



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: 3/11/2025 4:00:00 AM

Year of Data Covered in this Report: 2024

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. Number of IA complaints filed related to use of force incidents: 0	2. Number of such complaints filed by civilians: 0	3. Number of such complaints initiated by the agency: 0	4. Number of such complaints sustained: 0	5. Number of such complaints still 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 2024, 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 one 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 obtaining medical aid for an individual who was suffering from a mental health episode. The individual subjected officers and E.M.S. personnel to physical attack and spat bodily fluid at and on them.



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, including physical attack and subjecting the officers to bodily fluid by spitting at them. 2. There is no evidence, in all available, video that the protected class characteristics of the individual arrested and experiencing a mental health crisis, 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 2024 use of force incidents, there was again decrease in incidents as compared to 2022 and 2023, five incidents and two incidents respectively. The singular use-of-force incidents in 2024, 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 a Morris Plains Police Officer 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. A comparison preceding years use of force incidents, including anecdotal experiences, indicate that mental health continues to be a factor in the use of force. As such, the Morris Plains Police Department, continues to participate in the ARRIVE program. Currently, 10 of 18 sworn officers have attended the 40-hour C.I.T training and by year's end 2025, 13 officers will be certified in CIT. A three-year use-of-force review shows no major trend in the total amount, nor a drastic increase/decrease trend. One conclusion that can be drawn is that officers are relying upon de-escalation tactics and resorting to compliance holds to accomplish lawful and necessary objectives. These tactics, couple 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 uses of force. Use of Force Incidents 2022 5 2023 2 2023 1



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 two 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**

1. Number of IA complaints filed related to vehicle pursuit incidents 0	2. Number filed by civilians 0	3. Number initiated by the agency 0	4. Numbers sustained 0	5. Number still 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 2024, three pursuits were examined following the Agency's meaningful review procedures. Specifically, the incidents involved personnel at the ranks of police officer. Incident One: For the officers involved, level one review of their actions were completed by a Lieutenant, the Patrol Division Commander. Level two review was completed by a Lieutenant, the Support Services Division Commander. Both Lieutenants are also assigned to the Agency's Internal Affairs Unit. The executive-level review was completed by the Chief of Police. The review concluded that all guidelines and policies were followed. The officers attempted to initiate a traffic stop following an ALPR "hit" for a stolen motor vehicles. Due to the driver's unsafe operation of the vehicle, the shift's officer in charge, who was also assumed the role of secondary unit in the pursuit, advised that the pursuit was not authorized after a short distance and the pursuit was terminated. One officer was verbally counseled on applicable policies and/or directives for attempting to join the pursuit as a third police unit without authorization from the officer in charge. Incident Two: For the officer involved, level one review of his actions was completed by the officer's Sergeant. Level two review was completed by a Lieutenant, the Patrol Division Commander. It is also noted that the Lieutenant is also the Agency's Internal Affairs Unit Supervisor. The executive-level review was completed by the Chief of Police. The review concluded that all guidelines and policies were followed. The officer attempted to initiate a traffic stop for a moving violation and the driver fled from the officer at a high rate of speed. As the stop was only being initiated for traffic enforcement purposes, the shift's officer in charge advised that the pursuit was not authorized and the pursuit was terminated. Incident Three: For the officer involved, level one review of his actions was completed by the officer's Sergeant. Level two review was completed by a Lieutenant, the Support Services Division Commander. It is also noted that the Lieutenant is also assigned to the Agency's Internal Affairs function. The executive-level review was completed by the Chief of Police. The review concluded that all guidelines and policies were followed. The officer attempted to initiate a traffic stop after the suspect vehicle struck another patrol vehicle while it was on a traffic stop. The driver fled the area at a high rate of speed, committing multiple traffic violations and created a continued danger to the public if not stopped. Following the suspect coming to a voluntary stop, the driver was arrested for driving while intoxicated. The only officer involved, after taking the driver into custody by himself, was counseled for officer safety purposes and advised to wait for a secondary unit before approaching and detaining the driver.





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.

THE PURSUITS CONDUCTED BY THIS AGENCY WERE ALL FOUND TO BE COMPLIANT WITH ALL DIRECTIVES AND POLICIES.



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.



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.

The three pursuits engaged in by the Morris Plains Police Department followed all applicable guidelines and policies. Pursuit #1: Reason the pursuit was initiated: Stolen Motor Vehicle The number of officers who engaged in pursuits: Three Whether supervisors approved or terminated pursuits: Terminated Role of any outside agencies: N/A Length of pursuits by time and distance: 1 minute, 0.57 miles Top speeds reached: 75 MPH Nature of any injuries, crashes, or property damage: N/A Reason for termination (if terminated): Danger to officers/public Outcome of pursuit: Terminated Pursuit #2: Reason the pursuit was initiated: Motor Vehicle Violation The number of officers who engaged in pursuits: One Whether supervisors approved or terminated pursuits: Terminated Role of any outside agencies: N/A Length of pursuits by time and distance: 1 minute, 1.2 miles Top speeds reached: 75MPH Nature of any injuries, crashes, or property damage: N/A Reason for termination (if terminated): Identity of operator established Outcome of pursuit: Terminated Pursuit #3: Reason the pursuit was initiated: Imminent Threat to Public - Pursued vehicle struck a police vehicle, with emergency lights activated, while on a traffic stop. The number of officers who engaged in pursuits: One Whether supervisors approved or terminated pursuits: Approved Role of any outside agencies: N/A Length of pursuits by time and distance: 4 minutes, 3.26 miles Top speeds reached: 89 MPH Nature of any injuries, crashes, or property damage: N/A Reason for termination (if terminated): N/A Outcome of pursuit: Driver apprehended after voluntarily stopping.



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 three pursuits initiated by this Agency, no changes to departmental structure, policy, training, or equipment are required.