IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO AN INCIDENT INVOLVING SERIOUS INJURIES IN A MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT DURING WPS ARREST in RM of West. St. Paul

FINAL REPORT OF THE CIVILIAN DIRECTOR

OF THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT

Acting Civilian Director:	Bruce M. Sychuk
IIU File Number:	2025-0041
Date of Release:	October 13 , 2026

Introduction

On Sept. 19, 2025, the Winnipeg Police Service (WPS) notified the Independent Investigation Unit of Manitoba (IIU) of an incident.

The written notification disclosed the following information:

Excerpt from Part 7 Notification received on September 19, 2025:

On September 19th, 2025, a civilian witness reported two suspects breaking into a construction trailer in the vicinity of Ken Oblik Dr in the City of Winnipeg. The WPS flight operations unit helicopter (AIR1) attended the scene and observed the two suspects fleeing the scene in a 2015 Chevrolet Silverado, which was later determined to be a stolen vehicle. AIR1 followed the suspect vehicle from a distance, while assisting units attempted to position themselves to deploy pre-pursuit tactics.

The suspect vehicle was followed by AIR 1 west of the city to the perimeter highway, at which time it continued traveling northbound on the west perimeter highway. The suspect vehicle was followed by AIR1 to the vicinity of the north Perimeter Hwy and Pipeline Road, where mobile units attempted to deploy a stop stick. The attempt was unsuccessful. At this juncture, AIR1 had been forced to return to the airport for refueling.

The suspect vehicle turned onto Holmes Rd and took evasive action. At this time a mobile unit initiated a pursuit. The suspect vehicle failed to negotiate a turn on a gravel road in the vicinity of Holmes Rd and Poneida Rd, and the vehicle entered the ditch and rolled over.

The two suspects were arrested at the vehicle without further incident. No force was required to bring both suspects into custody. As a result of the single vehicle rollover, both suspects complained of soreness and were subsequently conveyed to the HSC in stable condition to be examined.

AP1 was treated at the HSC and was found to have suffered spinal fractures in his C5 and C6 vertebrae. AP1 was admitted to hospital and will require surgery. AP2 was treated and released from the HSC with no serious injuries.

As this matter concerned injuries during a motor vehicle collision related to an arrest, the IIU assumed responsibility for this investigation, in accordance with Sec. 65(4) of The Police Services Act. IIU investigators were assigned to this investigation.

IIU investigators obtained the following information from WPS or on their own accord:

- notes, narratives and reports of officers
- audio transmissions
- Air 1 video footage
- crash data analysis
- forensic identification report
- GPS reports
- surveillance footage
- medical reports

The civilian director declined to designate a subject officer. The director designated 26 witness officers (WO1 to WO26). IIU investigators also received information from three professional

witnesses (PW1 to PW3) and one affected person (AP1). Despite investigators' repeated efforts, AP2 was unwilling or unable to co-operate in the investigation.

NOTE: Because this incident occurred near the outskirts of the city, RCMP were made aware of it before the collision. One RCMP vehicle attended the scene after both affected persons were arrested. The RCMP officer(s) did not have any relevant involvement in the incident.

Facts and Circumstances

Scene Examination and Canvass

Investigators attended the scene and canvassed the area. This did not result in any civilian witnesses. One business in the area was able to provide surveillance footage for review.

Interviews

Affected Person

Affected Person 1 (AP1)

IIU investigators interviewed AP1 on Sept. 22, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

AP1 confirmed that he was aware WPS were pursuing him because of a theft. He was aware that Air1 was tracking their movements in the vehicle and that police vehicles were assisting in the pursuit.

AP1 confirmed that he was going too fast on a dirt road when he lost control of the vehicle because he was attempting to navigate a 90-degree turn. The vehicle overturned in the ditch. AP1 did not lose consciousness, however, AP2 did. AP2 was extracted from the rear window first, after officers broke the front and rear windows to gain access. AP1 followed and was extracted from the front windshield feet first.

AP1 alleged that the officers placed his arms under his stomach and then started to assault him with punches and kicks until they were able to secure his arms. Officers then lifted him without supporting his head and he screamed in agony. Police placed him on the ground and medical staff arrived on the scene shortly afterwards. He was transferred to the hospital for his injuries to be assessed.

AP1 confirmed that a police vehicle did not cause the accident and that he just lost control of the vehicle.

Affected Person 2 (AP2)

Despite investigators' repeated attempts to interview AP2, he was unwilling or unable to participate. On Aug. 16, 2026, investigators attempted again to interview AP2 and he refused.

Professional Witnesses

Professional Witness 1 (PW1)

IIU investigators interviewed PW1 on Oct. 29, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

PW1 confirmed that he provided treatment to AP1. AP1 was handcuffed and lying approximately 10 feet away from the vehicle. He was alert and complaining of knee, back and neck pain. A cervical collar was applied. PW1 thought the injuries AP1 complained about would be consistent with the motor vehicle accident. PW1 did not observe any obvious trauma to AP1.

PW1 confirmed that the only interaction he saw between AP1 and the officers was when the officers assisted in placing him in the ambulance. He did not have any concerns about the officer's interaction with AP1.

Professional Witness 2 (PW2)

IIU investigators interviewed PW2 on Oct. 24, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

PW2 provided care to AP2 who stated that he was in pain in the left leg and right shoulder. PW2 confirmed that rollover accidents can cause considerable injuries. AP2 was conscious and coherent throughout her assessment.

She did not see any officer interact with AP2 in her presence. She did not provide any medical care to AP1.

Professional Witness 3 (PW3)

IIU investigators interviewed PW3 on Dec. 11, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

PW3 confirmed that she assisted in AP1's care. He complained of neck and knee pain and had already been placed in a cervical collar. He was conscious and coherent. He was placed on a stretcher, and officers repositioned his handcuffs to allow proper medical assistance.

She gave AP1 IV inside the ambulance. She initiated Trauma Triage Protocol, which is standard procedure for motor vehicle accidents. AP1 had a few facial lacerations and abdomen lacerations that she noted in the ambulance. AP1 was transferred to Health Sciences Centre (HSC) emergency, which concluded her involvement.

Witness Officers

Witness Officer 1 (WO1)

IIU investigators interviewed WO1 on April 15, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO1 was asked to assist Air 1 in a pursuit that resulted from a break and enter incident. He stated that his vehicle was two to four vehicles behind the primary vehicle in the pursuit. After Air1 left to refuel, AP's vehicle went across oncoming traffic lanes and entered a dirt road. The road had an abrupt right turn, and the vehicle was unable to navigate it, rolling onto its side.

WO1 was the second officer to arrive at the vehicle and positioned himself near the rear quarter panel to watch for any gas leaks and flames. WO12 breached the rear windshield and removed AP2 from the vehicle. After a brief assessment, the officers moved AP2 farther from the vehicle because they were concerned the vehicle could catch fire.

After paramedics arrived, WO1 assisted WO14 in locating his keys near the accident. WO1 was not involved in extracting AP1.

Witness Officer 2 (WO2)

IIU investigators interviewed WO2 on June 10, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO2 arrived on the scene after both APs had been arrested. He did not witness any use of force, nor did he have any interaction with either AP. WO25 instructed him to get the vehicle identification number off the stolen vehicle, so the owner could be notified. WO3 had no further involvement.

Witness Officer 3 (WO3)

IIU investigators interviewed WO3 on Jan. 6, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO3 confirmed that his unit assigned themselves to assist in the pursuit because the vehicle had just entered their area. They were going to attempt to incapacitate the vehicle by placing the stop stick out on the road, but the vehicle rolled over before they could do that.

WO3 did not help extract either AP. He did place a hand on AP1's shoulder while he was being handcuffed. He called for medical assistance and observed AP1 to have minor facial lacerations and some minor bleeding to his face. AP1 was complaining of neck pain.

WO3 then went and provided medical assistance to AP2 while waiting for paramedics to arrive. AP2 complained of knee pain, so he radioed that information onto the paramedics.

Witness Officer 4 (WO4)

IIU investigators interviewed WO4 on June 23, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO4 was going to attempt to incapacitate the vehicle by placing a spike strip on the road, but the vehicle had already passed. He went to pursue the vehicle on the perimeter highway when he saw a large dust cloud. He then heard over the radio that the vehicle had rolled over.

WO4 was not involved in extracting the APs, but he did assist in moving AP2 away from the vehicle in case it caught fire. He did not have any interaction with AP1, and he did not see any use of force incident. He did say to AP2 that everything would be fine while they were waiting for paramedics to arrive.

Witness Officer 5 (WO5)

IIU investigators interviewed WO5 on June 6, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO5 arrived after the APs had been extracted and arrested. He did not have any involvement with either AP.

Witness Officer 6 (WO6)

IIU investigators interviewed WO6 on Dec. 10, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

WO6 confirmed that her unit assisted in the vehicle pursuit. She recalled that one of the radio comments was that the vehicle may have been involved in a firearm and ammunition theft. She followed Air1 until they saw the vehicle and took over the lead because Air1 had to refuel. She noted the vehicle driving in excess of 170 km/h on the perimeter highway.

The vehicle was on pipeline road, braked, and then crossed over the median onto holmes street. At this point, officers activated their lights and siren and were traveling at speeds in excess of 80km/h on the dirt roads. They decided to slow down because the dust was making it unsafe to travel at that speed. She saw the vehicle attempt to brake to navigate the turn, but it was unsuccessful and landed in the ditch. WO6 confirmed that their vehicle never made contact with the APs' vehicle at any point in the pursuit.

WO6 exited her vehicle and attended to the APs' vehicle. AP1 complained of a sore neck, so WO6 radioed for medical assistance. She held a flashlight while other officers breached the windows to extract the APs. AP2 was extracted by the rear windshield and AP1 was extracted from the front windshield afterwards. AP1 was placed in the recovery position, roughly 10 feet from the vehicle. They were concerned about moving him further because he was complaining about an injured neck.

Medical staff told WO6 that AP1 was intoxicated but stable, because the collar was placed on his neck. He was then placed into the ambulance for further medical assistance.

Witness Officer 7 (WO7)

IIU investigators interviewed WO7 on April 28, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO7 attended the scene after completing a different call for service in the area. When he arrived, WO25 told him his assistance was not required. He did not have any interaction with either AP.

Witness Officer 8 (WO8)

IIU investigators interviewed WO8 on Apr. 15, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO8 confirmed that they went to assist in this matter. She observed a vehicle cross numerous lanes of traffic and then the lead pursuit vehicle activated their lights and siren. Soon after, the vehicle rolled over into the ditch. She went along with other officers to assist in extracting the APs because the vehicle had rolled over onto the driver's side.

Officers were giving verbal direction to the APs to show their hands because the officers were concerned that they might be armed. When it became clear that they could not exit the vehicle, the officers attempted to breach the windows. Because AP2 was unconscious, he became the priority for removal.

AP2 was removed from the rear windshield after his seatbelt had been cut. WO8 helped grab AP1 under his armpits while another unknown officer pulled him out the front windshield by his

feet. After AP1 was extracted, she went over to help provide medical assistance to AP2 while they were waiting for paramedics.

Witness Officer 9 (WO9)

IIU investigators interviewed WO9 on June 6, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO9 confirmed that he attended the scene after both APs had been extracted and arrested. He did not have any interaction with either AP.

Witness Officer 10 (WO10)

IIU investigators interviewed WO10 on Jan. 6, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO10 was assisting in the pursuit from another district and was advised that the vehicle had rolled over. When she arrived at the scene, the APs had already been removed from the vehicle. She turned her attention to obtaining evidence related to the break and enter offence. She did not interact with either AP at any point.

Witness Officer 11 (WO11)

IIU investigators interviewed WO11 on March 27, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO11 attempted to incapacitate the vehicle with a stop stick on brookside boulevard. The driver of the vehicle evaded the stop stick and continued. WO11 retrieved the stop stick and joined the pursuit. He heard over the radio that the vehicle had rolled over and he attended the scene. He walked over to the vehicle and saw that AP2 was unconscious and AP1 was asking for assistance.

Officers were attempting to breach the windows while WO11 directed both APs not to attempt to grab the folding knife stuck on the dashboard. AP2 was extracted out the rear windshield and then AP1 went out the front windshield. AP1 complained of neck pain while he was handcuffed and placed in the prone position.

WO11 did not see any officer use force on either AP. He did observe minor cuts to AP1's face and confirmed that he was placed in a collar once paramedics arrived.

Witness Officer 12 (WO12)

IIU investigators interviewed WO12 on April 15, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO12 confirmed that he was involved in the vehicle pursuit and heard over the radio that it had rolled over near pipeline road. He observed the vehicle was on its side with the driver side down. Officers were at the vehicle to assist in extracting of the APs. WO12 used his baton to break the rear windshield. He asked for officers at the front windshield to cut AP2's seatbelt because he was unconscious. WO12 prevented AP2 from falling and pulled him from the vehicle. AP2 regained consciousness and was told about his arrest.

WO12 walked past AP1 and heard him complain about neck pain. He was not involved in AP1's extraction. He confirmed that he helped WO14 find his car keys.

Witness Officer 13 (WO13)

IIU investigators interviewed WO13 on June 10, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO13 was assigned to drop a stop stick to incapacitate the vehicle if it entered his area. He heard the vehicle had rolled over and went to the scene to assist. When he arrived, there were numerous units already present and his assistance was not required. WO13 did not interact with the APs in any manner.

Witness Officer 14 (WO14)

IIU investigators interviewed WO14 on Dec. 10, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

WO14 went to assist in following the APs' vehicle. He recalled hearing over the radio that the vehicle may have been involved in a firearm theft. Air1 gave directions until it had to refuel and he took over as the lead vehicle at that point. WO6 provided the updates while WO14 drove.

The vehicle was driving at 150km/h but was not erratic in its driving pattern. After another failed stop stick attempt, the vehicle went over numerous lanes and crossed the median. At that point, WO14 stated the incident went from a follow directive to a pursuit. Emergency equipment was activated.

The vehicle went onto a dirt road at approximately 80km/h. WO14 slowed his speed on the road as the dust was affecting visibility. The vehicle attempted to brake but couldn't navigate the corner and rolled into the ditch. He saw that construction items had been ejected from the vehicle because of the rollover.

WO14 directed the APs to show their hands because of the weapons concern. AP1 was asking to be removed from the vehicle while AP2 was in and out of consciousness. The officers used their batons and some construction tools to break the windows to extract the APs. AP2 was removed from the rear windshield and AP1 was removed from the front windshield. WO14 did not see who extracted AP1. He did recall AP1 complaining about neck pain.

WO14 confirmed that after the APs were removed from the car, he spent the rest of his time looking for his car keys. Medical assistance arrived and took care of the APs.

Witness Officer 15 (WO15)

IIU investigators interviewed WO15 on April 19, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO15 arrived after the vehicle had rolled over. He did not interact with either AP and did not witness any use of force by an officer.

Witness Officer 16 (WO16)

IIU investigators interviewed WO16 on June 25, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO16 gave AP1 his charge and caution at the hospital. He did not attend the scene.

Witness Officer 17 (WO17)

IIU investigators interviewed WO17 on June 10, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO17 was about to place a stop stick in the vicinity of the incident when he heard on the radio that the vehicle had rolled into the ditch. He attended the scene, and both APs had been removed from the vehicle before he arrived. He was told his assistance was not required and he left the area.

Witness Officer 18 (WO18)

IIU investigators interviewed WO18 on June 23, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO18 attempted to place a stop stick on roblin boulevard to incapacitate the vehicle, but it drove by before he could place the stick on the road. WO18's vehicle suffered some mechanical issues, so he was unable to immediately follow AP's vehicle.

WO18 started driving on the perimeter highway when he saw a cloud of dust on a side road and heard over the radio that the vehicle had rolled into a ditch. WO18 ran across the road to assist, however, several units were already on scene by the time he arrived.

WO18 assisted WO14 in locating his keys. He did not have any involvement with the APs.

Witness Officer 19 (WO19)

IIU investigators interviewed WO19 on July 8, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO19 was not at the scene of the rollover. She interviewed AP2 in relation to the criminal offences.

Witness Officer 20 (WO20)

IIU investigators interviewed WO20 on June 23, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO20 was not at the scene of the rollover. He interviewed AP1 in relation to the criminal offences.

Witness Officer 21 (WO21)

IIU investigators interviewed WO21 on Apr. 1, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO21 placed a stop stick down on the road near the underpass, however, AP's vehicle evaded it and continued driving. He drove his vehicle on the perimeter highway to assist in the pursuit, but he heard on the radio the vehicle had rolled into a ditch.

He attended the scene and saw the vehicle on its side. Officers were giving both APs verbal direction to show their hands. He noticed that AP2 was unconscious and AP1 was closer to the

ground but conscious. Multiple officers began to pull the front windshield out of the vehicle and WO21 went to assist in removing the rear windshield to extract AP2.

WO21 placed handcuffs on AP2 and provided his notice of arrest. Paramedics arrived and provided medical assistance. WO21 did not know who extracted AP1because he was on the other side of the vehicle.

Witness Officer 22 (WO22)

IIU investigators interviewed WO22 on March 27, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO22 confirmed that he attempted to incapacitate the vehicle by placing a stop stick on the road, but it was unsuccessful. He followed the vehicle on the perimeter highway until it rolled over in the ditch on the driver's side.

He saw that the APs could not exit the vehicle and assisted in removing the front windshield while others extracted the APs from the vehicle. WO22 then went to assist in locating the lost keys. Paramedics arrived and provided care to the APs.

Witness Officer 23 (WO23)

IIU investigators interviewed WO23 on June 17, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO23 helped interview AP2 at the hospital. He did not attend the rollover scene.

Witness Officer 24 (WO24)

IIU investigators interviewed WO24 on June 1, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO24 arrived at the scene after both APs had been extracted and arrested. He did not have any interaction with either AP.

Witness Officer 25 (WO25)

IIU investigators interviewed WO25 on Feb. 3, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO25 assigned himself as the street supervisor and attended the area. He was positioned to watch how AP's vehicle had evaded the stop sticks at the underpass near roblin, so he continued to follow the vehicle. He drove to the portage avenue and perimeter underpass because he thought the vehicle would attempt to get out of the city again using the main highway. Instead, the vehicle went back onto the perimeter highway, so he followed again.

WO6 and WO14 activated their lights and sirens as the vehicle attempted to evade them on pipeline road and the rollover happened near holmes street. He arrived at the scene and saw the vehicle on it side and multiple officers attempting to extract the APs from the vehicle. He did not assist with extracting either AP.

After both APs had been removed from the vehicle, they were arrested and handcuffed. He recalled that both APs complained of pain from the rollover and that paramedics arrived to provide medical care.

Witness Officer 26 (WO26)

IIU investigators interviewed WO26 on Dec. 10, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

WO26 attempted to get ahead of the fleeing vehicle to put down a stop stick to incapacitate it. As he was heading to the area, he heard the vehicle had rolled over and proceeded to the scene. AP2 had already been removed from the vehicle and officers were in the process of removing AP1 when he arrived. He was unaware of which officers extracted the APs.

WO25 assigned him duties that did not involve any interaction with the APs.

Other evidence

Crash Data Analysis

The data suggests that AP1 was not wearing his seatbelt before the rollover. Further, the data suggests a minimum speed of 75km/h five seconds before the collision. The data would also suggest that two seconds before the rollover, AP1 had stopped braking and was pressing full throttle on the gas which would have contributed to the rollover.

Forensic Identification Report

The report suggests the vehicle entered into the ditch sideways with the passenger's side hitting the ditch first and then rolling over to the driver's side.

Medical Reports

The medical reports confirmed that AP1 suffered a fracture of a cervical vertebra, which required surgery. AP1 confirmed to medical staff that he had smoked crack before the incident.

AP2 refused to allow investigators access to his medical records at the Health Sciences Centre.

Paramedic reports confirmed that both APs had a cervical collar placed on their necks at the scene. AP1 was complaining about neck pain while AP2 complained about shoulder and knee pain. AP1 confirmed that he had smoked crack before the incident.

Surveillance Footage

Although the footage did not catch the actual rollover, the footage confirmed that WO6 and WO14's police vehicle was 7 seconds behind AP's vehicle, just moments before the collision.

Air1 Footage

The first two videos are approximately 30 minutes long. The videos show the route the vehicle was taking to flee, reaching speeds of 150km/h. As Air 1 was about to leave the pursuit to refuel you could see the lead police vehicle activating their lights and siren.

Air1 returned to the scene after AP2 had been extracted. AP1 was soon extracted afterwards. Audio from the helicopter confirmed that both were arrested, conscious and receiving medical care.

Applicable Law

All relevant sections of the Criminal Code of Canada were considered with respect to this incident. Sec. 25(1), 25(3) and 25(4) of the Criminal Code of Canada have been emphasized here for consideration:

> ***25 (1)*** *Every one who is required or authorized by law to do anything in the administration or enforcement of the law*
>
> > ***(a)*** *as a private person,*
> >
> > ***(b)*** *as a peace officer or public officer,*
> >
> > ***(c)*** *in aid of a peace officer or public officer, or*
> >
> > ***(d)*** *by virtue of his office,*
>
> *is, if he acts on reasonable grounds, justified in doing what he is required or authorized to do and in using as much force as is necessary for that purpose.*
>
> ***(3)*** *Subject to subsections (4) and (5), a person is not justified for the purposes of subsection (1) in using force that is intended or is likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm unless the person believes on reasonable grounds that it is necessary for the self-preservation of the person or the preservation of any one under that person's protection from death or grievous bodily harm.*
>
> ***(4)*** *A peace officer, and every person lawfully assisting the peace officer, is justified in using force that is intended or is likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm to a person to be arrested, if*
>
> > ***(a)*** *the peace officer is proceeding lawfully to arrest, with or without warrant, the person to be arrested;*
> >
> > ***(b)*** *the offence for which the person is to be arrested is one for which that person may be arrested without warrant;*
> >
> > ***(c)*** *the person to be arrested takes flight to avoid arrest;*
> >
> > ***(d)*** *the peace officer or other person using the force believes on reasonable grounds that the force is necessary for the purpose of protecting the peace officer, the person lawfully assisting the peace officer or any other person from imminent or future death or grievous bodily harm; and*
> >
> > ***(e)*** *the flight cannot be prevented by reasonable means in a less violent manner.*

Conclusion

AP1 and AP2 were involved in a reported theft by a civilian. Information provided to WPS suggested that there may be firearms. Air1 and numerous police vehicles followed AP's vehicle as it attempted to flee, reaching speeds of roughly 150 km/h. The vehicle evaded all police attempts to incapacitate it before the rollover.

Air 1 was forced to refuel, so the lead police vehicle activated its emergency equipment and continued the pursuit. AP's vehicle failed to navigate a turn on a dirt road and rolled into the ditch, landing on the driver's side. Neither AP was able to exit the vehicle because of the collision. Multiple officers assisted in extracting both APs. They were arrested, handcuffed and treated for their injuries.

All the evidence suggests that no officer was responsible for the vehicle rolling over. AP1 confirmed that no officer contacted their vehicle at any point. Surveillance footage shows the lead police vehicle was 7 seconds behind AP's vehicle moments before the rollover. Data suggests that AP1 failed to navigate the turn and slid into the ditch sideways and then rolled over.

As the civilian director declined to designate a subject officer in connection with the evidence provided, no charges are recommended and the IIU investigation is now completed and closed.