



**IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO A HIT-AND-RUN INVOLVING AN
OFF-DUTY RCMP OFFICER**

FINAL REPORT OF THE CIVILIAN DIRECTOR
OF THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT

Acting Civilian Director:	Bruce M. Sychuk
IIU File Number:	2023-0085
Date of Release:	June 5, 2025

Introduction

On Dec. 30, 2023, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) 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 Jan. 2, 2024:

- *On December 30, 2023, at 0020hrs, Nelson House RCMP received a call of a vehicle vs. pedestrian hit and run. Members spoke with AP, who said that he had been run over by a black truck, the vehicle was driven by a male he knows as "SO". "SO" got out and offered AP money to stay silent.*
- *Nelson House nursing station contacted RCMP and said that AP was being flown to Thompson General Hospital (TGH) for a CT scan as there were concerns of internal bleeding. Members attended and AP told the officers that someone else hit him.*
- *CW4 then called RCMP and said that it was SO that hit AP. SO is an RCMP officer. CW4 explained that SO came to their house last night and told them he almost hit AP. Statements were obtained from CW1 and CW3. Both said SO came to their house and said that AP jumped in front of his vehicle but he did not hit him with the vehicle. SO told them that he got out and hit AP on the shoulder and asked what was wrong with him before driving him to a friend's house. SO repeatedly said "I didn't hit him, I didn't hit him"*
- *WO4 obtained a statement from AP and CW5. AP said he was walking on the road and was clipped by a vehicle; he ended up on the ground. SO got AP into his truck, told him not to tell anyone and that he would give him whatever he wanted. AP went home and used the bathroom and saw blood in his stool, so he went to the nursing station. CW5 corroborated AP's statement as she saw AP get hit by the vehicle. SO picked up AP and punched him in the face, and then asked them not to say anything*
- *While patrolling Nelson House on December 30, 2023, WO1 was flagged down by an unknown male now believed to be SO. The male told WO1 that he almost hit AP and explained that it was a good thing he was not speeding or he would have hit him. SO also stated that AP punched the window of the truck and SO then threw AP in the ditch. This interaction happened before RCMP were advised of a possible hit and run by AP.*

As this matter concerned injuries during a possible hit and run by an off-duty officer, the IIU assumed responsibility for this investigation in accordance with Sec. 75(1) 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
- statements to RCMP by civilian witnesses

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.

- CCTV surveillance

The civilian director designated one subject officer (SO1) and five witness officers (WO1 to WO5). IIU investigators attempted to obtain further evidence from AP and five civilian witnesses. Despite repeated efforts by the IIU investigators, AP and the civilian witnesses were unwilling or unable to cooperate with the investigation.

Facts and Circumstances

Scene Examination

No scene examination or canvassing of the area was conducted by the IIU, because notice was not received until Jan. 2, 2024, and the scene was not held to be investigated by the RCMP.

Interviews

Affected Person

AP was contacted by IIU investigators in an attempt to receive further evidence. AP told the investigators “I don’t want to talk to you.”

Civilian Witnesses

IIU investigators made repeated efforts to obtain further evidence related to the investigation from the civilian witnesses. Unfortunately, the civilian witnesses were unable or unwilling to cooperate with the IIU investigators.

Witness Officers

Witness Officer 1 (WO1)

IIU investigators interviewed WO1 on Aug. 14, 2024, and were provided the following information:

WO1 was heading towards the detachment when he encountered a dark-coloured dodge ram truck. The driver of the truck was waving for WO1 to stop. WO1 saw another male in the passenger’s seat. The driver of the truck told WO1 that he nearly hit AP, who was walking in the middle of the road and wearing dark clothing. The driver told WO1 that he was not speeding, otherwise the driver thought he would have hit AP. WO1 asked the driver if he needed any further assistance, and he declined.

WO1 continued towards the detachment and did not notice anything of concern on his travels. WO1 did not have any concerns as a result of the interaction at the time.

Later, WO1 became aware of a reported hit-and-run by AP. WO1 and WO5 located AP and CW5 on the road. AP and CW5 told the officers that AP had been struck by a vehicle, however, both refused to tell them who hit AP. WO1 observed AP and CW5 to be intoxicated during their discussion. WO1 did not observe any injuries to AP or CW5 during their conversation.

WO1 did not learn that the driver of the truck was SO until the next day.

Witness Officer 2 (WO2)

IIU investigators interviewed WO2 on July 18, 2024, and were provided the following information:

WO2 was off-duty that day and received a call from WO3, suggesting that SO may have been involved in a hit-and-run. CW4 told WO2 that SO was identified as the driver of the truck and that AP was being flown to the hospital because of his injuries.

WO2 was informed that WO3 was taking statements from CW1 and CW3, who said SO told them about a near miss with AP. AP and CW5 told CW1 and CW3 that SO was the driver of the vehicle and that SO had asked AP not to report the incident.

WO2 located SO's truck and took photos of the vehicle. WO2 did not observe any damage to the vehicle. WO2 also had a discussion with CW2, who stated that he was with SO all evening, but nothing further was discussed.

WO2 was informed by CW4 that AP did not have any internal injuries.

Witness Officer 3 (WO3)

IIU investigators interviewed WO3 on March 19, 2024, and were provided the following information:

WO3 had to deal with another task before his involvement in the potential hit-and-run. WO3 met up with AP and CW5 before AP's flight to the hospital. During that time, AP told WO3 that individual "X" hit him, which was not SO. WO3 could not explain to IIU investigators why AP identified a different individual than SO.

WO3 then met with CW1 and CW3, who provided different information and identified SO as the driver that hit AP. CW1 and CW3 confirmed that AP told them that SO was the driver of the truck.

Witness Officer 4 (WO4)

IIU investigators interviewed WO4 on March 19, 2024, and were provided the following information:

WO4 confirmed that he was aware of a potential hit-and-run involving SO. WO4 met with AP and CW5, who were originally reluctant to speak about the incident because they knew SO was an officer.

WO4 advised AP and CW5 about the role of the IIU and attempted to build a rapport with them to talk about the matter more freely. AP advised WO4 that he was hit by a truck and that SO picked him up from the ground. AP told WO4 that SO might have slapped him after picking him up and that SO was asking AP not to report the incident. AP said that SO offered him anything not to report the incident, but confirmed that money was not expressly stated.

Witness Officer 5 (WO5)

IIU investigators interviewed WO5 on Aug. 8, 2024, and were provided the following information:

WO5 stated that CW5 called the detachment to report that AP had been hit by a vehicle, driven by SO. CW5 told WO5 that SO said “don’t tell on me. I’ll give you anything you want.” WO5 was informed that AP was okay and had left the scene. WO5 and WO1 had to attend to another call, which also involved AP. WO5 attempted to discuss the hit-and-run with AP and CW5, but they were too intoxicated to provide any relevant information. WO5 did not see any significant injuries on AP during their discussion.

Subject Officer

In accordance with his rights, SO declined to be interviewed by the IIU investigators.

Other evidence

CCTV

IIU investigators were able to review video of the exchange between WO2, CW2 and SO related to the photos of the vehicle. No audio was available.

CCTV cameras did not capture any incident as described by AP or reported by CW5.

Photos of the Truck

In reviewing the photos of SO’s vehicle, nothing of significance is noted.

Medical Reports

IIU investigators were unable to receive the medical reports as SO was not willing to participate in the investigation.

Applicable Law

Not applicable. No criminal charges can be assessed based on the evidence available at this time.

Conclusion

With the lack of cooperation from AP and the civilian witnesses, it is impossible to consider criminal charges against the subject officer. Therefore, no charges are recommended and the IIU investigation is now completed and closed.