think that there's something missing in what you have in those that you've attended that you would have liked to have had included or asked in that process, in that procedure?

STEVEN WASSERMAN: Well no, I would prefer if they ask less frankly. I mean they give our clients a really hard time over there. And as long as they're getting a hard time, I hope the

1	COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS 63	
2	city would benefit from it a little bit.	
3	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you. If	
4	there are no other questions.	
5	COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: I have one	
6	more question. I'm sorry.	
7	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: That's all	
8	right.	
9	COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: I apologize	
10	to my colleagues and everyone else on a nice	
11	Friday when people including myself would like to	
12	get home. I just wanted to say is it your	
13	understanding just for information about the	
14	process. Someone gets arrested, accused of a	
15	crime, an attorney whether they retain their own	
16	attorney or you provide services, they have to	
17	file something within 90 days if they have any	
18	intention of suing the city. Is that true?	
19	STEVEN WASSERMAN: That's correct.	
20	So it's very strict statute of limitations on that	
21	and you are really barred if	
22	COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER:	
23	[interposing] I'm going to ask again because this	
24	is an important point I think. In other words,	
25	any one who is accused of a crime, arrested and	

that most of the people filing notice of claims

25

1	COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS 67	
2	you're looking for.	
3	CHRISTOPHER DUNN: Right.	
4	COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: Thank you.	
5	CHRISTOPHER DUNN: The claims	
6	report the comptroller does is based on notices of	
7	claim.	
8	COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: Thank you.	
9	STEVEN WASSERMAN: We've noticed by	
10	the way sometimes we compare notices of claim with	
11	the Comptroller's report on judgments and	
12	settlements and it turns out that the cases on	
13	which there were notices of claim are actually a	
14	rather small subset of judgments and settlements.	
15	It's really only in the order of about 50%.	
16	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I want to thank	
17	you very much for your testimony today. It's been	
18	very informative and I'm sure that there will be a	
19	follow up. Thank you very much. We'll go to our	
20	next panel, our final panel is DeNora Getachew and	
21	Rachel Fauss from the Citizens Union and Cynthia	
22	Conti-Cook from Stoll, Glickman and Bellina, also	
23	from Citizens Union.	
24	[Pause]	
25	RACHEL FAUSS: I quess since we	

weighed in on issues involving political reform

25

and good and effective government. We are increasingly weighing in on issues that rise to a level of citywide importance. That includes what we recently reviewed and released a report on specifically on New York City's policies and procedures for handling alleged police misconduct and the subsequent internal disciplinary action.

We issued a series of recommendations. I'm just

We support legislation that would create a prosecutorial power for the CCRB. That is one of our chief recommendations in the report. As you know, there is a bill in the Council sponsored by Council Member Garodnick and de Blasio.

going to go through those briefly as a refresher.

A couple of the other recommendations we have are expanding the range of penalties available to the police commissioner, reinstating the zero tolerance penalty for false statements and also creating a permanent and stronger commission to combat police corruption.

Speaking more specifically to today's hearing, the organization is concerned about the rising trend of police claims over the

last several years, especially the data from

Comptroller Thompson's March 2009 claims report

that was cited earlier today.

Just to go over that data very quickly. In fiscal year 2008 there were 2,863 new police action claims which was up 15% from fiscal year 2007 and that totaled \$35.2 million. We juxtaposed this with the number of complaints at the CCRB. While it seemed like there was somewhat of a trend, they did seem to align with each other. That was something that was a concern to us.

When viewed together, the data may be indicative of a trend toward increasing claims filed for both civil and disciplinary actions with allegedly aggrieved parties believing it's necessary to pursue civil claims more frequently as an alternative or in conjunction with disciplinary claims.

I'd just like to briefly say that as has been the subject of this hearing, we recognize that not all claims are valid. But we think that this bill would help to parse what are legitimate claims and what are not legitimate

because we believe that it will create greater transparency regarding claims. This requirement in addition to the five-point plan that we outlined earlier we believe will create an opportunity for the Council, Administration and public to more transparently view trends between allegations of police misconduct and civil actions in order to establish best practices for how to mitigate this important issue and going forward in a more holistic manner.

We thank you for the opportunity to testimony today and we plan to work to both follow this bill as well as the bill I mentioned earlier that would transfer prosecutorial power to the CCRB. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

LEO GLICKMAN: Good morning. My name is Leo Glickman. I'm with Cynthia Conti-Cook. We're from the firm of Stoll, Glickman and Bellina.

Ms. Cook will be reading our testimony and I promise you that it's short,

cases involving the NYPD. A fraction of those claims are the claims settled for over \$250,000 that as we discussed earlier perhaps go unofficially reported to the NYPD.

The majority of claims are repeat routine misconduct by officers and it's often a handful of officers in a handful of precincts.

There is no way to know though which precincts account for the majority of NYPD claims. And there's no way to know which officers account for the majority of the lawsuits brought against them.

Civil rights attorneys know from experience that certain officers in precincts have long histories of liability. This information while available and on public record in filed civil rights complaints often in federal court which are available on the Pacer database. It's just not reviewed by the NYPD.

For example, in our office, I took a list of 50 officers from one precinct that we sue often. From those 50 officers, at least 13 of those officers had been sued at least 3 times or more. Several had been sued 4 to 6 times.

Without knowing the source of the civil rights

2 lawsuits, the City Council cannot even begin to
3 act on the cost of NYPD liability.

Requiring the NYPD to track this civil rights liability data and connect it to the precincts and the officers will be inexpensive.

In addition to that data already being available in the lawsuits, and as was pointed out, the city is already taking time upfront at the beginning of lawsuit to make an assessment about representation.

The technology already exists to connect the precincts and the officers with the City Council liability. The Department of Justice when it sued the City of Los Angeles pursuant to a consent decree created the training and evaluation management system that tracks officers and precincts and connects, track lawsuits, keeps on file a copy of the complaint and demographics about the plaintiffs and information about the officer, the shift he was working on, his supervisor, the precinct that he's from.

Collecting this information is going to limit future liability by revealing leadership and training issues at the precinct

LEO GLICKMAN:

Well if we're

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

waiting, Council Member Dilan is here and I 2 believe the 79th Precinct. It's not in your 3 4 district? Well I apologize. There really truly 5 is a pattern of misconduct from certain precincts

and certain officers. 6

> We just think that if the individual Council Members don't have the understanding of what's happening at the precincts in terms of civil liability that the idea that they can be held accountable for the amount of money that they're costing the city, it's still almost impossible.

> The Comptroller's Office does issue reports with somewhat comprehensive information. But you really as a body or as individual Council Members really cannot act on it because the information is so macro.

> If you have a precinct by precinct breakdown, the individual members in the course of their discussions about policing and public safety can also be discussing these issues and put these issues on the table. You can do it with some data.

> > Very often I think you have to walk

Counsel cutting people. I think it would be

25

2 useful to the committee.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Go ahead.

not really egregious conduct. It's if the department disciplines an officer. If the department does not discipline an officer, or is not about to discipline an officer, the Law Department does not make an independent judgment that this guy was so bad that we're not going to represent him. It's only if the department is taking disciplinary actions do they start to have the discussion about whether to represent him.

I would say that it's not that big an issue because most of the time the city and the Law Department is still in the case even if you do have one of these officers because you're suing the City of New York in addition to the officers. So the Law Department is still involved with the case.

Finally, I will tell you that even when they cut an officer loose, and there's a PBA attorney that's representing them, this is the real result, a \$50,000 settlement and then the city is arguing with the PBA attorney about how

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

much that officer should contribute to the
\$50,000. I can tell you that the Comptroller's
Office considers \$1,000 of that \$50,000 or
\$100,000 to be a huge win, so they're really not
getting that much from the police officers, but
they're not paid that much. I'm not here to argue
about that. But that's sort of the reality.

So really you're not losing that much by not knowing who the officer who is cut loose. In every case, and we have dozens and dozens of these cases, it's never happened that Corporation Counsel is completely out of the case. The city is paying 98% of the settlement and the officer in those cases is paying 1% or 2% at most.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: That's a good point. I thank you very much. Your testimony has been excellent.

> LEO GLICKMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

There are no other testimony coming from those that are here today? I will then officially declare this hearing closed.

I, Donna Hintze certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Signature	Xor

Date \_\_December 21, 2009\_