



**IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO AN INCIDENT INVOLVING A
FATAL MOTOR VEHICLE COLISION DURING RCMP (HOLLOW WATER FIRST
NATION) ARREST**

FINAL REPORT OF THE CIVILIAN DIRECTOR
OF THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT

Acting Civilian Director:	Bruce M. Sychuk
IIU File Number:	2025-0039
Date of Release:	January 19, 2026

Introduction

On Sept. 4, 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 Sep. 4, 2025:

On September 4, 2025, a community safety officer called the RCMP to report that AP fought with some civilians in the area. AP was intoxicated and his whereabouts in the area was unknown.

A second report came into the RCMP that AP had assaulted more civilians in the area and had stolen a vehicle, fleeing the area. RCMP received a report that AP wanted to commit suicide by police.

AP drove the stolen vehicle at a high rate of speed on the highway and collided with a police vehicle that was responding to the incidents in the area. AP's vehicle rolled over and [he] was pronounced dead on scene.

The police officer inside the vehicle suffered injuries that required medical treatment.

As this matter concerned a motor vehicle fatality during 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 the RCMP, among other items:

- notes, narratives and reports of officers
- audio transmissions
- watch guard videos
- traffic analyst report
- medical reports

The civilian director declined to designate a subject officer. The civilian director designated two witness officers (WO1 to WO2). No other witnesses were identified to be interviewed because the entire matter was caught on video.

Facts and Circumstances

Scene Examination

IIU investigators attended to the scene on notice. The area was reviewed for further witnesses or surveillance video. Because the incident happened on an isolated part of the highway, nothing further was identified for review.

Interviews

Witness Officers

Witness Officer 1 (WO1)

WO1 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Oct. 30, 2025, and provided the following information:

WO1 was asked to assist in the area because of the previous assault calls to the RCMP involving AP. WO1 was originally going to leave at the same time as WO2, however, she had to switch vehicles. Radio communication provided WO1 with a description of the vehicle AP was driving.

WO1 came across AP's vehicle on the highway and radioed that he was in pursuit. WO1 confirmed that his police vehicle lights were activated, but he did not activate his siren. WO1 confirmed that his vehicle was travelling at approximately 160 km/h. WO1 noted that he was losing ground to AP in the pursuit and believed AP's vehicle was travelling in excess of 180 km/h. AP was swerving all over the road as he drove at an excessive speed.

WO1 could see WO2's vehicle in the distance at a complete stop in the correct lane. WO1 saw AP's vehicle drive directly at WO2's vehicle and intentionally drive into it. WO1 noted that the impact was so significant that it sent both vehicles in the opposite direction.

WO1 went to check on WO2 and was able to see that she was breathing although she appeared to be confused. WO1 went to check on AP's vehicle and noted it to be totally destroyed.

He attempted to help WO2 out of her vehicle but was having difficulty because of the significant damage. After some time, WO2 was able to exit the vehicle and sit on the side of the road while waiting for medical services. WO1 went back to AP's vehicle once medical services attended to WO2. WO1 checked AP for a pulse and there was none. Medical services came over to AP's vehicle and pronounced him dead.

Witness Officer 2 (WO2)

In an effort to take a trauma informed approach, it was decided that it was not necessary or in the best interest to interview WO2, despite the designation.

With the other evidence available in connection with the traffic analyst report, there was no value in having WO2 participate in an interview.

Other evidence

Medical Reports

The autopsy report concluded that AP died of blunt force injuries due to a motor vehicle collision. The toxicology report noted that AP had significant levels of alcohol, cocaine and other metabolites (molecules produced or used during metabolism) in his system at the time of the incident.

Traffic Analyst Report

The report suggested that at the time of the collision AP's vehicle was traveling at approximately 187 km/h. The report also suggested that AP did not attempt to slow down as he drove directly

into the police vehicle, with the accelerator pressed to the maximum. The report confirmed that the police vehicle was at a complete stop before the collision.

After the collision, AP's vehicle travelled roughly 43 metres after impact. The police vehicle travelled roughly 31 metres after impact. AP was not wearing a seatbelt at the time of the incident.

The analyst concluded that AP's actions were either intentional or reckless.

Watch guard videos

The videos are extremely difficult to view because the impact of the collision is significant. The following observations can be made:

1. AP was driving at a significant speed. WO1's vehicle had difficulty keeping up with AP's vehicle as he followed behind.
2. AP made no effort to avoid WO2's police vehicle. He went into the wrong lane to intentionally cause the collision.
3. The impact of the collision caused the video footage to stop operating on the police vehicle involved in the collision.

Applicable Law

All relevant sections of the Criminal Code of Canada were considered with respect to this incident. Sec. 25(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada has 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.

Conclusion

Based on the evidence available in connection with the fact that I declined to designate a subject officer, I am of the opinion that the actions of the police did not cause AP's death. Unfortunately, AP was the cause of his own tragic end. Therefore, no charges are recommended and the IIU investigation is now completed and closed.

