



**IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO AN OFFICER-INVOLVED
SHOOTING DURING MFNPS (BROKENHEAD) ARREST**

FINAL REPORT OF THE CIVILIAN DIRECTOR
OF THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT

Acting Civilian Director:	Bruce M. Sychuk
IIU File Number:	2025-0047
Date of Release:	March 4, 2026

Introduction

On Nov. 15, 2025, the Manitoba First Nations Police Service (MFNPS) 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 Nov. 16, 2025:

On November 15th, 2025, the writer was advised of an incident that occurred on Brokenhead First Nation, MB surrounding an officer being shot in the foot. A member discharged his firearm at an aggressive dog inside a residence that officers were executing a warrant on for a male individual who was wanted by police. Police entered the residence and were greeted by a large aggressive dog. One officer attempted to shoot the dog and two shots were fired. One shot inadvertently struck the other officer. The bullet struck his right foot, requiring surgery.

As this matter concerned an officer-involved shooting 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 MFNPS or of their own accord:

- notes, narratives and reports of officers
- audio transmissions
- use of force report
- medical reports

The civilian director designated one subject officer (SO) and one witness officer (WO1). IIU investigators also received information from one civilian witness (CW1).

Note: the witness officer and the affected person are the same individual in this incident.

Facts and Circumstances

Scene Examination and Canvass

IIU investigators attended the scene and saw blood droplets near the stair of the bi-level residence. Investigators also saw the dog (deceased) in a pool of blood near one of the beds in the residence. Two bullet casings were also located at the scene.

IIU investigators canvassed the area for potential witnesses and video surveillance. One civilian witness was located.

Interviews

Affected Person/Witness Officer

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

AP and SO were assigned to execute a warrant on an individual who was known to reside at the scene of the incident. AP and SO entered the residence and AP saw a large dog inside. AP drew

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.

his taser, which provides a pitch noise, in case the dog was aggressive. AP observed the dog to be fearful and non-aggressive.

AP positioned himself at the top of the stairs to clear the floor when the dog ran past him towards the stairs. At that moment, SO discharged his weapon twice, striking AP in the foot, causing significant damage. SO did not give any verbal warning before discharging his gun.

SO radioed “officer down,” which AP corrected to “accidental shooting,” so the incident did not escalate. AP recalled SO stating “I tried saving you,” and was anxious following the incident. AP confirmed that the dog was not aggressive, and he did not believe lethal force was necessary. AP pointed out that SO was on his second day as an officer. AP believed that SO’s fear of dogs influenced his decision making.

Civilian Witness 1 (CW1)

CW1 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Nov. 16, 2025, and provided the following information:

CW1 was outside when she saw a police officer arrive at the residence and remain outside for approximately twenty minutes. CW1 did not believe anyone was at home in the residence when the police were present. She saw a police car arrive again outside the residence. An officer stated “warrant” and then kicked in the door.

A few minutes later, CW1 heard two gunshots and a dog whimpering. She yelled at the officers, asking if they shot the dog. The officers did not respond immediately and then she was instructed to leave the scene.

CW1 saw one of the officers exit the residence limping. She asked the officer if the dog bit him and he responded that he was shot. CW1 entered the residence and remained with the dog. She noted blood inside the residence.

Subject Officer

In accordance with his rights, SO declined to be interviewed by IIU investigators. So’s legal counsel provided IIU investigators with a prepared statement, which contained the following:

SO confirmed that they attended the residence to execute a warrant. SO had tried to execute the warrant the previous day with another partner without success. SO stated that on the previous day, no dog was observed at the residence.

On the day of the incident, SO confirmed that they announced their presence to execute the warrant. SO could hear a dog barking inside while his partner pulled out his taser and SO unholstered his firearm. SO stated that when they entered the residence, the dog was barking, growling aggressively and moving towards the stairs. AP walked by the dog, at which point the dog focused its attention on SO and lunged at him. SO discharged his weapon twice while yelling at AP to “watchout!”

SO confirmed that the dog fell immediately and then AP said that he had been injured as well. SO helped AP out of the residence and then radioed for assistance stating, “shots fired, officer down.” SO provided medical assistance to AP until medical services arrived.

Other evidence

Medical Report

Medical reports confirmed that AP suffered multiple fractures of the right metatarsi, requiring surgery. The fractures were given a grade three diagnosis, which is the most severe level.

Applicable Law

The officers were present at the residence with the lawful intent of executing a warrant. The issue for consideration is whether SO's actions were careless, as expressed in the criminal code of Canada. Caselaw related to this area of law was reviewed.

Conclusion

In reviewing the evidence available, along with the relevant caselaw, the actions of the subject officer do not rise to the level of a criminal code offence. I have concerns about his thought process, but the necessary criminal charging standard can not be met. Therefore, no charges are recommended and the IIU investigation is now completed and closed.