



Annual Review of Use of Force & Vehicle Pursuit Incidents

This submission is made in accordance with Sections 7.6 and 7.7 of the Attorney General's Use of Force Policy (April 2022) ("Use of Force Policy"), and Sections 12.2 and 12.3 of Addendum B to the Attorney General's Use of Force Policy (April 2022) ("Vehicular Pursuit Policy").

County: Morris

Law Enforcement Agency: Morris Plains PD

Date of Report: 1/9/2026

Year of Data Covered in this Report: 2025

Report has been reviewed by and endorsed by the agency's law enforcement executive: Yes

Contact Information:

Name: Michael Koroski **Title:** Chief of Police

Phone #: 973-889-1110 **Email:** mkoroski@morrisplainsboro.org

Email for submission to Prosecutor's office: mcpoannualreports@co.morris.nj.us



Use of Force Annual Review: Written Report

Section One: BWC/Video Audit

Your review must include a brief description of your agency's random and risk-based audit process (e.g., how videos are selected, who reviews the videos, etc.). If your agency did not conduct a risk-based and/or random BWC/video audit last year, please indicate how you plan to remedy that in the coming year.

The Morris Plains Police Department supervisory and administrative personnel complete random monthly audits of sworn officer BWC recordings and conduct meaningful reviews of BWC and other video footage for risk-based incidents following Attorney General Guidelines, Morris County Prosecutor's Office Directives, Department Policies, and N.J.S.A.C.O.P. Accreditation Standards. Specifically, there is a two-level review process. A sworn officer who is one rank above the officer involved in the incident completes the level one review. An officer one rank above the level one reviewer completes the level two review. In cases of rank conflict, the internal affairs unit or training coordinator may complete the level two review.



Section Two: Internal Affairs Complaints

Your analysis must include a review of internal affairs complaints related to use of force incidents and must include the following:

1. **Number of IA complaints filed related to use of force incidents**
2. **Number of such complaints filed by civilians**
3. **Number of such complaints initiated by the agency**
4. **Number of such complaints sustained**
5. **Number of such complaints still pending**

1. I.A. Complaints Filed	0
2. I.A. Complaints Filed by Civilians	0
3. I.A. Complaints Initiated by Agency	0
4. I.A. Complaints Sustained	0
5. I.A. Complaints Pending	0



Section Three: Meaningful Review of Individual Uses of Force

Section 7.5 of the Attorney General's Use of Force Policy requires that every use of force must undergo a meaningful command level review. Your annual review should include a brief description of your agency's meaningful review policy. If your agency was not able to conduct a meaningful review of each use of force incident, please explain why you were unable to do so and please indicate how you plan to do so going forward.

The intent of the documented meaningful review process is to determine whether policy, training, equipment, or disciplinary issues need to be addressed. A supervisor, commanding officer, or internal affairs may conduct a meaningful review. The reviewing officials should be one rank above the officer using force. If a command rank officer or the agency chief of police uses force, the internal affairs function or training coordinator must conduct a meaningful review.

For the calendar year 2025, one use-of-force incident was examined following the Agency's meaningful review procedures. Specifically, the incident required two officers responded to an incident, with both of those officers utilizing force.

Incident One: A Lieutenant, assigned as the Patrol Division Commander, completed the level one review of the officer's actions. A Lieutenant, assigned as the Support Services Division Commander, completed the level two review. It is also noted that both Lieutenants are assigned to the Department's Internal Affairs function. The Chief of Police completed an executive-level review of the incident. The review concluded that the use of force was appropriate, necessary, and justified with the minimal amount of force utilized to accomplish the objective of taking an intoxicated driver, who subsequently resisted, into custody.



Section Four: Non-Discriminatory Application of Force

Your review must include an explanation of how you concluded whether force was applied in a non-discriminatory manner based on race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, or any other protected characteristic. Your analysis should include a review of your community's demographics and demographic data from the Use of Force portal. If you conclude that any use of force was applied in a discriminatory manner, please explain what steps you have taken and will take to address this conclusion.

This review concludes that the application of force in the agency's single use of force incident was applied in a non-discriminatory manner. This conclusion was reached in consideration of:

1. Force was applied in response to the actions of the subject involved, who was an active resistor, failing to comply with verbal commands.
2. There is no evidence in all available video, including mobile video recordings and body worn cameras, that the protected class characteristics of the individual arrested were a factor in the application of force.



Section Five: Overall Review of Use of Force

Please utilize as much space as needed to conduct a thorough review of your agency's use of force during the preceding calendar year. Your review should evaluate whether force was used in compliance with the Attorney General's Use of Force Policy and your agency's policy. Even if the use of force itself was compliant with those policies, your review should include any recommendations for training, equipment, or room for improvement (e.g., additional de-escalation efforts could have been made).

In a review of 2025, there was a single use of force incident. This use of force, which involved the arrest of a intoxicated and active resistor, was reviewed in accordance with the meaningful review process and revealed no need for changes to departmental structure, policy, or equipment.

Additionally, the use of force by two Morris Plains Police Officers was found to comply with the Attorney General's Use of Force Policy and Morris Plains Police Department Policy.

In consideration of the desire to further reduce an already low number of use-of-force incidents, the Morris Plains Police Department has established a goal of training every sworn officer in the 40-hour Crisis Intervention Training program. The Department also continues to participate in the ARRIVE program. Increasing from the previous year, the Department now has 13 of 19 sworn that have attended the 40-hour C.I.T training. The goal is to train an additional four officers in 2026.

A three-year use-of-force trend analysis shows minimal use of force incidents, indicating that there is no reliance on force to accomplish objectives. Another conclusion that can be drawn is that officers are relying upon de-escalation tactics and when force is necessary, officers are resorting to the most minimal level of force available, compliance holds. These tactics, coupled with training, have resulted in zero injuries sustained by officers, zero injury sustained on those that force was used upon, and zero internal affairs complaints related to use of force.

Use of Force Incidents

2023	0
2024	0
2025	0



--



Section Six: Further Action

Please explain what further action your agency has taken, or will take, to implement any changes in departmental structure, policy, training, or equipment you have deemed appropriate. These actions can include department-wide changes, or changes applicable to specific officers or divisions.

As noted in paragraph three of Section Five, the Morris Plains Police Department is committed to the reduction of an already low number of use-of-force incidents through training, including Crisis Intervention, and community partnerships. There is no identifiable need to enact department-wide changes to structure, policy, or equipment. No specific or identifiable needs exist for individual members of the agency or any of its divisions.



Vehicle Pursuit Annual Review: Written Report

Section One: BWC/Video Audit

Your review must include a brief description of your agency's random and risk-based audit process (e.g., how videos are selected, who reviews the videos, etc.). If your agency did not conduct a risk-based and/or random BWC/video audit last year, please indicate how you plan to remedy that in the coming year.

The Morris Plains Police Department supervisory and administrative personnel complete random monthly audits of sworn officer BWC recordings and conduct meaningful reviews of BWC and other video footage for risk-based incidents per Attorney General Guidelines, Morris County Prosecutor's Office Directives, Department Policies, and N.J.S.A.C.O.P. Accreditation Standards. Specifically, there is a three-level review process. A sworn officer one rank above the officer involved in the incident completes the level one review, and an officer one rank above the level one reviewer completes the level two review. In cases of rank conflict, the internal affairs unit or training coordinator may complete the level two review. The chief of police completes an executive-level review.



Section Two: Internal Affairs Complaints

Your analysis must include a review of internal affairs complaints related to vehicle pursuit incidents and must include the following:

- 1. Number of IA complaints filed related to vehicle pursuit incidents**
- 2. Number of such complaints filed by civilians**
- 3. Number of such complaints initiated by the agency**
- 4. Number of such complaints sustained**
- 5. Number of such complaints still pending**

I.A. Complaints Filed	0
I.A. Complaints Filed by Civilians	0
I.A. Complaints Initiated by Agency	0
I.A. Complaints Sustained	0
I.A. Complaints Pending	0



Section Three: Meaningful Review of Individual Pursuits

Section 12.1 of the Attorney General's Vehicular Pursuit Policy requires that every vehicle pursuit must undergo a meaningful command level review. Your annual review should include a brief description of your agency's meaningful review policy. If your agency was not able to conduct a meaningful review of each vehicle pursuit incident, please explain why you were unable to do so and please indicate how you plan to do so going forward.

The intent of the documented meaningful review process is to determine whether policy, training, equipment, or disciplinary issues need to be addressed. The meaningful review can be conducted by a supervisor, commanding officer, the training function, or the internal affairs function. The reviewing officials should be one rank above the officer using force. If a command rank officer or the agency chief of police uses force, the internal affairs function or training coordinator must conduct a meaningful review.

For the calendar year 2025, a single pursuit was examined following the Agency's meaningful review procedures. Specifically, the incident involved personnel at the rank of police officer.

Incident One: For the officer involved, level one review of his actions was completed by the patrol officer's supervisor, a sergeant. Level two review was completed by a Lieutenant, the Support Services Division Commander. The Lieutenant is also assigned to the Agency's Internal Affairs Unit.

The executive-level review was completed by the Chief of Police. The meaningful review concluded that the pursuit was inconsistent with policy and therefore, non-complaint. As a result, verbal counseling and retraining were completed with the employee.



Section Four: Analysis of Non-Compliant Reports

Your review must include an analysis of all pursuits determined to not be in compliance with the Attorney General's Vehicular Pursuit Policy, or agency policy, and the steps taken to address the non-compliance. Please indicate whether all non-compliant pursuits were referred to the Office of Public Integrity and Accountability or the County Prosecutor in compliance with Section 12.1(e) of the Attorney General's Vehicular Pursuit Policy.

As noted in section three, verbal counseling and retraining were completed with the employee as a result of noncompliance with policy. As this pursuit occurred in the final quarter of the year, notification to the Morris County Prosecutor's Office will occur this month, January 2026.



Section Five: Non-Discriminatory Pursuits

Your review must include an explanation of how you concluded whether vehicular pursuits were conducted in a non-discriminatory manner based on race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, or any other protected characteristic. Your analysis should include a review of your community's demographics and demographic data from the Use of Force portal. If you conclude that any pursuit was conducted in a discriminatory manner, please explain what steps you have taken and will take to address this conclusion.

The vehicle pursuits conducted by this Agency were all initiated by the violators? driving behaviors or criminal activity. Race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation or any other protected characteristic were not a factor in any of the pursuits. Furthermore, the sole pursuit engaged in by the Department was of the operator of a motorcycle, wearing a helmet. As such, identification of the rider's race or ethnicity would not have been possible.



Section Six: Overall Review of Vehicle Pursuit Analysis

Please utilize as much space as needed to conduct a thorough review of your agency's vehicle pursuit incidents during the preceding calendar year. Your review should include but is not limited to: the reason the pursuit was initiated; the number of officers who engaged in pursuits; whether supervisors approved or terminated pursuits; role of any outside agencies; length of pursuits by time and distance; top speeds reached; nature of any injuries, crashes, or property damage; reason for termination (if terminated), and the outcome of pursuits. Your review should evaluate whether pursuits were compliant with the Attorney General's Vehicular Pursuit Policy and your agency's policy. Even if pursuits were compliant with those policies, your review should include any recommendations for training, equipment, or room for improvement.

Pursuit #1:

Reason the pursuit was initiated: Motor Vehicle

The number of officers who engaged in pursuits: One

Whether supervisors approved or terminated pursuits: Non-complaint, Supervisor not notified, as officer believed he was engaged in closing the distance on the violator. Terminated upon loss of sight

Role of any outside agencies: N/A

Length of pursuits by time and distance: One minute, 1.2 miles

Top speeds reached: 80 MPH

Nature of any injuries, crashes, or property damage: Vehicle crash with violator/suspect. Not injured.

Reason for termination (if terminated): Lost sight of vehicle

Outcome of pursuit: Terminated



Section Seven: Further Action

Please explain what further action your agency has taken, or will take, to implement any changes in departmental structure, policy, training, or equipment you have deemed appropriate. These actions can include department-wide changes, or changes applicable to specific officers.

Based upon a meaningful review of the single pursuit initiated by this Agency, no changes to departmental structure, policy, training, or equipment are required.