



**IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO AN INCIDENT INVOLVING AN  
OFF-DUTY RCMP OFFICER ARREST**

**FINAL REPORT OF THE CIVILIAN DIRECTOR**  
**OF THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT**

Acting Civilian Director:	Bruce M. Sychuk
IIU File Number:	2025-0046
Date of Release:	May 13, 2026

## **Introduction**

On Oct. 22, 2025, the Brandon Police Service (BPS) notified the Independent Investigation Unit of Manitoba (IIU) of an incident.

The written notification disclosed the following information:

*Written excerpt from Part 7 Notification received on Oct. 23, 2025:*

*On Oct. 19, 2025, BPS received a call from the mother of AP, reporting a male showed up with her daughter in handcuffs. The male was wearing shorts and a Police vest, currently on the driveway. Police responded to AP's residence and observed a black Toyota Corolla in front of the residence with SO standing by it on the driver's side.*

*SO was wearing shorts, a t-shirt, a ballistic Molle vest with a "POLICE" patch across the chest, and a full duty belt including a firearm, Taser, and other equipment. Police deployed their rifles and gave a clear loud command, "Hands up don't move. Hands up don't move." In response, SO took a flashlight from his vest and shone it at police while raising his other hand.*

*It soon became apparent that SO was a member of another police agency. SO indicated that the girl was inside the residence, and that he "had arrested her" even though he was not on duty and was operating a personal vehicle. The duty belt and weapons were seized from SO.*

*SO was advised that he was being detained for a forcible confinement Investigation. He was transported back to BPS headquarters where he was eventually released.*

As this matter concerned the actions of an off-duty officer during an arrest, the IIU assumed responsibility for this investigation in accordance with Sec. 75 of the Police Services Act. IIU investigators were assigned to this investigation.

IIU investigators obtained the following information from the BPS or of their own accord:

- notes, narratives and reports of officers
- civilian witness statement to BPS
- audio transmissions
- area crime stat reports
- cell surveillance
- medical reports

The civilian director designated one subject officer (SO) and eight witness officers (WO1 to WO8). The civilian director designated one police associate witness (PA1). IIU investigators also received information from five civilian witnesses (CW1 to CW5) and AP.

## **Facts and Circumstances**

### **Scene Examination and Canvass**

IIU investigators did not conduct a scene examination because the scene was never held by the police authority. IIU investigators canvassed the area for civilian witnesses and video surveillance, which had positive results in both areas.

## Interviews

### **Affected Person**

#### Affected Person (AP)

IIU investigators interviewed AP on Oct. 28, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

AP confirmed that she planned to have a sleepover with CW4 at her residence. They met up with the other youth witness in the evening and decided to play “Ding Dong Ditch”. AP made it clear that she did not want to participate in the actual game, but she did want to walk along with the group. AP recalled that the boys in the group decided to ring the doorbell of a residence and ran away. AP heard someone yelling but could not make out what that individual was actually saying. The boys ran back to AP and CW4 after a while. They discussed playing the game at the same residence where the person yelled at them.

One of the boys played the game again and then the group started to walk home. AP stated that three cars pulled up near the group. SO exited the white car and ran towards the group. SO was wearing a police vest and khaki shorts. AP noted that SO had a pistol in his vest, but she confirmed that he never took it out of the vest. AP did not run away, but the rest of the group did. She asked SO if everything was okay and SO responded, “do you think this is funny?” AP recalled that another male from the same white vehicle exited the car while holding a long black rifle. AP confirmed that this male did not point the rifle directly at her, but she was definitely aware that he had it. The male with the rifle went back into the vehicle while SO grabbed AP’s right elbow, placed her in handcuffs and took her phone. AP stated that SO did not say anything to her while he placed her in handcuffs and did not tell her she was under arrest.

SO had a tight grip on AP and was pushing or pulling her while they were walking towards her residence. The male that had the rifle was following behind them in the white vehicle. SO asked AP where the boys went and she confirmed that she did not know but confirmed that they lived on the same block as her. AP walked approximately four blocks in handcuffs towards her residence, with SO holding her arm and the white vehicle following close behind. She confirmed that SO was asking her where she lived, her name and age. AP stated that SO was quite aggressive with her during their interaction. AP recalled that as they were getting closer to her residence, SO was conversing with the male in the vehicle in a different language. She recalled that the male in the white car left at some point but returned in a different car that was darker in colour.

AP saw CW1 and her sister outside her residence. SO put AP’s phone on top of a car and then started to talk to CW1. AP recalled that CW1 asked SO for his badge number, which he did not provide, so CW1 called 911. SO walked over to the dark car and said something to the driver, who then drove away. Still in handcuffs, AP went into her house with CW1 and her sister and waited for police to arrive.

AP confirmed that she had a sore wrist, arm and elbow from being placed in handcuffs and from SO holding her arm while he was walking her back to the residence.

## **Civilian Witnesses**

### Civilian Witness 1 (CW1)

IU investigators interviewed CW1 on Oct. 28, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW1 confirmed that her older daughter told her AP had been arrested. The background information was that three cars surrounded the group and that AP had been placed in handcuffs. CW1 originally thought AP had been kidnapped.

CW1 got dressed and was exiting her residence with her other daughter when she saw AP crying hysterically with a male escorting her in handcuffs. She noted the male to be wearing a police vest, a T-shirt and shorts. CW1 confirmed that the vest was holding a gun and radio and that SO never removed the gun from the vest.

SO told her that he arrested AP because the kids were playing knock knock ginger. CW1 asked to see SO's badge and he told her he did not have to show it to her. SO asked her if she wanted back up called and she said that she did. However, SO refused to call. CW1 decided to call 911 as a result.

CW1 pulled AP behind her and SO tried to grab her back. She told SO not to touch her daughter. CW1 recalled 911 directing her to go inside the house with her daughters and to wait for police to arrive. CW1 complied with the directions.

After police arrived, an officer attended to the residence and took the handcuffs off AP. CW1 confirmed that AP complained of sore wrists, elbow and arm from the incident. CW1 observed redness to AP's wrists and confirmed that AP was taken to the doctor's office after the incident.

CW1 recalled a dark coloured vehicle on the street that police later towed away. She confirmed that this vehicle drove away at one point, but returned moments later. CW1 could not provide a description of who was inside the vehicle.

### Civilian Witness 2 (CW2)

IU investigators interviewed CW2 on Oct. 28, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW2 confirmed that he was part of the group playing Ding Dong Ditch before the incident. CW2 stated that they played the game on four houses, and that on the fourth house, an individual exited the house and yelled at them. He could not recall the exact words, but he believed it was something to the effect that if they did it again, they would be in trouble. CW2 confirmed that they thought it would be funny to do it again to that same house. He confirmed that they played the game again on the house, but this time no one exited. They assumed the game was over and started to walk down the street.

CW2 saw a newer dark coloured vehicle speed towards the group in the wrong lane and slam on its brakes as they neared. CW2 saw a male exit the car and he ran away. He confirmed that the male from the car was the same male that had yelled at them from the fourth house. CW2 confirmed that he hid for twenty minutes and that AP was not with the group when they ran.

CW2 went home afterwards and noticed six police cars in front of AP's house. He did not hear anyone say they were a police officer before he ran away. CW2 did not see any male wearing a police vest or observe anyone handcuff a member of his group.

#### Civilian Witness 3 (CW3)

IIU investigators interviewed CW3 on Oct. 28, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW3 heard his dogs barking, which woke him up. He looked outside and saw roughly six police vehicles. CW3 reviewed his security cameras and saw SO escorting AP towards her residence while a car followed.

CW3 confirmed that SO was wearing a police vest and may have had his gun in his hand. He confirmed that he heard through his camera that SO refused to show CW1 his badge, stating that his vest was sufficient. He heard CW1 state that she was going to call 911 and this male went to talk to the individual in the vehicle. CW3 thought SO handed something to the individual in the car and then it sped away. He confirmed that the vehicle returned later.

CW3 confirmed that AP appeared to be scared and sought protection from SO. SO attempted to move towards AP, but CW1 stood in between them, protecting her daughter from SO. Soon after, police arrived and arrested SO. CW3 could not see any injuries on AP from his position.

#### Civilian Witness 4 (CW4)

IIU investigators interviewed CW4 on Oct. 28, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW4 confirmed that she was part of the group that played Ding Dong Ditch before the incident. She confirmed that a male came out of one of the houses and yelled at them while they ran away. CW4 stated that the group had a handstand competition and then decided to play the game again on the house where the person yelled at them. CW4 confirmed that the group knocked on the door and ran away.

Later, a white car came upon the group and two individuals exited. One individual was a police officer, and the other individual was holding a long black rifle to his chest. SO was wearing a police vest and shorts and grabbed AP by the arm and placed her in handcuffs. Initially, SO was taking AP in the wrong direction from her house but soon turned around. CW4 could hear AP yelling that she did not do anything, and SO stated that he did not care. CW4 recalled seeing two other vehicles pull up with the white vehicle, but she could not recall any details. She confirmed that she ran away from AP to go and tell AP's sister what had happened.

CW4 was present when SO and AP came towards CW1's residence. AP was bawling her eyes out when she arrived. CW4 recalled that a dark vehicle followed AP and SO while they walked to the house. CW4 recalled CW1 asking SO for his badge number and he refused. CW1 called 911 as a result. When police arrived, she was directed to attend the station and give the police a statement.

### Civilian Witness 5 (CW5)

IIU investigators interviewed CW5 on Oct. 28, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW5 confirmed that he was part of the group playing Ding Dong Ditch. He confirmed that they knocked on one door, and a male came out and told them they would be in trouble. CW5 confirmed that they knocked on the same door later in the evening.

CW5 noted that a dark vehicle with a Brandon Wheat Kings license plate sped towards them. CW5 believed it was the same dark vehicle that he saw outside AP's house later that evening. CW5 ran and hid and later went towards his residence, where he saw multiple police vehicles outside AP's house.

He did not see any interaction between AP and SO.

### Civilian Witness 6 (CW6)

IIU investigators interviewed CW6 on Jan. 27, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

CW6 recalled seeing two individuals walking on the street with a car following close behind. CW6's son identified AP and noticed she was handcuffed with her hands behind her back. CW6 noted that SO was wearing a police vest and khaki shorts. CW6 was not entirely sure if SO was a real officer or someone in a costume.

CW6 saw SO walk AP towards her residence and the dark coloured vehicle leave the area, but it returned a few minutes later. He saw police arrive and tell SO to keep his hands up. An officer approached SO and removed his police vest and placed him in the back of a vehicle.

CW6 did not see SO use any force on AP, but he recalled that AP was crying and looked upset.

### Civilian Witness 7 (CW7) and Civilian Witness 8 (CW8)

CW7 and CW8 provided a prepared statement through SO's legal counsel. The following information was provided:

CW7 and CW8 were at the residence. They confirmed that there were two incidents of loud banging at the front door. On the first occasion, they couldn't see anyone at the door. On the second occasion, their son saw four people run away from the residence. They stated that their dogs barked each time. CW 7 and CW8 stated they were scared because they had heard of multiple break-ins in Brandon and that officers were being targeted for assaults across Canada.

SO grabbed his vest and told CW7 and CW8 to stay inside the residence. They did not hear from SO or his brother for hours. At one point, SO's brother came back to the house to grab SO's wallet and phone, but he did not tell them what was going on.

They tried to reach both SO and his brother on their phones without success. CW9 told them that SO and his brother were at the police station. They drove past the station and saw their vehicle exiting the station. At the residence, SO and his brother complained about their treatment by police.

### Civilian Witness 9 (CW9)

IIU investigators interviewed CW9 on April 1, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

CW9 confirmed that at the time of the incident, she was dating SO. She recalled three different incidents of loud knocking at the door. CW9 did not see anything, but she confirmed that CW 7 and CW8 were afraid. CW9 confirmed that SO grabbed his police vest and went outside to investigate. She did not see anyone grab a long black rifle.

CW9 confirmed that SO was wearing his police vest and khaki shorts when he left the house. She confirmed that SO complained about his detention after the fact. CW9 did not observe SO or his brother consume any intoxicants.

### **Police Associate Witness**

#### Police Associate 1 (PA1)

IIU investigators interviewed PA1 on Feb. 9, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

PA1 medically cleared SO at the police station. Other than a slightly elevated blood pressure, SO was healthy. SO did not disclose any injuries and none were observed on SO. He did not appear to be under the influence of any intoxicants.

PA1 also cleared SO's brother at the station. PA1 assessed SO's brother to be in a similar condition to SO. PA1 noted nothing of concern.

PA1 denied having any contact with SO or his brother after assessing them at the police station. She denied discussing the incident with them after the fact.

### **Witness Officers**

#### Witness Officer 1 (WO1)

IIU investigators interviewed WO1 on Jan. 27, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO1 heard a call of a possible kidnapping over the radio. The complainant reported that a male wearing a police vest had her daughter. WO1 was the last to arrive on scene and SO was already in custody. WO1 did not interact with SO.

While on scene, three youths came up to WO1 and explained that they had played Ding Dong Ditch earlier in the evening and AP was with them. The three youths were transported to the station to provide statements.

WO1 remained at the scene and waited for a tow truck to take the vehicle to the station. He was also instructed to canvass the area for possible witnesses or video footage of the incident. WO1 did not interact with AP at any point during his involvement with the incident.

### Witness Officer 2 (WO2)

IIU investigators interviewed WO2 on Jan. 7, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO2 heard over the radio that a mother's daughter was returned home in handcuffs, and someone was standing in her driveway wearing a police vest. WO2 thought this might have been an off-duty arrest by an officer, but this was definitely unusual. WO2 used caution attending the scene because the call suggested the male had a police vest, which could also mean he could possess weapons.

WO2 exited the vehicle with his rifle and pointed it at SO, stating "hands up, don't move" twice. SO decided to shine a flashlight at WO2, saying, "Come on WO2, it's SO, you know me." WO2 asked SO where AP was and SO responded that he arrested her and that "you know me." WO2 asked SO if he was on duty and SO confirmed he was not on duty. WO2 asked SO about the civilian vehicle near the residence and SO confirmed it was his own vehicle. WO2 assessed SO's demeanour to be quite nonchalant considering the seriousness of the situation.

WO2 approached SO, asked him what was going on and where AP was. SO confirmed that AP was inside the house. WO2 took SO's utility belt, walked him over to the police vehicle and told him he was detained on a forcible confinement investigation. WO2 did a pat down on SO and placed him in the backseat of the police vehicle. SO said that he had placed AP under arrest, but he did not tell WO2 what offence it was for. WO2 confirmed with RCMP telecommunications that SO did not put himself on duty that evening.

WO2 directed WO6 and WO9 to speak with AP and seek further information. Based on the information received, WO2 decided to arrest SO and inform him of his rights. SO said that he wanted to speak with counsel, which WO2 confirmed would happen at the police station.

WO2 directed WO4 to take SO to the police station. WO2 told WO4 that he had to be the only officer to have direct contact with SO from this point onward. SO was removed from WO2's vehicle and placed in WO4's vehicle. WO2 directed WO3 to be the exhibit officer for the investigation.

WO2 did not interact with AP. He had an opportunity to observe AP and he did not notice any injuries. WO2 assisted with some of the interviews related to the incident. WO2 did not see SO or his brother with a rifle, however, he did recall that a couple of witnesses mentioned a rifle being present at the initial interaction between SO and AP.

WO2 confirmed that SO was released without charges.

### Witness Officer 3 (WO3)

IIU investigators interviewed WO3 on Jan. 12, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO3 was assisting on a call involving a youth in handcuffs and a man wearing a police vest at the residence. While WO3 was driving to the scene, he heard WO2 say over the radio, "it's SO." He recognized the name as a past Brandon police officer.

WO3 arrived at the scene as WO2 was performing a pat down on SO. He then saw WO4 take SO and place him in his police vehicle. WO3 was instructed by WO4 to arrest SO's brother for

forcible confinement. He charged SO's brother and patted him down before placing him in the back of his vehicle. WO3 confirmed that he drove SO's brother to the station for processing and that the brothers were kept apart from each other until they were released.

WO3 denied having any interaction with SO other than a brief moment when SO stated, "nobody is helping me out." WO3 said something to the effect that it will all be fine and not to worry. WO3 recalled SO's brother saying this was all "bullshit." He did not interview or question SO's brother about the incident. WO3 noted that SO's brothers' eyes were bloodshot and there was a faint smell of alcohol. WO3 did not think he was intoxicated.

WO3 confirmed that SO's police property was not returned to SO directly and that it would remain in storage until it was picked up by the RCMP. WO3 confirmed that SO and his brother were released without charges. WO3 did not interact with AP at all. He confirmed that he had worked with SO when he was still a Brandon police officer. However, WO3 denied having any communication with SO or discussing the incident after he was released.

#### Witness Officer 4 (WO4)

IIU investigators interviewed WO4 on Jan. 12, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO4 was asked to assist with the incident. He recalled that AP was handcuffed by a male wearing a police vest, and there was a dark -coloured car following nearby. WO4 thought that it might be an abduction call. WO4 arrived on scene and observed SO in WO2's custody. WO4 placed SO's brother under arrest as a party to the offence and WO3 placed him in the police vehicle.

WO4 spoke with WO2 to obtain a status update, and it was agreed WO4 would take custody of SO and take him back to the station. WO4 radioed both RCMP and BPS to see if SO placed himself on duty that evening. SO did not place himself on duty that evening.

WO4 removed SO from WO2's vehicle to place him in the back of his own vehicle. SO wanted to talk with WO4 about the incident, but WO4 told SO to keep his mouth shut and wait until he was at the detachment. WO4 assessed SO's demeanour to be angry.

WO4 placed SO in the lawyer's room, instead of a cell, because there could still be a chance that SO had placed himself on duty that evening. Originally, SO was left with his cellphone. WO4 saw SO texting and receiving numerous phone calls. It was decided that SO's phone should be removed. WO4 confirmed with SO that he had spoken with his union, lawyer and employer. SO said that his phone was about to die, so WO4 agreed to charge it in the staff room.

WO4 was instructed to release SO without charges or any paperwork. SO mentioned that he did not have his wallet. WO4 drove to the area where SO initiated the first interaction with AP and located it on the ground. WO4 drove by SO's residence and saw an RCMP vehicle there. WO4 thought it was odd that SO would take a civilian vehicle to locate AP when he could have used his police vehicle.

WO4 confirmed that he did not have any interaction with AP. He confirmed that at no time did SO mention that he placed AP under arrest. He assessed SO to be sober during there interactions. SO did not tell WO4 at any time that he placed himself on duty. WO4 acknowledged that he had worked with SO in a strictly professional manner when SO was employed with BPS. WO4

denied having any further discussions with SO about the incident after he released him from custody on the date of the incident.

#### Witness Officer 5 (WO5)

IIU investigators interviewed WO5 on Jan. 12, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO5 was asked to assist with the incident. When he arrived, SO was already in custody. While on the scene, CW2, CW5 and another youth came up to WO5 and provided some background about their actions from the evening. WO5 obtained video statements from the youth back at the station, including a video statement from AP.

WO5 met AP at the station and observed the youth to be very emotional, distraught and crying. AP provided the officer with a statement consistent with the one provided to IIU investigators. AP complained that her wrists were sore, but WO5 did not see any injuries to AP. Other than applying handcuffs, SO did not appear to use any other force on AP that evening.

WO5 confirmed that he went to high school with SO, but they were not friends and did not interact with each other.

#### Witness Officer 6 (WO6)

IIU investigators interviewed WO6 on Jan. 12, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO6 was asked to assist with the incident. When he arrived, SO was already in custody. WO6 went inside CW1's residence and observed AP in handcuffs. While inside the residence, AP provided WO6 with a statement consistent with the one provided to the IIU investigators. WO6 told AP that a video statement would be required at the station. WO6 assessed AP to be scared as though she had been through a traumatic event. He did not observe any injuries to AP.

WO6 confirmed that neither AP nor CW4 advised him that they heard SO place AP under arrest. WO6 does not know SO and only found out during the incident that he was an RCMP officer.

#### Witness Officer 7 (WO7)

IIU investigators interviewed WO7 on Jan. 7, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO7 confirmed that SO called him after he had been released from the police station. SO confirmed that BPS had seized his gun and belt. SO also told WO7 that he spoke to his lawyer and his union.

WO7 went to SO's residence roughly two hours later to seize all property of the RCMP. SO was told that he was to report in civilian clothes to the detachment for desk duties. WO7 provided SO with information about supports available to him because of the incident. SO advised WO7 that he could not go into details, but he did acknowledge that the situation was blown out of proportion.

SO was cooperative in providing WO7 with the RCMP property. SO had to grab one of his shirts from the laundry pile. SO took WO7 to the basement of his house to retrieve his carbine. WO7 did not see SO use any key to unlock a gun safe and saw SO grab the carbine in one smooth

motion. He confirmed that the carbine was returned to him in a safe and proper manner. WO7 confirmed that ammunition was separated from the carbine and that the chamber of the carbine was clear.

SO did not tell WO7 that he had placed himself on duty with respect to the incident. WO7 confirmed that the incident was not discussed with SO, except as it related to SO's duties related the IIU investigation.

#### Witness Officer 8 (WO8)

IIU investigators interviewed WO8 on Jan. 27, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO8 was asked to assist with the incident. When he arrived, he saw that SO was already in custody. WO8 confirmed that he is friends with SO and at one point, SO yelled out to him, asking him what was going on. WO8 placed his hand on SO's shoulder and told him to just comply and everything would sort itself out. WO8 stated that since the incident, he has had minimal contact with SO.

WO8 was asked to assist in AP's residence. WO8 observed AP to be extremely distraught, fearful and crying, with mascara running down her face. WO8 saw that AP was handcuffed with her hands behind her back.

WO8 initiated rapport building with AP, CW1, CW4 and AP's sister. He was able to remove the handcuffs from AP. WO6 attended and was tasked with taking statements from the civilian witnesses. WO8 advised WO2 that he had a conflict with the investigation because of his friendship with SO.

WO8 was tasked with another call because of the conflict. He acknowledged that SO called him later that evening, but he let the call go to voicemail. WO8 knew that the matter would be investigated and that he should not talk to SO about it. He sought guidance on if he could still communicate with SO, and he was told that he could be a friend to SO, but he was not to speak to him about anything related to the investigation.

WO8 returned SO's call when he finished his shift. SO asked him why he was arrested and what was going on. WO8 told SO that he could not talk about the incident, but they could talk about other things as friends.

WO8 confirmed that SO did not tell him that he placed himself on duty or that he placed AP under arrest. WO8 confirmed that AP did not tell him that SO placed her under arrest. He confirmed that he did not observe any injuries to AP when he was at the residence.

#### **Subject Officer**

In accordance with his rights, SO declined to be interviewed by IIU investigators. SO's counsel provided IIU investigators with a prepared statement that contained the following information:

1. SO heard loud bangs on his door and the dogs began to bark.
2. Again, there was loud bangs at the door and SO feared for his life and the lives of his family.
3. SO saw multiple people outside running away from his residence.

4. SO talked to his neighbour, asking if they saw anything, and the neighbour did not.
5. SO felt his family had been targeted. He stated that there had been many break and enters in the area. He had also heard on the news about officers being targeted.
6. SO stated that there was a third knock at the door that was more aggressive than the other two. SO felt it was a home invasion.
7. SO grabbed his vest and intervention tools and he and his brother went into their vehicle to search for the individuals.
8. SO and his brother started to drive away from their residence and immediately saw three individuals running away. SO's brother started honking the horn, hoping that they would stop running.
9. SO wanted to catch one of the individuals before he contacted BPS.
10. He approached an individual and yelled "this is police." AP identified herself as a thirteen-year-old. SO originally had his taser in the ready low position, but after seeing that AP did not have any weapons, he put away the taser.
11. SO told AP she was under arrest for trespassing or mischief and placed her in handcuffs. AP continued to apologize to SO. SO confirmed AP was crying.
12. SO assessed that AP was a youth and that he would need to notify one of her parents.
13. AP was providing the names of the other youth she was with while they were walking towards her residence. SO's brother followed in the car.
14. SO confirmed that AP continued to cry as they arrived at the residence. SO told CW1 that he was an officer and that he had arrested AP. CW1 accused him of being a fake cop and wanted his badge number. CW1 kept screaming at him so he told her to call 911 as he was going to call BPS for back up.
15. SO tried to walk towards AP to take the handcuffs off AP, but CW1 went in between them and pulled AP behind her. CW1 and AP went inside the house with the other civilians. SO checked his vest for his phone and realized he forgot it at home. SO told his brother to go home and grab his phone and wallet because it included his badge.
16. SO's brother returned with his phone and badge and waited in the car on the street. SO could hear the police sirens, so he did not call the police.
17. SO was surprised when WO2 arrived and was pointing his rifle at him. SO confirmed he had worked with WO2 previously. WO2 told him to show his hands and SO asked what was going on. WO2 continued to tell SO to place his hands on the vehicle and SO complied. WO2 seized SO's utility belt and placed SO in handcuffs.
18. SO was shocked that WO2 would do this because he told WO2 that he had arrested AP. WO2 told him that he was detained for a forcible confinement investigation.
19. SO saw WO8 and had a brief chat about what was going on. WO8 told SO to just comply and that they will figure it out.
20. WO2 told SO he was under arrest for forcible confinement. WO4 opened the door to the police vehicle and escorted SO to his police cruiser. WO4 told SO that he was directed to take SO to the police station.
21. SO confirmed that he was medically cleared and that his blood pressure was elevated. WO4 gave SO his phone so he could make some calls.
22. WO4 returned to the room and asked for the phone back. SO told him it needed charging, so WO4 agreed to charge it in the office. WO4 agreed to give SO's brother a contact number for a lawyer.
23. SO confirmed he was allowed to use the washroom.

24. SO and his brother were released after a period of time. SO noted that no one took his statement.
25. SO felt that their personal vehicle was damaged by the tow.
26. SO suggested that WO4 told him that the incident was blown out of proportion and would have been handled differently if he had been in charge.
27. SO suggested the next day that numerous BPS officers suggested the situation was blown out of proportion.

## **Other evidence**

### **Area Crime Report**

BPS was able to provide IIU investigators with data related to reported offences in SO's neighbourhood, for the previous year from the date of the incident. There were no incidents of break and enters, theft or mischief reported in the previous year. Further, BPS confirmed that there was one incident in 2024 of a BPS officer being harassed.

### **Medical Report**

The medical information provided suggested that AP was suffering psychological trauma from SO's actions. No significant injuries were noted, although AP's arm was tender when assessed. AP's mother updated the IIU that AP is still suffering significant trauma as a result of SO's actions.

### **Video Footage**

Video footage appeared to show AP and SO at different times walking towards AP's house. In one video clip, you can hear someone say, "where do you live?" You can also see a dark-coloured vehicle following close by in some of the videos. In another video, you can see emergency vehicles and hear someone say, "don't move!" twice.

## **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**

What is clear based on the evidence is that this was not a targeted home invasion of a police officer. This was a case of a bunch of young teenagers playing Ding Dong Ditch. SO had the subjective belief that he feared for his own well-being and that of his family. In this state of “fear”, SO and his brother decided to go chase after the individuals who were running away from the residence. SO grabbed his utility belt and his police vest because he was “fearful”.

Once they caught up to the group of individuals, SO decided to handcuff a thirteen-year-old girl. Depending on the evidence provided, one of the individuals in SO’s car was carrying a rifle. Further, SO suggested that he placed AP under arrest for trespassing or mischief — no civilian witness recalled hearing SO arrest AP. What is also clear is that SO handcuffed the girl despite acknowledging that he did not see any weapons, and all the while, she was crying. He then did not try and use his phone to call BPS or place himself on duty as an RCMP officer. Instead, he walked AP to her residence because he knew she was a youth and a youth waiver would be required. According to SO’s prepared statement, he did not realize that he did not have his phone until after he had already interacted with AP’s mother.

Once at the residence, AP’s mom did what any parent should do — they protected their child and called 911. Similarly, BPS did what any police force should do when there is a suggestion of a male with a police vest having handcuffed a child who is not identified. They treated the incident with an appropriate level of seriousness to ensure the well-being of the public.

SO suggested that he arrested AP, which would trigger Sec. 25 of the Criminal Code, which allows for a reasonable level of force as required. Further, caselaw makes it clear that officers are not to be held to a perfect standard. Put another way, despite the fact that SO’s actions displayed questionable judgement and seem to be extreme, considering the entirety of the evidence, I am not in a position to say that his actions are criminal. What is clear is that AP continues to suffer trauma from the incident.

Therefore, no charges are recommended and the IIU investigation is now completed and closed.