



**IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO AN INCIDENT INVOLVING
SERIOUS INJURIES DURING WINNIPEGOSIS RCMP (PINE CREEK FIRST
NATION) ARREST**

FINAL REPORT OF THE CIVILIAN DIRECTOR
OF THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT

Acting Civilian Director:	Bruce M. Sychuk
IIU File Number:	2025-0038
Date of Release:	December 30, 2025

Introduction

On July 29, 2025, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) 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 July 29, 2025:

On July 28, 2025, RCMP were dispatched to a mental health complaint on Pine Creek First Nation. An update was received that AP was with EMS and they were transporting him to Dauphin Hospital and police were no longer required.

During transport, AP began assaulting both paramedics and they called a "Code White". SO1 was the first member on scene and encountered AP armed with trauma shears. SO1 deployed his CEW and baton numerous times at AP and had no effect due to methamphetamine used by AP.

AP attempted to enter a passing vehicle and attempted to stab an occupant of the vehicle numerous times which also included a child in the back seat. SO2 then arrived on scene to assist and deployed her CEW. SO1 deployed the 40MM at AP and stuck him on the left side of the abdomen in the ribs.

After a lengthy struggle with AP both members were eventually able to handcuff him. Other members arrived to assist with securing AP in leg shackles and place him into the police vehicle. AP was then transported to Dauphin Hospital. AP was treated in hospital and later released into police custody and later remanded. AP had a broken rib and stiches to his face.

As this matter concerned injuries to an individual during an arrest, the IIU assumed responsibility for this investigation in accordance with Sec. 66(4) of The Police Services Act. IIU investigators were assigned to this investigation.

IIU investigators obtained the following information from the RCMP, among other items:

- notes, narratives and reports of officers
- audio transmissions
- 911 call audio
- watch guard video
- body worn camera footage
- use of force report
- medical reports
- taser download report

The civilian director designated two subject officers (SO1 to SO2) and two witness officers (WO1 to WO2). IIU investigators also received information from AP and five civilian witnesses (CW1 to CW5).

This document is the property of the IIU and is not to be distributed to any other party without the written consent of the IIU.

Facts and Circumstances

Scene Examination

IIU investigators attended the scene and it was otherwise unremarkable. The entirety of the incident was captured on a body worn camera. IIU investigators canvassed the area for potential witnesses or video footage, however, the incident occurred on a remote part of the highway. No buildings were located in the area.

Interviews

Affected Person (AP)

AP was interviewed by IIU investigators on July 30, 2025, and provided the following information:

AP recalled that an ambulance picked him up and that police were also in the area. He could not recall exactly what happened, but he felt that people “spazzed out.” AP recalled that he was tasered twice and shot, but he did not recall what he was doing at the time. AP did not believe that he said anything to the police. He also felt that he was handcuffed when they tasered him and shot him. AP did recall an officer asking him to stop and calling him by his first name.

AP denied that he was drinking or taking any form of illegal drug. He was taking his prescription medicine that day because he is bi-polar. AP recalled hearing voices in the ambulance, that they were telling him he is the devil and that he talks to the devil.

It should be noted that because of AP’s medical condition, it was quite difficult to get a fulsome interview. It is clear that AP has some significant disabilities that affect his reality.

Civilian Witnesses

Civilian Witness 1 (CW1)

CW1 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Aug. 12, 2025, and provided the following information:

CW1 confirmed he was working on the day of the incident as a paramedic. He recalled that AP turned violent in the ambulance. AP was destroying the ambulance and lunging at CW1 and his partner. CW1 confirmed that AP struck his partner with medical shears inside the ambulance.

He confirmed that the RCMP were called to assist with AP and that the ambulance pulled over on the side of the highway to wait for the RCMP. CW1 exited the vehicle once RCMP arrived. CW1 confirmed that an officer told AP to drop the medical shears, however, he would not comply. CW1 stated that the officer told AP multiple times that if he did not comply, the officer would have to deploy his taser. AP still did not comply.

CW1 saw the officer move backwards, and then AP lunged at him. The officer attempted to taser AP but it did not have any effect. CW1 saw the officer attempt to taser AP on two further occasions without any success. CW1 did not observe any other use of force at that point besides the taser.

CW1 saw the officer follow AP, trying to get him to stop. CW1 went back into the ambulance and watched the incident using the side mirrors of the vehicle. CW1 believed that AP attempted to carjack a vehicle, but he was not entirely sure. CW1 confirmed that AP attempted to get back in the ambulance, but they drove down the road for safety. CW1 confirmed that AP was eventually arrested. He did not know how AP was arrested and he did not recall hearing any popping sounds or gunshots.

Civilian Witness 2 (CW2)

CW2 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Aug. 12, 2025, and provided the following information:

CW2 confirmed that he was part of the ambulance crew that was asked to assist AP. CW2 confirmed that AP became agitated and violent, destroying the ambulance and assaulting him with the medical shears. CW2 confirmed RCMP were called to assist.

CW2 recalled that RCMP arrived shortly after he was assaulted. He stated that all members of the ambulance crew were outside the vehicle and that AP was inside alone. CW2 heard the officer direct AP to drop the shears, but he did not comply. CW2 stated that the officer made several requests of AP to drop the shears without compliance. He felt AP was given multiple opportunities to drop the shears before the officer said to drop them once more or he would taser AP. AP did not comply with this direction.

AP started moving towards the officer and the officer deployed his taser, which did not have any effect on AP. The officer deployed his taser a second time, which was also ineffective. CW2 saw taser probes hanging off AP as he left the ambulance. AP did not say anything during the incident.

After AP left the ambulance, CW2 and his partners entered the ambulance and locked the doors. CW2 confirmed that it looked like AP was trying to carjack a vehicle, but he could not say for sure because he was watching the incident from a distance. CW2 confirmed that AP approached the ambulance again, but it drove away from him. He confirmed that AP was arrested by officers shortly after. CW2 did not see exactly how AP was arrested and no further use of force by the officers.

Civilian Witness 3 (CW3)

CW3 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Aug. 12, 2025, and provided the following information:

CW3 confirmed that she was driving the vehicle on the highway as she saw the ambulance on the side of the road and an RCMP vehicle. CW3 could not recall if there was more than one officer present at that time. She was with CW4 and four children in the vehicle.

CW3 confirmed that AP walked down the road towards her vehicle and jumped in the passenger's seat while locking the door. AP started to jab CW4 with the medical shears while CW3 went to assist CW4.

The officer opened the passenger's door and told AP to drop the weapon, but he did not comply. The officer then hit AP at least once with his baton. CW3 could not recall where the baton hit

AP. AP exited the vehicle after being hit. That was the extent of CW3's recollection of the incident.

Civilian Witness 4 (CW4)

CW4 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Aug. 12, 2025, and provided the following information:

CW4 confirmed that he was in the vehicle with CW3 and the children on the day of the incident. CW4 saw AP run out of the ambulance towards their vehicle with medical probes still attached to his body. CW4 heard an officer yelling at them to back up, but CW3 had exited the vehicle.

AP entered CW4's door and locked it. AP then lunged at CW4 with the shears, cutting him on the shoulder. CW4 grabbed AP in a bear hug and unlocked the door for the officer. CW4 confirmed that CW3 returned to the vehicle to assist him with AP.

CW4 recalled the officer pointing his taser at AP and him replying "go ahead and shoot me." The officer directed AP to exit the vehicle without success. The officer struck AP three or four times in the forearm with his baton, making AP drop the shears. AP then exited the vehicle and ran down the street.

CW4 then drove the vehicle near the ambulance. He observed one of the paramedics with a cut to his cheek. CW4 saw the rest of the incident from his rearview mirror. He saw more officers arrive on scene and saw AP get tasered and drop to the ground. He did not see anything else. CW4 thought AP must have been "pilled out" as a result of his actions.

Civilian Witness 5 (CW5)

CW5 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Aug. 12, 2025, and provided the following information:

CW5 confirmed AP was at her residence before the incident. She noted that AP was acting weird and paranoid. She saw AP use a lighter on a piece of foil and assumed it must have been meth. CW5 called for an ambulance and AP went into the ambulance without issue.

CW5 confirmed that AP has mental health conditions and she did not believe that he was taking his prescription medication before or during the incident.

Witness Officers

Witness Officer 1 (WO1)

WO1 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Oct. 22, 2025, and provided the following information:

WO1 was originally asked to assist the medical team with AP at the residence. The call history suggested AP was suicidal and on meth and was suffering mentally. WO1 was going to assist on the call, but he was told it was not necessary by the medical staff. A short while later, the medical staff called asking for assistance, because AP had assaulted them.

WO1 went to assist and SO1 was already on scene. WO1 heard over the radio that AP was in possession of shears, extremely violent and not complying with directions. SO1 confirmed that

he had deployed his taser twice without success. WO1 recalled hearing on the radio that AP attempted a carjacking.

WO1 arrived on scene and was warned by SO1 that AP was trying to grab their guns. AP was shirtless and in handcuffs at this point. AP had lacerations on his face, midsection and legs. WO1 observed a bruise to his rib cage consistent with being shot by a rubber bullet. WO1 saw that AP was high. His eyes were dilated, and he was jittery, grinding his teeth and making nonsensical remarks. WO1 saw blood on both subject officers as well as the police vehicle. WO2 and the subject officers helped AP into the vehicle.

WO1 confirmed that he did not witness any use of force. He commented that AP was now cooperating with the officers and he did not require handcuffs. WO1 took AP to the hospital and he confirmed that AP suffered a broken rib where the rubber bullet hit him.

Witness Officer 2 (WO2)

WO2 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Nov. 17, 2025, and provided the following information:

WO2 was off duty when he received a call to come into work. The call history suggested that SO1 was fighting with someone on the highway. It sounded like SO1 had used his taser and 40 mm rubber bullet gun and nothing was working.

WO2 went to the detachment and got a vehicle and a 40mm rifle. He heard that a female officer from Brandon was on scene and that the incident was now under control. WO2 arrived shortly after and saw AP trying to crawl under the police vehicle while SO1 and SO2 were on top of him. WO2 assisted by holding AP's legs down.

WO2 observed some cuts to AP's face and an impact mark for a rubber bullet in his rib area. AP was now cooperative and was placed in the back of the vehicle without issue. WO2 did not see any use of force while he was present. WO2 was given background information from SO1 about what had happened before he arrived.

Subject Officers

Subject Officer 1 (SO1)

In accordance with his rights, SO1 declined an interview with IIU investigators. He consented to IIU investigators receiving a copy of his narrative, which provided the following information:

SO1 was originally dispatched on a Mental Health Act call for AP. The call history suggested that AP was high on meth, acting erratic and suicidal. While enroute to the call, SO1 received a call from the medical providers stating that they had AP in their care and that he was cooperating. SO1 continued into the area to speak with the civilian witness.

He heard on the Telecom system that AP had become violent and assaulted one of the medical staff with shears. AP still had shears with him in the ambulance. SO1 arrived and saw AP holding a pair of shears and AP appeared to be disoriented.

SO1 directed AP to drop the shears and he did not comply. SO1 then asked AP if he understood the command and AP said that he did. SO1 drew his taser and told AP that he would deploy it if he did not drop the shears. AP told SO1 to shoot him and moved aggressively toward SO1. SO1 deployed his taser three times without any effect on AP. AP continued moving aggressively toward SO1.

AP started to walk down the road toward a vehicle stopped on the highway. AP was still holding the shears. SO1 directed the vehicle to back away from AP but it remained stationary. AP entered the vehicle and started assaulting a civilian. SO1 went up to the vehicle passenger's side and drew his firearm. He directed AP to drop the shears, with AP responding "shoot me." SO1 holstered his firearm because he was concerned about the well-being of the civilians.

SO1 struck AP in the face once in an attempt to gain compliance without success. SO1 pulled out his baton and struck AP in the hands, making him drop the shears. AP continued to assault the civilian in the vehicle. SO1 struck AP in the legs and arms with the baton to get him to exit the vehicle. SO1 was concerned that AP could continue the assault in the vehicle. There were also children present.

AP turned his aggression toward SO1. SO1 hit AP with his baton to get distance from him. SO1 retrieved his 40mm launcher from his police vehicle and fired the launcher at AP while AP continued to walk toward him. The rubber bullet struck AP in the chest, but it did not have any effect on him.

SO2 arrived on scene and deployed her taser, which resulted in AP falling to the ground near her vehicle. SO1 restrained AP on the ground while he resisted and tried to grab SO1's tool belt. SO2 came over to assist and they were able to place AP in handcuffs. WO2 then arrived and placed leg shackles on AP. At this point, AP became cooperative with the officers.

Subject Officer 2 (SO2)

In accordance with her rights, SO2 declined an interview with IIU investigators. She consented to giving IIU investigators a copy of her report, which provided the following information:

SO2 confirmed the radio history of a dispatch to detain AP because of meth use and acting erratic. SO2 also confirmed that emergency services had AP in the ambulance and that he was originally cooperative. SO2 then heard over the radio that AP had assaulted the medical staff and that SO1 was enroute to assist.

SO2 went to assist SO1 with AP. She heard updates from SO1 while she was driving to the scene that his taser had been used without effect on AP. SO2 also heard over the radio that AP had medical shears in his possession.

As SO2 arrived on scene, she saw AP walking toward SO1 in an aggressive manner. SO2 saw SO1 deploy his 40mm launcher, striking AP in the chest. AP continued to walk toward SO1. SO2 exited her vehicle. Both officers gave AP commands without success. SO2 deployed her taser twice, striking AP each time and causing him to fall to the ground. Both officers went to restrain AP and handcuff him. AP was resisting and was shouting "just shoot me" and "run me over."

Both officers were able to gain control of AP and handcuff him while WO2 arrived on scene and placed AP in leg shackles. SO2 noted AP to be bleeding from multiple places on his body.

Other evidence

Medical reports

AP was presenting as violent while at the hospital. AP admitted to medical staff that he had been using meth. AP did not know why he was at the hospital. AP suffered a non-displaced rib fracture and had stitches to his knee, jaw, temple and chest area.

Taser report

The taser download report confirmed that SO1's taser trigger was pulled four times in 34 seconds. The taser report for SO2's taser confirmed that the trigger was pulled twice in one second.

Use of Force Reports

The use of force reports in this matter confirmed the evidence as provided by SO1 and SO2 in their narratives or reports.

Body worn camera footage

In reviewing SO1's body camera footage, the following observations can be made:

1. SO1 arrived on scene and spoke with CW1. He was told that AP assaulted a member of the medical staff and may have been in possession of medical shears.
2. SO1 attended the ambulance where AP could be seen holding medical shears. SO1 instructed AP multiple times to drop the shears. SO1 could be heard telling AP that he would tased if AP didn't drop the shears.
3. AP started to exit the ambulance in an aggressive manner while holding the shears. SO1 deployed his taser without effect.
4. AP continued to advance toward SO1 in an aggressive manner while holding the shears. SO1 fired his taser but it did not deploy. AP continued moving forward, chasing SO1. SO1 fired his taser, which deployed, but did not have any effect on AP.
5. AP moved into the civilian's vehicle. SO1 attempted to remove the shears from AP's hand, while two civilians held AP. SO1 delivered four strikes with his baton to AP's hand, which made AP drop the shears. SO1 yelled "Stop! You're under arrest!" SO1 struck AP four times in his leg and grabbed him by his hoodie, removing him from the vehicle. AP did not say anything during this period of time.
6. AP broke free of the hold as his hoodie came off in the process. SO1 struck AP in the chest. AP said "Ow" and SO1 moved away from AP.
7. SO1 could be seen grabbing the 40mm launcher while AP continued to move toward the officer. SO1 deployed the launcher and AP continued moving forward without breaking stride.
8. SO2 could be heard yelling "on the ground" as SO1 ran past her. A taser could be heard being deployed and then AP yelled "ow." SO1 turned around, and AP was stiff on the ground.

9. AP struggled with the officers on the ground. You could see that the 40 mm rubber bullet struck AP on his left side.
10. More officers arrive on scene and AP is now detained and cooperative.

In reviewing SO2's body camera footage, the following observations can be made:

1. SO2 did not turn on her body worn camera until AP had been handcuffed.
2. AP could be heard yelling "shoot me!" and "help me!".
3. AP was still trying to squirm away from being detained.
4. AP could be heard yelling and squirming while the two officers were holding him down and waiting for back up.
5. Once more officers attended the scene, AP became compliant and was stood up to be placed in a police vehicle.

Below are some still images from SO1's body worn camera.



Image of AP exiting the ambulance with shears in his right hand. SO1 has deployed his taser without affect.



SO1 deploys his taser while AP continues to move forwards with shears in his hand. AP again is not affected by the deployment.



SO1 has deployed the 40mm launcher, striking AP in the chest. AP continues moving forward without breaking stride.

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,*

This document is the property of the IIU and is not to be distributed to any other party without the written consent of the IIU.

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

Having reviewed all the evidence available, I am of the opinion that the subject officers' actions were reasonable in the circumstances. AP's actions at the time of the incident resulted in the use of force by the subject officers for the safety of the public and the officers themselves. Therefore, no charges are recommended and the IIU investigation is now completed and closed.