



Log # 2023-5654

## FINAL SUMMARY REPORT<sup>1</sup>

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On December 1, 2023, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a telephone complaint from [REDACTED] reporting alleged misconduct by members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). [REDACTED] alleged that on November 28, 2023, Police Officer Amra Bukalo-Mehmedovic, Police Officer Jesus Miranda, and Police Officer Jacob Pagan searched his vehicle, without justification. [REDACTED] also alleged that Officer Miranda searched him without justification.<sup>2</sup> Upon review of the evidence, COPA served additional allegations that Police Officer Amra Bukalo-Mehmedovic, Police Officer Jesus Miranda, and Police Officer Jacob Pagan failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) documenting their interaction with [REDACTED]. Officer Amra Bukalo-Mehmedovic received two additional COPA allegations that she failed to accurately document the search of [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] vehicle in a Traffic Stop Statistical Study and conducted a protective pat down of a male subject as a female police officer, when male police officers were available to perform the pat down, in violation of Special Order S04-13-09. Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings regarding the allegations of failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report and failing to accurately document the search of [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] vehicle in a Traffic Stop Statistical Study.

### II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE<sup>3</sup>

On November 28, 2023, Officers Miranda, Bukalo-Mehmedovic, and Pagan conducted a traffic stop on [REDACTED] for a broken headlight.<sup>4</sup> As Officers approached the vehicle (limousine), Mr. [REDACTED] opened the driver's side door and stepped out without the officers requesting.<sup>5</sup> [REDACTED] stated that he opened the door because the windows cannot not roll down.<sup>6</sup> Officer Pagan asked for a license, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that he lost it.<sup>7</sup> Officers then patted down

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix A includes case identifiers such as the date, time, and location of the incident, the involved parties and their demographics, and the applicable rules and policies.

<sup>2</sup> One or more of these allegations fall within COPA's jurisdiction pursuant to Chicago Municipal Code § 2-78-120. Therefore, COPA determined it would be the primary investigative agency in this matter.

<sup>3</sup> The following is a summary of what COPA finds most likely occurred during this incident. This summary utilized information from several different sources, including identify the most material and outcome-determinative evidence relied upon, such as BWC footage, police reports, civilian interviews, officer interviews, etc.

<sup>4</sup> Att. 1, Traffic Stop Statistical Study

<sup>5</sup> Att. 5, BWC PO Pagan at 2:27

<sup>6</sup> Att. 5, at 2:40

<sup>7</sup> Att. 5, at 3:04

██████████ handcuffed him, and escorted him to the rear of the limo.<sup>8</sup> The two other passengers were also asked to exit and stand near the rear of the vehicle.<sup>9</sup> The other male passenger, later identified as ██████████ was handcuffed while the female passenger was not.<sup>10</sup> Officers obtained information from all the parties and conducted a name-check on the portable data transmitter (PDT).<sup>11</sup> Officer Bukalo-Mehmedovic then briefly searched inside vehicle.<sup>12</sup> Officer Miranda also searched inside the vehicle, specifically the driver side, front passenger seat, and the back of the limousine.<sup>13</sup> After a few minutes of searching, Officer Miranda said, “let’s cut these guys,” and Officers removed the handcuffs from Mr. ██████████ and ██████████<sup>14</sup> Despite conducting a stop and brief detention of the civilians involved, Officers failed to document the incident in an ISR and a TSSS is the only documentation available.<sup>15</sup>

### III. ALLEGATIONS

#### **Police Officer Amra Bukalo-Mehmedovic:**

1. Searching ██████████ vehicle, without justification.
  - Not Sustained
2. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting her interaction with ██████████
  - Sustained, violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10.
3. Failing to accurately document the search of ██████████ and/or ██████████ ██████████ vehicle in a Traffic Stop Statistical Study.
  - Sustained, violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10.
4. Conducting a protective pat down of a male subject as a female police officer, when male police officers were available to perform the pat down, in violation of Special Order S04-13-09.
  - Not Sustained

#### **Police Officer Jesus Miranda:**

1. Searching ██████████ without justification.
  - Not Sustained
2. Searching ██████████ vehicle, without justification.
  - Not Sustained
3. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting his interaction with ██████████
  - Sustained, violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10.

#### **Police Officer Jacob Pagan:**

<sup>8</sup> Att. 4, BWC PO Miranda at 6:25

<sup>9</sup> Att. 4, at 6:30

<sup>10</sup> Att. 5, at 6:40

<sup>11</sup> Att. 5, at 7:28- 12:47 Att. 3, and BWC PO Bukalo-Mehmedovic at 12:52

<sup>12</sup> Att. 3, at 15:32 and 15:45

<sup>13</sup> Att. 4, at 13:56, 17:03, 17:42, 18:18

<sup>14</sup> Att. 4, at 18:40

<sup>15</sup> Att. 1, TSSS

1. Searching ██████████ vehicle, without justification.
  - Unfounded
2. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting his interaction with ██████████
  - Sustained, violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10.

#### IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

The credibility of an individual relies primarily on two factors: 1) the individual's truthfulness and 2) the reliability of the individual's account. The first factor addresses the honesty of the individual making the statement, while the second factor speaks to the individual's ability to accurately perceive the event at the time of the incident and then accurately recall the event from memory.

This investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to question the credibility of any of the individuals who provided statements.

#### V. ANALYSIS<sup>16</sup>

##### a. Searching ██████████ without justification

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Miranda searched ██████████ without justification, is **Not Sustained**. CPD policy defines a "Protective Pat Down" as "a limited search during an Investigatory Stop in which the sworn member conducts a pat down of the outer clothing of a person for weapons for the protection of the sworn member or others in the area."<sup>17</sup> To conduct a pat down, "a sworn member must possess specific and articulable facts, combined with rational inferences from these facts, that the suspect is armed and dangerous or reasonably suspects that the person presents a danger of attack to the sworn member or others in the area."<sup>18</sup> In other words, "the fact that an officer has reason to stop a citizen does not necessarily justify the further intrusion of a search for weapons; the officer may conduct a pat-down search only if he has reason to believe that he is dealing with an armed and dangerous individual."<sup>19</sup> An officer's subjective belief is not determinative, but is probative in determining the validity of the frisk.<sup>20</sup> The Supreme Court of

<sup>16</sup> For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

<sup>17</sup> S04-13-09(II)(B), Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017, to present).

<sup>18</sup> S04-13-09(II)(C)(2); pursuant to 725 ILCS 5/108-1.01, officers are permitted to conduct a limited search on a person for weapons if the officer has lawfully stopped the person for temporary questioning and reasonably suspects that they are in danger of attack.

<sup>19</sup> *People v. Watson*, 145 Ill. App. 3d 492, 497 (1st Dist. 1986).

<sup>20</sup> *People v. Flowers*, 179 Ill. 2d 257, 264 (1997) ("Although the standard is an objective one, the officer's subjective belief regarding the safety of the situation is one of the factors that may be considered in determining whether a weapons frisk was valid under *Terry*."); *People v. Sorenson*, 196 Ill. 2d 425, (2001); *People v. Walker*, 2013 IL App (4th) 120118, ¶ 46.

Illinois has explained that “the sole justification for the search allowed by the *Terry* exception is the protection of the police officer and others in the vicinity, not to gather evidence.”<sup>21</sup>

In this case, Officer Miranda told COPA that [REDACTED] immediate actions of quickly exiting the vehicle was odd and in his experience, drivers will usually stay in their vehicle when a stop is conducted.<sup>22</sup> Miranda also noted that [REDACTED] did not have a driver's license.<sup>23</sup> While Officer Miranda may have felt those circumstances were enough to pat down [REDACTED] COPA does find there to be enough evidence beyond a reasonable doubt to justify the search. However, COPA understands traffic stops are inherently dangerous, and does not minimize Officer Miranda’s experience and inferences drawn from [REDACTED] actions. Therefore, COPA finds the allegation, is **Not Sustained**.

#### b. Searching [REDACTED] vehicle without justification

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Bukalo-Mehmedovic, Miranda, and Pagan searched [REDACTED] vehicle without justification, is **Not Sustained** for Officers Bukalo-Mehmedovic and Mirada, and **Unfounded** for Officer Pagan. If officers discover probable cause of a crime during an investigatory traffic stop, they may search the vehicle for evidence related to the crime.<sup>24</sup> Under the “automobile exception” to the search warrant requirement, “law enforcement officers may undertake a warrantless search of a vehicle if there is probable cause to believe that the automobile contains evidence of criminal activity that the officers are entitled to seize.”<sup>25</sup> The scope of a warrantless search depends on “object of the search and the places in which there is probable cause to believe that it may be found.”<sup>26</sup> “When officers have such probable cause, the search may extend to ‘all parts of the vehicle *in which contraband or evidence could be concealed*, including closed compartments, containers, packages, and trunks.”<sup>27</sup> However, officers with probable cause to believe a vehicle contains evidence must limit their search the areas where such evidence may be found.<sup>28</sup> Officers are not limited to searching the driver’s possessions; “police officers with probable cause to search a car may [also] inspect passengers’ belongings found in the car that are capable of concealing the object of the search.”<sup>29</sup>

In this case, Officer Bukalo-Mehmedovic told COPA officers observed open containers with alcohol, and movements within the vehicle that made them suspicious the backseat passenger

<sup>21</sup> *People v. Flowers*, 179 Ill. 2d 257, 263 (1997) (citing *Minnesota v. Dickerson*, 508 U.S. 366, 373 (1993)).

<sup>22</sup> Att. 25, Pg. 13, Lns 8-13

<sup>23</sup> Att. 25, Pg. 13, Lns 23-24 and Pg. 14, Lns 22-24

<sup>24</sup> *People v. Clark*, 92 Ill. 2d 96, 99 (1982) (citing *United States v. Ross*, 456 U.S. 798 (1982)).

<sup>25</sup> *People v. James*, 163 Ill. 2d 302, 312 (1994) (citing *Carroll v. United States*, 267 U.S. 132 (1925)).

<sup>26</sup> *United States v. Ross*, 456 U.S. 798, 824 (1982).

<sup>27</sup> *United States v. Richards*, 719 F.3d 746, 754 (7th Cir. 2013) (emphasis added) (quoting *United States v. Williams*, 627 F.3d 247, 251 (7th Cir. 2010)).

<sup>28</sup> *United States v. Ross*, 456 U.S., 798, 824 (1982) (“Just as probable cause to believe that a stolen lawnmower may be found in a garage will not support a warrant to search an upstairs bedroom, probable cause to believe that undocumented aliens are being transported in a van will not justify a warrantless search of a suitcase”).

<sup>29</sup> *Wyoming v. Houghton*, 526 U.S. 295, 307 (1999).

could have been retrieving or concealing a weapon.<sup>30</sup> Additionally, Officer Miranda told COPA when he approached the vehicle he smelled weed and during a search of the vehicle, found weed.<sup>31</sup> Officer Pagan told COPA he did not search the vehicle and a further review of the evidence confirmed that after he asked the passenger in the rear of the limo to exit, left the vehicle and was not involved in the search.<sup>32</sup>

While the officers stated reasons that would justify a search of the vehicle, COPA is unable to independently verify those reasons because Officers failed to document them in an ISR or verbally on BWC. For these reasons, COPA finds, that there is not sufficient evidence to prove or disprove if the officers' decision to search the vehicle during the traffic stop was reasonable. Therefore, COPA finds the allegation against Officers Bukalo-Mehmedovic, Miranda, is **Not Sustained**, and **Unfounded** for Officer Pagan.

### c. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report

COPA finds the allegation against Officers Bukalo-Mehmedovic, Miranda, and Pagan of failing to complete an ISR, is **Sustained**. Officers must submit an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) following an investigatory stop, probable cause stop, and protective pat down "or other search in a public place".<sup>33</sup> Officers must document "[a]ll the factors" supporting reasonable articulable suspicion "to temporarily detain an individual for investigation", and "if applicable . . . to perform a Protective Pat Down" in the narrative portion of the ISR.<sup>34</sup> Additionally, officers who conduct a probable cause stop must document all the factors supporting probable cause in the narrative portion of the ISR if "no other document captures the reason for the detention".<sup>35</sup>

In this case, all three officers failed to remember or admitted that it was likely an administrative oversight when asked about the lack of an ISR.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, COPA's search of the ISR database confirmed that no ISR was completed.<sup>37</sup> Therefore, COPA finds the allegation is **Sustained**.

### d. Inaccurately documenting the search of [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] vehicle in a TSSS

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Amra Bukalo-Mehmedovic failed to accurately document the search of [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] vehicle in a Traffic Stop

<sup>30</sup> Att. 24, Pg. 13, Lns 3-6 and Lns 11-16

<sup>31</sup>Att. 25, Pg. 11, Lns 16-23

<sup>32</sup> Att. 23, Pg.13, Lns 10-18 and Att. 5, at 5:31-6:00

<sup>33</sup> S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(1).

<sup>34</sup> S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(1).

<sup>35</sup> S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(1). For example, officers do not need to complete an ISR if they (1) observe factors giving them probable cause to arrest a subject, (2) perform an arrest, and (3) complete an arrest report explaining the probable cause.

<sup>36</sup> Att. 24, Pg. 17, Ln 7; Att. 25, Pg. 27, Lns 11-12; and Att. 23, Pg. 14, Lns 13-15

<sup>37</sup> Att. 11

Statistical Study (TSSS), is **Sustained**. Special Order S04-14-09 states that to comply with the Illinois Traffic and Pedestrian Stop Statistical Study, the statistical data collected by the Department from all traffic stops initiated by a Department member will include: whether a search was conducted of the vehicle, driver, passenger, or passengers during the traffic stop and if the search was conducted by consent or other lawful means.<sup>38</sup> In this case, the TSSS for this stop stated that search consent was not requested, search consent was not approved, and that there was no search conducted.<sup>39</sup> However, in Officer Bukalo-Mehmedovic's statement to COPA she conceded that the vehicle was searched and the TSSS was incorrectly filled out.<sup>40</sup> Therefore, COPA finds the allegation, is **Sustained**.

**e. Patting down of a male subject as a female police officer, in violation of Special Order S04-13-09.**

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Amra Bukalo-Mehmedovic conducted a protective pat down of a male subject as a female police officer, in violation of Special Order S04-13-09, is **Not Sustained**. Special Order S04-13-09 states Protective Pat Downs will be conducted by a member who is the same gender as the person that is the subject of the Investigatory Stop.<sup>41</sup> In this case, it appears Officer Bukalo-Mehmedovic may have assisted in restraining [REDACTED] while other officers conducted the pat down.<sup>42</sup> But there is no independently verifiable evidence that she conducted a pat down of [REDACTED] herself.<sup>43</sup> Therefore, COPA finds the allegation against Officer Bukalo-Mehmedovic, is **Not Sustained**.

**VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION**

**a. Officer Amra Bukalo-Mehmedovic**

**i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History<sup>44</sup>**

Officer Bukalo-Mehmedovic has received 112 total awards, including 103 honorable mentions, three Department commendations, and one life saving award. Officer Bukalo-Mehmedovic has received two SPARs for preventable accidents, both resulting in a reprimand.

**ii. Recommended Discipline**

COPA has found that Officer Bukalo-Mehmedovic has violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when she failed to complete an ISR and failed to accurately document the search of [REDACTED] and his vehicle in her TSSS. In mitigation, COPA has considered Officer Bukalo-Mehmedovic's

<sup>38</sup> Att. 26, S04-14-09 (III.)(B.)(7.)

<sup>39</sup> Att. 1, TSSS

<sup>40</sup> Att. 24, Pg. 16, Lns. 16 to 18

<sup>41</sup> Att. 27, S04-13-09 (VI.)(2.)

<sup>42</sup> Att. 3, at 04:02

<sup>43</sup> Atts. 3, 4, and 5

<sup>44</sup> Att. 28

numerous awards, honors, and lack of prior discipline. However, the Department GOs in this case is very clear and Officer Bukalo-Mehmedovic's failure to submit an ISR or accurately document the search in a TSSS clearly violates the orders. For her part, Officer Bukalo-Mehmedovic admitted to the oversight and was remorseful. Therefore, COPA recommends Officer Bukalo-Mehmedovic receive a **reprimand** and **retraining** on the Department's ISR and TSSS policy.

**b. Officer Jesus Miranda**

**i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History<sup>45</sup>**

Officer Miranda has received 77 total awards, including 62 honorable mentions, two complimentary letters, and two live saving awards. Officer Miranda has received one SPAR for a court appearance violation, that resulted in a reprimand.

**ii. Recommended Discipline**

COPA has found that Officer Miranda has violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when he failed to complete an ISR. In mitigation, COPA has considered Officer Miranda's numerous awards, honors, and lack of prior discipline. However, the Department GO in this case is very clear and Officer Miranda's failure to submit an ISR clearly violates the order. For his part, Officer Miranda admitted to the oversight and was remorseful. Therefore, COPA recommends Officer Miranda receive a **reprimand** and **retraining** on the Department's ISR policy.

**c. Officer Jacob Pagan**

**i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History<sup>46</sup>**

Officer Pagan has received 65 total awards, including 60 honorable mentions, one Department commendation, and one live saving award. Officer Pagan has received one SPAR for a court appearance violation, that resulted in a reprimand.

**ii. Recommended Discipline**

COPA has found that Officer Pagan has violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when he failed to complete an ISR. In mitigation, COPA has considered Officer Pagan's numerous awards, honors, and lack of prior discipline. However, the Department GO in this case is very clear and Officer Pagan's failure to submit an ISR clearly violates the order. For his part, Officer Pagan admitted to the oversight and was remorseful. Therefore, COPA recommends Officer Pagan receive a **reprimand** and **retraining** on the Department's ISR policy.

---

<sup>45</sup> Att. 28

<sup>46</sup> Att. 28

Approved:



6-26-2025

---

*Angela Hearts-Glass*  
*Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator*

---

Date

**Appendix A**

**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	November 28, 2023-7:30pm- 4900 W Le Moyne St,
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	December 1, 2023- 10:51 a.m.
Involved Member #1:	Amra Bukalo-Mehmedovic, Star #7811, Employee ID# [REDACTED] DOA:07/17/2017, Unit: 025, Female, White.
Involved Member #2:	Jesus Miranda, Star #15029, Employee ID# [REDACTED] DOA:03/16/2018, Unit: 025, Male, White Hispanic.
Involved Member #3:	Jacob Pagan, Star #16589, Employee ID# [REDACTED] DOA: 05/16/2018, Unit 025, Male, White Hispanic.
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Male, Black.
Involved Individual #2:	[REDACTED] Male, Black.
Involved Individual #3:	[REDACTED] Female, Black.

**Applicable Rules**

- Rule 2:** Any action or conduct which impedes the Department’s efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.
- Rule 3:** Any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals.
- Rule 5:** Failure to perform any duty.
- Rule 6:** Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.
- Rule 8:** Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.
- Rule 9:** Engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.
- Rule 10:** Inattention to duty.
- Rule 14:** Making a false report, written or oral.
- Rule 38:** Unlawful or unnecessary use or display of a weapon.
- Rule \_\_:** *[Insert text of any additional rule(s) violated]*

**Applicable Policies and Laws**

- S04-13-09: Investigatory Stop System (effective July 2017 to Present)

- S04-14-09: Illinois Traffic and Pedestrian Stop Statistical Study (effective March 2018 to Present)

## Appendix B

### **Definition of COPA’s Findings and Standards of Proof**

For each Allegation, COPA must make one of the following findings:

1. Sustained – where it is determined the allegation is supported by a preponderance of the evidence;
2. Not Sustained – where it is determined there is insufficient evidence to prove the allegations by a preponderance of the evidence;
3. Unfounded – where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that an allegation is false or not factual; or
4. Exonerated – where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that the conduct described in the allegation occurred, but it is lawful and proper.

A **preponderance of evidence** can be described as evidence indicating that it is **more likely than not** that a proposition is proved.<sup>47</sup> For example, if the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the conduct complied with CPD policy than that it did not, even if by a narrow margin, then the preponderance of the evidence standard is met.

**Clear and convincing evidence** is a higher standard than a preponderance of the evidence but lower than the “beyond-a-reasonable doubt” standard required to convict a person of a criminal offense. Clear and convincing can be defined as a “degree of proof, which, considering all the evidence in the case, produces the firm and abiding belief that it is highly probable that the proposition . . . is true.”<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> See *Avery v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 216 Ill. 2d 100, 191 (2005) (a proposition is proved by a preponderance of the evidence when it is found to be more probably true than not).

<sup>48</sup> *People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036, ¶ 28 (quoting Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions, Criminal, No. 4.19 (4<sup>th</sup> ed. 2000)).

**Appendix C**

**Transparency and Publication Categories**

Check all that apply:

- Abuse of Authority
- Body Worn Camera Violation
- Coercion
- Death or Serious Bodily Injury in Custody
- Domestic Violence
- Excessive Force
- Failure to Report Misconduct
- False Statement
- Firearm Discharge
- Firearm Discharge – Animal
- Firearm Discharge – Suicide
- Firearm Discharge – Unintentional
- First Amendment
- Improper Search and Seizure – Fourth Amendment Violation
- Incidents in Lockup
- Motor Vehicle Incidents
- OC Spray Discharge
- Search Warrants
- Sexual Misconduct
- Taser Discharge
- Unlawful Denial of Access to Counsel
- Unnecessary Display of a Weapon
- Use of Deadly Force – other
- Verbal Abuse
- Other Investigation