



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

**Letitia James
Attorney General**

June 23, 2026

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

Via Email

Re: Executive Law § 75(5)(b) Referral of Detective Edin Bacovic
OAG Matter No. 1-794795067
Tax ID No. 960189

Dear Commissioner Tisch,

The Office of the New York State Attorney General has reviewed your agency's referral of Detective Edin Bacovic pursuant to Executive Law Section 75(5)(b). Based on our review, we have concluded that Detective Bacovic engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving unlawful seizures, searches, and uses of force, as well as inappropriate threats of force, while working as a police officer.

Our findings are based on the following incidents:

- **CCRB No. 202100174:** On February 14, 2020, at approximately 11 p.m., then-Officer Bacovic¹, with Detective Steven Amico and Officer Michael Arini, working as part of an anti-crime team, were patrolling near the area of 187th Street in an unmarked police car when they pulled up alongside Complainant 1 as he was walking home. Officer Bacovic could not articulate any reason why his attention was initially drawn to Complainant 1 other than his presence on the street. According to Officer Bacovic, Complainant 1 stopped walking, "bladed" his body away from the unmarked police vehicle, and bent down, making a motion as if he was dropping something on the sidewalk before running into a grocery store. Officer Arini testified that he did not observe Complainant 1 do anything suspicious ("I just saw him

¹ During the time of the referenced incidents, Detective Bacovic was assigned to the 48th Precinct and held the rank of Police Officer. In October 2025 he was promoted to the rank of Detective and assigned to Auto Crimes Zone II, where he conducts long-term auto crime investigations in the Bronx. Detective Bacovic is referred to in this letter using the rank he held at the relevant times discussed.

running”), but that because Officer Bacovic stopped their vehicle, he and Det. Amico ran after Complainant 1 into the store, followed by Detective Bacovic after he parked the vehicle. Complainant 1 alleged that Officer Bacovic grabbed and twisted his collar and instructed his partners to “fuck him up,” after which they punched him and Officer Bacovic frisked him, searched him, and strip-searched him by entering his underpants. Complainant 1 was then detained on suspicion of having a weapon, but, finding no firearm, the officers released Complainant 1.

The Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) investigated this incident and substantiated the allegation that Officer Bacovic’s stop of Complainant 1 was an abuse of authority because he did not have sufficient legal authority. However, CCRB was unable to substantiate any of the other allegations because NYPD did not provide Officer Bacovic’s body-worn camera (BWC) footage. IAB had viewed the BWC footage as part of a concurrent investigation, but upon receiving a CCRB request for the video, the Legal Bureau informed CCRB they could not locate it.

Notwithstanding the substantiated stop, NYPD did not initiate disciplinary proceedings against Officer Bacovic or the other officers because the statute of limitations was close to expiring. CCRB attributed the delays to NYPD, namely that Officer Bacovic failed to appear for four scheduled interviews with CCRB between February 2021 and December 2021, and Officer Amico missed eight scheduled interviews, then retired, meaning he could not be interviewed.

- **CCRB No. 202003620:** On May 23, 2020, Officer Bacovic, Officer Jonathan Gonzalez, and Sergeant Michael Vega conducted a vehicle stop of Complainant 2A who was driving a vehicle in which Complainant 2B was the passenger. The officers reported that the stop was based on a traffic violation, but none could recall the specific infraction. The officers ordered both occupants out of the vehicle based on their purported detection of a marijuana odor emanating from the car. Officer Bacovic searched Complainant 2A and Complainant 2B. After recovering the keys to the vehicle, Officer Gonzalez searched it. During the search, Officer Gonzalez found marijuana crumbs on the seats and floor of the front section of the vehicle but did not locate additional marijuana or any other contraband during the search. Upon completion of the vehicle search, Officers Gonzalez and Bacovic advised both complainants to get back in their vehicle.

Complainant 2B later began recording the incident with his cell phone, prompting Officer Bacovic to threaten to tow the vehicle, to arrest both complainants for possession of marijuana, and to use force against Complainant 2B, stating, “Come at me sideways, I have no idea who you are. You’re messing with the wrong cop right now,” and “Put your hand in my face one more time and watch how that ends for you.” Officer Bacovic also interfered with Complainant 2B’s attempt to record him by shining his flashlight directly into the camera and following the phone with his flashlight as the complainant moved it.

The CCRB investigated this incident and substantiated abuse of authority allegations for the officers’ stop of the vehicle, because the officers could not recall a specific vehicle infraction during their interviews with CCRB and did not take any enforcement action related to an

alleged violation, releasing both complainants at the end of the incident without an arrest or summons.

The CCRB also substantiated allegations of abuse of authority for Officer Bacovic's unjustified threats of force, arrest, and seizure of property.

CCRB recommended that NYPD prefer charges and specifications against Officer Bacovic and impose Command Discipline on Officer Gonzalez and Sgt. Vega. NYPD did not proceed with charges or discipline against any of the subject officers, administratively closing the case and citing a short statute of limitations.

- **IAB Log No. 2022-3927:** NYPD's Internal Affairs Bureau investigated an incident involving Officer Bacovic's use of force against Complainant 3 on February 20, 2022. We reviewed the BWC footage, NYPD documents related to the incident, and IAB's internal investigation.

On February 20, 2022, NYPD officers responded to a vehicle accident at the intersection of East Avenue and Webster Avenue where one of the drivers fled the scene. Three uninvolved individuals walked out of a nearby nightclub and allegedly interfered with the accident investigation, including climbing onto the officers' patrol vehicle. The officers attempted to detain the individuals for interfering with their investigation, but the individuals fled first on foot and then in a vehicle. The officers requested additional units to assist in apprehending them, providing a description of the vehicle they had entered.

Officer Bacovic, assigned to the Bronx Public Safety Team, and assisting NYPD officers, attempted to stop the vehicle but its driver did not comply, and the officers engaged in a short pursuit. The suspect vehicle stopped at the intersection of Valentine Avenue and Fordham Road. Sgt. Bryan Ortiz approached the driver side of the vehicle with his firearm pointed at the window. Shortly after, Sgt. Brenden Reilly, the Bronx Public Safety Supervisor, and Officers Bacovic and Dante Pulido, approached the driver's side of the vehicle. Sgt. Reilly pointed his taser in the window saying, "Taser, you want to get tased?" Officer Bacovic, Sgt. Reilly, and Officer Pulido removed the driver, Complainant 3, from the vehicle. The officers immediately brought Complainant 3 to the ground. While attempting to detain Complainant 3, one of the officers ordered him to "give me your fuckin' hands, hands, give me your fuckin' hands, I'll break your fingers, give me your fuckin' hands." Officer Bacovic proceeded to strike Complainant 3 on the top of his head with a flashlight at least twice, which caused a gash that immediately bled through his sweatshirt hood (Axon_Body_3_Video_2022-02-20_0419 at 1:28 to 1:44). Complainant 3 was handcuffed and NYPD officers assisted him to stand. Officer Bacovic pointed at Complainant 3 and said, "Who did that to you? You did that to yourself. You did that to yourself. When the police are behind you, you stop." (Axon_Body_3_Video_2022-02-20_0419 at 2:24 to 2:36). Complainant 3 was arrested and charged with reckless endangerment.

Complainant 3 was transported to a hospital. Complainant 3's discharge papers describe blunt trauma to his head, a nasal bone fracture and a head injury that required at least one staple.

Involved members of service did not follow proper force notification and investigation procedures (which are beyond the scope of this letter), and as a result Officer Bacovic's use of force was not investigated by a duty captain immediately following the incident. A force investigation began on February 24, 2022 by Patrol Borough Bronx Sergeant Donald Ford. On March 30, 2022, Captain Miguel Cabrera, then-Executive Officer of the 48th Precinct, was made aware of the force incident, reviewed the relevant BWC, revised Officer Bacovic's TRI to include the use of an impact weapon against the subject, and recommended a more thorough investigation. Sgt. Ford continued his investigation and interviewed several involved officers, including Officer Bacovic.

During Officer Bacovic's recorded interview with Sgt. Ford, he stated that he struck Complainant 3 with his flashlight two or three times² but believed he was striking him in the shoulder initially. He did not recall reporting the use of an impact weapon to his supervisor, Sgt. Reilly, who also participated in the use of force. Officer Bacovic explained during his interview that he did not notify Sgt. Reilly that he struck Complainant 3 with a flashlight because he did not believe he struck him with a flashlight, but rather with his hand, until his interview that day.

As detailed in the Internal Case Management System (ICMS) Allegation Findings Worksheet, the investigation concluded that Officer Bacovic utilized hand strikes and his flashlight as an impact weapon to subdue Complainant 3, that Complainant 3's injuries were "sustained from being struck on the head with a flashlight from Officer Bacovic," and that Officer Bacovic's conduct violated NYPD Patrol Guide Section 221-01 (Force Guidelines). Despite these investigative findings, the Command Discipline Report describes a hand strike as the cause of injury, not the use of the flashlight as an impact weapon, and lists one unspecified substantiated violation ("any other Schedule B appropriate violation"), instead of force. Officer Bacovic accepted a Schedule B penalty of a one-day forfeiture. Below, we identify several concerns related to the Command Discipline Report and the discipline imposed in this incident.

- **CCRB No. 202401390:** On October 18, 2023, Officer Bacovic, Officer Dante Pulido, Officer Kasseem Pennant, and Sgt. Daniel Davila were driving in a police vehicle when Officer Bacovic conducted a traffic stop of Complainant 4 for a broken headlight, making illegal U-turn, and not wearing his seatbelt. When Complainant 4 could not produce the requested paperwork for the vehicle, Officer Bacovic asked if there were any weapons in the vehicle and requested consent to search it. Complainant 4 declined, stating he had a Door Dash order to deliver. Officer Bacovic ordered Complainant 4 out of the vehicle, claiming that he noticed a "J-shaped" bulge protruding from the front of his sweatshirt pocket, suspecting the

² During his recorded interview with Sgt. Ford, Officer Bacovic stated, "I used a hand strike, um but going back like I said, I had a flashlight in my hand to illuminate the situation, and the situation escalated quickly that I did not know my flashlight was still in my hand, as I was unintentionally striking him with my flashlight but I was intentionally using my hand" (1652835965891_interview at 3:25 to 3:54).

bulge was a weapon. CCRB observed that Officer Bacovic's BWC does not show a visible "J-shaped" bulge in the sweatshirt pocket. Detective Bacovic patted down the front of his Complainant 4's sweatshirt and a fanny pack slung across his chest. He then lifted Complainant 4's sweatshirt, revealing his underwear waistband. Officer Bacovic searched the sweatshirt pocket. Finally, he patted down Complainant 4's pants pockets. Officer Pulido conducted a search of the Complainant's vehicle but was cut short as officers had to prioritize an urgent request to respond to a reported firearm they received over the radio.³ The officers did not arrest Complainant 4 or issue him any traffic tickets.

The CCRB investigated this incident and substantiated allegations that Officer Bacovic abused his authority when he questioned and searched Complainant 4 without sufficient legal authority. The CCRB recommended formalized training related to investigative encounters, which Officer Bacovic received.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the above incidents, we conclude that Detective Bacovic engaged in a pattern of misconduct involving repeated abuses of his authority, including unconstitutional seizures, searches, and uses of force, as well as inappropriate threats of force.

Detective Bacovic began his career at the NYPD as a police officer in 2016 and has been the subject of 10 CCRB complaints filed between 2019 to 2023 described above, including three substantiated complaints involving his participation in policy violations and unlawful conduct. In two of the incidents described above, he was assigned to anti-crime units. Despite these substantiated complaints, Officer Bacovic was promoted in October 2025 to the position of detective and assigned to Auto Crimes Zone II, where he now conducts long-term auto crime investigations in the Bronx.

We do not make any specific recommendations regarding discipline, as the above matters have been resolved and are beyond the statute of limitations. Moving forward, we recommend that NYPD prioritize Detective Bacovic for assignments that limit his interactions with the public.

Our review of IAB Log No. 2022-3927 revealed deficiencies in NYPD's accountability structure⁴ that we ask NYPD to address in its response pursuant to Executive Law § 75(5)(c). While the force investigation found that Officer Bacovic violated NYPD's Force Guidelines by

³ According to the CCRB Closing Report, "PO Pulido searched the interior of the vehicle, including the glove compartment, because these were places where Mr. Espinosa may have another license plate stowed. PO Pulido intended to search the trunk, but a firearm job came over the radio, causing the officers to cut the vehicle stop short."

⁴ The independent monitor for the NYPD has reported on the department's supervisory and accountability deficiencies. While that review is limited to stops, frisks, and searches, we have observed similar deficiencies with respect to other types of misconduct, including force, which we address here.

striking Complainant 3 in the head with his flashlight as an impact weapon, the Command Discipline Report mischaracterized the cause of the complainant's injury and the resulting violation. This mischaracterization obscures the severity of the incident and the policy violations. Additionally, the mislabeling of the violation resulted in an inaccurate data entry which could also skew future risk assessment.

Moreover, the discipline imposed does not appear to be in line with NYPD's Disciplinary System Penalty Guidelines (the "Discipline Matrix") given the nature and severity of the substantiated misconduct, *i.e.*, the unreasonable use of an impact weapon to the complainant's head resulting in physical injury, and Detective Bacovic's disciplinary history. In following the Investigations Unit recommendation, the commanding officer of the 48th Precinct resolved the substantiated force violation with Command Discipline, Schedule B, and a penalty of one day, although the presumptive penalty for such misconduct is 10 suspension days and 10 penalty days.⁵ Moreover, Command Discipline is not authorized for violations of NYPD's use of force policy. As the department's Discipline Matrix explains, the Command Discipline procedure allows for "technical violations," such as "improper uniform, reporting late for duty, and loss of Department property," to resolve without a formal disciplinary hearing.⁶ For non-technical violations, the Discipline Matrix addresses how and when they may be resolved through Command Discipline in three ways. First, it specifies categories of misconduct that may resolve through the Command Discipline procedure instead of being adjudicated by charges and specifications if the presumptive penalty is not greater than that which may be imposed through Command Discipline – use of force is not one of those specified categories.⁷ Instead, it directs supervisors to subject "[a]ny violation of NYPD's Use-of-Force policy [] to maximum scrutiny." Second, "[t]he Department Advocate may direct that a disciplinary matter be adjudicated through CD [Command Discipline] in lieu of Charges and Specifications when appropriate." Third, a Commanding or Executive Officer may adjudicate "any other violation" through the Command Discipline procedure when deemed "appropriate" after consultation with the Department Advocate's Office. The Department Advocate's Office was not involved in this matter. As such, the Command Discipline procedure appears to have been unauthorized here. Discipline imposed should track the substantiated force conduct and injury to the subject, as prescribed by the Discipline Matrix.

We ask that NYPD provide an explanation for the adjudication of this force violation with Command Discipline and a one-day penalty, which is far below even the presumptive

⁵ NYPD Disciplinary System Penalty Guidelines, at 23 (Feb. 15, 2022), https://www.nyc.gov/assets/nypd/downloads/pdf/public_information/nypd-disciplinary-penalty-guidelines-effective-2-15-2022-final.pdf.

⁶ *Id.* at 3.

⁷ The Guidelines explicitly permit adjudication through Command Discipline of "Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy, Offensive Language" violations (*id.* at 30) and "Violation of Department Rules and Regulations" that are "commonly adjudicated through Charges and Specifications" (*id.* at 45).

penalties under the Guidelines and was not apparently authorized or appropriate given the nature of the incident and the resulting injury. 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: Emily Winograd Leonard
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the New York State Attorney General