



**IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO AN OFFICER-INVOLVED  
SHOOTING RELATED TO RCMP ARREST NEAR GYPSUMVILLE**

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

Acting Civilian Director:	Bruce M. Sychuk
IIU File Number:	2024-0054
Date of Release:	April 15 , 2025

## **Introduction**

On Oct. 24, 2024, 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 Oct. 25, 2024:

*On October 24, 2024, Gypsumville RCMP were on patrol looking for a vehicle reported stolen out of Thompson. They located the vehicle and attempted to perform a traffic stop. AP refused to stop and the vehicle initially fled. After a short pursuit, AP exited the stolen vehicle with a firearm and attempted to carjack a stopped vehicle. AP pointed a gun at a member of the public and SO discharged his firearm, striking AP. AP was then able to get into the stopped car and drive short distance before coming to a stop in a ditch. Police arrested AP and requested EMS. Members performed first aid on AP until EMS arrived.*

*AP was involved in a robbery in Thompson earlier in the day which involved stolen vehicles. AP was believed to be in possession of a firearm.*

As this matter concerned injuries 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 video
- cell surveillance
- forensic evidence from the scene of the shooting

The civilian director designated one subject officer (SO) and two witness officers (WO1 to WO2). IIU investigators also received information from eight civilian witnesses (CW1 to CW8).

## **Facts and Circumstances**

### **Scene Examination**

IIU investigators attended the scene and observed two bullet casings along with the two vehicles AP had driven during the incident. The investigators canvassed the area for potential witnesses or video footage without success.

### **Interviews**

#### **Affected Person**

IIU investigators attempted to obtain a statement from AP on Oct. 28, 2024. Unfortunately, AP declined to participate in the process.

*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.*

## **Civilian Witnesses**

### Civilian Witness 1 (CW1)

CW1 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Oct. 25, 2024, and provided the following information:

CW1 was driving on the highway when he saw multiple police vehicles, with their sirens activated, blocking the highway. CW1 considered driving around the vehicles when he saw AP waving at him to stop. CW1 thought that AP might have been driving an unmarked police vehicle so he rolled down his window.

AP asked CW1 for cigarettes, at which point CW1 saw what appeared to be the muzzle of a long gun on AP's arm. AP threatened to shoot CW1 and instructed him to put his vehicle in park and move over to the passenger's side. CW1 exited the vehicle, heard two shots and ducked behind his vehicle. CW1 thought AP was shooting at him. CW1 then saw AP drive away erratically and then hit the ditch soon after. CW1 confirmed that he did not actually see a weapon on AP.

### Civilian Witness 2 (CW2)

CW2 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Oct. 29, 2024, and provided the following information:

CW2 had an interaction with AP before the shooting incident. AP was driving a government vehicle, but he appeared unfamiliar with the usual processes in place for such a vehicle. CW2 recalled AP making a comment that AP was on a "coke run." CW2 was suspicious of AP, so he informed CW6 and called CW7 to report his concerns.

CW7 confirmed that the vehicle had been reported stolen earlier and that CW7 had called the police. CW2 noted that AP's hands appeared to be injured and that AP's demeanour was agitated. CW2 and CW6 stood outside and watched AP drive away.

### Civilian Witness 3 (CW3)

CW3 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Oct. 25, 2024, and provided the following information:

CW3 and CW4 were grabbing food when they saw a utility truck being pursued by police. The vehicle evaded police officers near the post office and made a U-turn onto the highway. CW4 used CW3's phone to record the incident.

CW3 saw the truck and the police vehicles stopped on the highway. Officers were now out of the vehicle with their guns drawn. The truck moved towards a black vehicle with the officers following on foot.

CW3 saw CW1 jump out of the black car and he appeared to be visibly upset. After the vehicle went into the ditch, CW1 told CW3 that AP had carjacked him and pointed an object at him. CW1 told CW3 that he believed AP's gunshots were directed at CW1.

CW3 recalled AP exiting the vehicle in the ditch with his hands up. AP was noted to be bleeding. Police came to view CW3's camera footage, asking CW1 if AP pointed a shotgun at him. CW3

recalled that CW1 stated that AP pointed a black case containing a tire iron at CW1. CW3 and CW4 remained with CW1 for a period of time at the request of the police.

#### Civilian Witness 4 (CW4)

CW4 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Oct. 25, 2024, and provided the following information:

CW4 confirmed he was in the area of the incident grabbing food. CW4 observed the police attempt to pull over a truck, but it evaded the officers and turned onto the highway. CW4 confirmed that they followed the officers and saw the truck stopped and the officers out of the vehicle with guns drawn.

CW4 saw the truck move towards a smaller vehicle, but his view was blocked to see if anyone entered the smaller vehicle. CW4 noticed an individual exit the smaller car. CW4 confirmed that police were giving verbal directions, but he couldn't hear exactly what they were saying. CW4 heard what he thought was a gunshot, followed by the smaller vehicle accelerating and swerving into the ditch. CW4 saw the officers arrest the individual who was in the vehicle in the ditch.

CW4 confirmed that CW1 informed him that AP demanded cigarettes and threatened him with a weapon to move over in his vehicle. CW4 did see a leather case that would be used for a tire iron on the road.

#### Civilian Witness 5 (CW5)

CW5 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Oct. 25, 2024, and provided the following information:

CW5 reported a suspicious man driving a government truck. The male did not have knowledge of how a fleet vehicle was processed with respect to refuelling. CW5 consulted CW6, who contacted CW7 who reported the matter to the RCMP.

CW5 confirmed that AP returned to the garage in the truck while RCMP were present. Officers were giving directions to AP, which he ignored. AP evaded the officers and fled on the highway.

CW5 went back to review the surveillance footage and noticed that AP originally attended the garage with a female passenger, but she did not re-enter the vehicle when AP left the garage the first time.

#### Civilian Witness 6 (CW6)

CW6 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Oct. 29, 2024, and provided the following information:

CW6 confirmed that CW5 alerted her to a suspicious male driving a government truck. CW6 observed AP attempting to put the wrong type of fuel into the truck's fuel tank. CW6 confirmed that CW7 contacted RCMP to investigate.

CW6 confirmed that AP re-attended the garage to fuel up the truck, but CW6 had locked the fuel tanks. RCMP were present and gave commands to AP, which he ignored, and fled onto the highway.

CW6 reviewed the surveillance footage and confirmed that a female passenger was present when AP originally attended the garage.

#### Civilian Witness 7 (CW7)

CW7 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Oct. 29, 2024, and provided the following information:

CW7 confirmed he was informed about the suspicious driver by CW2 at the garage. CW7 contacted RCMP after receiving information from his supervisor that the truck had been reported stolen. CW7 told CW6 to stay away from AP and the truck after he found out it was stolen.

CW7 was not present at the scene of the incident.

#### Civilian Witness 8 (CW8)

CW8 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Oct. 24, 2024, and provided the following information:

CW8 met AP the night before while in an intoxicated state. CW8 agreed to join AP for a ride. CW8 did not know the vehicle was stolen. CW8 requested that AP take her home, which he refused to do.

When the vehicle stopped at the garage, CW8 left the vehicle and hid behind a building and then went and used the washroom. When CW8 exited the washroom, AP and the truck were gone. CW8 confirmed hearing police give directions to AP such as “put your hands in the air,” but she did not hear or see any response by AP to the directions.

### **Witness Officers**

#### Witness Officer 1 (WO1)

WO1 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Jan. 9, 2025, and provided the following information:

WO1 was partnered with WO2 on the date of the incident. They were tasked to attend the garage to deal with a suspicious male driving a government truck. WO1 confirmed that further information was received advising the officer that the truck was stolen, and the driver had been involved in an armed robbery the previous day.

WO1 and WO2 attended the garage after AP and the truck had left and were receiving background information when the truck reattended the garage. Despite commands to AP to stop he ignored them and fled in the truck onto the highway. WO1 and WO2 followed AP’s truck in a low-speed pursuit. WO1 believed that AP waved a sawed-off shotgun in the direction of the officers while fleeing.

SO arrived on scene to provide further assistance to WO1 and WO2. AP eventually stopped the truck near CW1’s vehicle and threatened CW1 at gunpoint. SO then fired his gun, wounding AP as he attempted to flee in CW1’s vehicle. CW1’s vehicle accelerated and swerved to get away from the officers, but the vehicle spun out into the ditch soon after.

WO2 arrested AP and then provided medical care to him. WO1 confirmed that CW1 advised the officers that AP had threatened him with a short black pump action shotgun. WO1 secured the scene and did not actually see any weapon.

#### Witness Officer 2 (WO2)

WO2 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Jan. 13, 2025, and provided the following information:

WO2 confirmed that he was assigned to investigate a stolen vehicle. WO2 confirmed that background information suggested that the driver had been involved in an armed robbery the previous day.

WO2 confirmed that they were able to locate AP's truck and attempted a traffic stop. WO2 was armed with a carbine rifle. He directed AP to exit and then step away from the vehicle. AP ignored the direction, re-entered the truck and fled. WO2 confirmed that during the pursuit, they continued to direct AP to stop his vehicle.

WO2 confirmed that SO joined the pursuit to assist in AP's arrest. SO reported that AP had pointed a gun at the officers. AP stopped the truck near CW1's vehicle and WO2 observed what appeared to be a shotgun pointed towards the officers.

WO2 confirmed that the officers stepped out of their vehicle with their guns drawn. Officers continued to demand AP to stop and exit the vehicle. AP exited the truck and was pointing what appeared to be a shotgun at CW1. SO discharged his weapon, striking AP.

AP attempted to flee the scene in CW1's vehicle, but he spun out into the ditch. WO2 observed AP to be significantly injured and provided medical care to AP after he was arrested. AP stated to WO2 that he wanted to die and asked the officer to stop providing medical care. AP then stated to WO2 that "it was not a real gun." WO2 confirmed that a search of the scene did not produce a shotgun. WO2 confirmed that a black bag with two tubes in it appeared to be part of an imitation weapon.

#### **Subject Officer**

In accordance with his rights, SO declined to be interviewed by IIU investigators. SO, however, did provide his notes, which stated the following:

SO confirmed that he attended to the scene to assist WO1 and WO2. SO was aware that AP may have been involved in an armed robbery the previous day.

SO observed AP driving the stolen truck and attempted to stop AP from fleeing, by placing his vehicle in front of AP's truck. SO stepped out of his vehicle and drew his gun while directing AP to stop. AP was able to maneuver the truck around SO's vehicle and get onto the highway.

SO confirmed that all officers followed AP in their vehicle with sirens activated. SO confirmed that direction was given to AP to stop over the loud speaker. SO recalled that AP stated he "wanted to talk." AP, however, did not stop his vehicle at this point and the pursuit continued.

A few hundred metres later, AP stopped his vehicle. SO exited his vehicle with his pistol drawn and yelled for AP to exit his vehicle. AP leaned out the driver's window and pointed what appeared to be a shotgun in the direction of the officers.

AP moved his vehicle forward a couple hundred metres, with officers following on foot with weapons drawn. SO switched from his pistol to a carbine rifle and positioned himself on the passenger's side of his police vehicle. AP's truck blocked CW1's vehicle from passing.

SO heard AP state to CW1 "I'm going to fucking shoot you" and was observed to be with the shotgun pointing out of his window. AP exited his vehicle and went towards CW1's vehicle with the shotgun in his hands. SO discharged two bullets, allowing CW1 to escape, while AP tried to drive away in CW1's vehicle. The vehicle spun out into the ditch after driving a short distance.

After AP was arrested by WO2 and WO2 provided medical assistance, SO observed a black bag with a metal pole inside at the scene. SO believed that the bag would appear to look like a shotgun when rolled up in someone's hands. SO confirmed that no one touched the black bag.

### **Other evidence**

#### **Video Footage**

In reviewing the video footage available, it is clear that officers were in pursuit of AP in the stolen truck. You can see CW1's vehicle coming in the opposite direction and being stopped by AP's vehicle blocking its way. There is an interaction between AP and CW1 while in their respective vehicles, followed by AP exiting his vehicle. The footage point of view is not entirely clear, however, you can see CW1 flee his vehicle and AP enter.

Officers can be seen with their weapons drawn. You can not hear exactly what officers are saying in the video, however, it is clear that the officers are giving commands to AP. As AP moves towards CW1's vehicle, you can hear the witness on the video comment that shots have been fired. This is followed by CW1's vehicle driving away from the scene in a very erratic manner until it spins out into the ditch. Officers attend to AP while he exits CW1's vehicle. It looks as if AP is injured.

### **Applicable Law**

All relevant sections of the Criminal Code of Canada were considered with respect to this incident. Sections 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,*

*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**

It is my view that, in the full consideration of the circumstances of this incident, the use of force by the subject officer was authorized and justified by law. There are no reasonable grounds to support any charges against the subject officer. Therefore, no charges are recommended and the IIU investigation is now completed and closed.