



**Office of the New York State
Attorney General**

**Letitia James
Attorney General**

December 9, 2025

Police Commissioner Jessica Tisch
New York City Police Department
One Police Plaza
New York, NY 10038

Via email

Re: Letter regarding Executive Law § 75(5)(b) Referral of Det. Damir Vukosa, OAG
Matter No. 1-817981908

Dear Commissioner Tisch,

The Office of the New York State Attorney General has reviewed your agency's referral of Det. Damir Vukosa¹ pursuant to Executive Law § 75(5)(b). Based on our review, we have concluded that Det. Vukosa engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving repeated unlawful searches during vehicle stops and repeated unlawful pedestrian frisks and searches in contravention of the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 12 of the New York State Constitution, and NYPD policies and procedures.

Our findings are based on the following incidents:

- CCRB #202207009: On October 18, 2022, a complaint was filed on behalf of Complainant 1 alleging that several officers, including Det. Vukosa, engaged in misconduct during a pedestrian stop. The Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) investigated this incident and substantiated the allegation that Det. Vukosa engaged in an improper search when he ordered Complainant 1 to open his fanny pack. CCRB found that after the officers determined that Complainant's bag did not contain a weapon, Det. Vukosa had no lawful basis for conducting a full search of the fanny pack. Due to the sustained misconduct, Det. Vukosa received formalized training.
- CCRB #202305729: On June 26, 2023, a complaint was filed on behalf of Complainant 2 alleging that several officers, including Det. Vukosa, engaged in misconduct during a traffic stop. CCRB investigated this incident and substantiated that Det. Vukosa unlawfully frisked and searched multiple individuals on the scene. First, upon noticing a rectangular object in a

¹ During his term of service, Det. Vukosa changed his name from Damir Kozarac. For clarity, he will be referred to as Det. Vukosa throughout this letter.

bag, Det. Vukosa unlawfully felt an individual's bag for contraband. CCRB found the frisk to be unlawful because Det. Vukosa had no basis for suspecting that the individual was armed, and the rectangular bulge could have been any innocuous object. Second, Det. Vukosa unlawfully searched another individual's bag. Det. Vukosa was under the mistaken belief that the individual would be arrested, but since there was no arrest, the CCRB found that Det. Vukosa had no authority to search the bag. Third, after asking an individual for his ID and learning that the individual spoke only Spanish, Det. Vukosa frisked and searched his pockets to uncover his ID. CCRB found this search to be unlawful as Det. Vukosa had no reason to believe that the individual was armed or dangerous, and Det. Vukosa made no effort to locate a Spanish-speaking officer or use any other means of interpretation prior to the search and frisk. As of this writing, CCRB's prosecution of the charges remains pending.

- CCRB #202306931: On July 27, 2023, a complaint was filed by Complainant 3 alleging that several officers, including Det. Vukosa, engaged in misconduct during a traffic stop. The CCRB investigated this incident and substantiated that Det. Vukosa engaged in an improper frisk of Complainant 3, conducted an improper vehicle search, and failed to properly document the stop and search. CCRB found that Complainant 3 was relatively still and calm during the interaction and that nothing indicated the presence of a weapon. Therefore, Det. Vukosa had no basis to frisk Complainant 4 as there existed no reasonable suspicion that Complainant 3 was armed or dangerous. Additionally, CCRB found that Det. Vukosa's subsequent search of Complainant 3's vehicle was unjustified because once the Complainant was removed from the vehicle and found to be unarmed, there was no immediate threat to the officers' safety nor probable cause to justify a search. Finally, CCRB determined that the stop, frisk, and search of Complainant and his car were more likely than not due to racial profiling given a number of factors, including Det. Vukosa's assumption that the car was stolen because it was a "luxury vehicle." As of this writing, these charges related to these substantiated allegations remain pending.
- CCRB #202307068: On July 8, 2023, a complaint was filed by Complainant 4 alleging that several officers, including Det. Vukosa engaged in misconduct during a vehicle search. The CCRB investigated this incident and substantiated that Det. Vukosa engaged in an illegal search of Complainant 4's vehicle and failed to prepare a memo book entry of the stop and search. While Det. Vukosa believed that Complainant 4 was a person of interest in a gun-related incident, that incident occurred 5 months prior, and Det. Vukosa had no additional observations that Complainant 4 was armed or dangerous. Given these factors, CCRB concluded that the search was unjustified because there was no probable cause to believe a firearm was inside the vehicle. NYPD determined it would not discipline Det. Vukosa for this incident.
- CCRB #202308733: On September 15, 2023, a complaint was filed by Complainant 5 alleging that several officers, including Det. Vukosa engaged in misconduct during a traffic stop. The CCRB investigated this incident and substantiated that Det. Vukosa engaged in an illegal search of Complainant 5's vehicle and person and failure to document the stop and search. CCRB found that the passenger's movements indicated nothing more than innocuous behavior and were insufficient to justify a vehicle search. Further, under suspicion that a bag inside the vehicle contained a taser, Det. Vukosa was unjustified in searching the entirety of a

bag first rather than just the compartment suspected to contain the alleged taser. The CCRB also found that Det. Vukosa broke the center console and proceeded to search its contents absent any reasonable belief that the console contained a weapon. Lastly, the CCRB found that Det. Vukosa discourteously “flip[ped] off” a passing member of the public. As of this writing, charges related to this incident remain pending.

- CCRB #202309570: On September 30, 2023, a complaint was filed by Complainant 6 alleging that several officers, including Det. Vukosa engaged in misconduct during a traffic stop. The CCRB investigated this incident and substantiated that Det. Vukosa engaged in an illegal frisk of Complainant 6 and an additional passenger. Det. Vukosa justified the frisk based on the nervousness of the individuals and the presence of an L or J-shaped bulge in their fanny pack. CCRB found that BWC footage contradicts Det. Vukosa’s statements that the fanny pack contained an L or J-shaped bulge. As such, Det. Vukosa’s only justification for these frisks was the individuals’ alleged nervousness, a factor that the CCRB concluded was insufficient to serve as the basis for reasonable suspicion. CCRB also found that Det. Vukosa interfered with a fellow officer’s BWC and failed to prepare a memo book entry. After a separate investigation, NYPD concluded that Det. Vukosa was exonerated of all allegations.
- CCRB #202312110: On December 27, 2023, a complaint was filed by Complainant 7 alleging that several officers, including Det. Vukosa engaged in misconduct during a traffic stop. The CCRB investigated this incident and substantiated that Det. Vukosa engaged in an illegal frisk of Complainant 7 and an illegal vehicle search. CCRB found Complainant 8 to have exhibited none of the suspicious and furtive conduct that could form the basis of reasonable suspicion that he was armed. As such, CCRB concluded that Det. Vukosa’s frisk of Complainant 7 was unlawful. Further, the CCRB found that Det. Vukosa has no probable cause to search Complainant 7’s vehicle because there was no aggravating factor, such as a bulge or nervous behavior, that would support the belief that the Officers were in actual and specific danger. In addition, CCRB also found that Det. Vukosa did not have the required level of suspicion to inquire about weapons, nor restrict Complainant from recording his face during the interaction. Det. Vukosa received Command Discipline A for the substantiated improper search and frisk.
- CCRB #202400157: On January 4, 2024, a complaint was filed on behalf of Complainant 8 alleging that several officers, including Det. Vukosa, engaged in misconduct during a pedestrian stop. The CCRB investigated this incident and substantiated that Det. Vukosa engaged in an illegal search and frisk of Complainant 8. CCRB found that Det. Vukosa’s observation that Complainant 8 had a “heavy object” inside his pocket could not provide the reasonable suspicion necessary to conduct a frisk. Due to a lack of reasonable suspicion, the CCRB concluded that Det. Vukosa’s stop and frisk of Complainant 8 was unjustified. Further, since the frisk did not yield any evidence of a weapon, the CCRB concluded that Det. Vukosa’s subsequent search of Complainant 8 was also unjustified. Further, CCRB found that Det. Vukosa did not properly use his body camera. As of this writing, charges related to this incident remain pending.

- CCRB #202401639: On February 16, 2024, a complaint was filed on behalf of Complainant 9 alleging that several officers, including Det. Vukosa engaged in misconduct during a traffic stop. The CCRB investigated this incident and substantiated that Det. Vukosa engaged in an illegal search of Complainant 9's vehicle. CCRB found that Det. Vukosa received inadequate consent from Complainant 9 to search the vehicle. CCRB concluded that, given Det. Vukosa's shining of a flashlight inside the car, coupled with the number of officers surrounding and searching the complainant, Complainant 9 was intimidated and not properly aware of his legal rights to prevent a search. Therefore, Det. Vukosa's search was unjustified because Complainant 9's consent was not free and unconstrained. Det. Vukosa received Command Discipline A for the substantiated for the improper vehicle search.
- CCRB #202401907: On February 26, 2024, a complaint was filed on behalf of Complainant 10, alleging that several officers, including Det. Vukosa, engaged in misconduct during a traffic stop. The CCRB investigated this incident and substantiated that Det. Vukosa engaged in an illegal frisk of Complainant 10. CCRB found that because Det. Vukosa admitted to not suspecting Complainant 10 of criminality or observing any signs that Complainant 10 possessed a weapon, Det. Vukosa did not have the necessary founded suspicion to frisk complainant. Moreover, the CCRB found that Det. Vukosa did not receive a knowing, intelligent, or voluntary consent because he failed to explain that Complainant 10 could refuse to give consent and quickly asked for consent while complainant's hands were already in the air. CCRB also substantiated that Det. Vukosa failed to prepare a memo book entry and asked the Complainant improper questions during the interaction. Det. Vukosa received Command Discipline B for the substantiated improper frisk which resulted in him forfeiting 2 days of vacation.
- CCRB #202405418: On May 31, 2024, a complaint was filed by Complainant 11 alleging that several officers, including Det. Vukosa, engaged in misconduct during a stop and frisk and failed to prepare memo book entries documenting their actions. The CCRB investigated this incident and substantiated that Det. Vukosa lacked reasonable suspicion to frisk Complainant 11. CCRB found that given the distance and lighting, there was no way for Det. Vukosa to obtain reasonable suspicion that Complainant 11 possessed a firearm. Additionally, Complainant 11's loose-fitting clothes provided insufficient rationale for the frisk as the clothing area is commonly used to carry a variety of items. Det. Vukosa received Command Discipline A for the substantiated for the improper stop of Complainant 11.

Based on the above incidents, we conclude that Det. Vukosa engaged in a pattern of unjustified vehicle searches, personal searches, and frisks contrary to federal and state law and NYPD policy.

Det. Vukosa has a substantiated pattern of misconduct, and discipline imposed to date does not appear to have changed his behavior. To prevent future misconduct, and consistent with the NYPD's Discipline Matrix, we recommend that Det. Vukosa's repeated misconduct be considered as an aggravating factor when imposing discipline for substantiated violations up to and including termination. The Department should also have higher expectations in his conduct, given his role as a Detective.

Given that many of his previous investigations already resulted in discipline, we further recommend immediate monitoring of Det. Vukosa for at least one year. We also request that NYPD develop a training plan involving lawful search and seizure principles and consider transferring Det. Vukosa to a different non-patrol assignment while the numerous charges of serious misconduct are being adjudicated.

Pursuant to Executive Law § 75(5)(c), please provide a written response within 90 days as to NYPD's response to these recommended remedial actions.

Thank you,

LETITIA JAMES
Attorney General of the State of New York

By: AAG Sean Bunny
Law Enforcement Misconduct Investigative Office
Office of the New York State Attorney General