



**IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO AN RCMP OFFICER-INVOLVED
SHOOTING IN NORWAY HOUSE**

FINAL REPORT OF THE CIVILIAN DIRECTOR
OF THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT

Acting Civilian Director:	Bruce M. Sychuk
IIU File Number:	2024-0056
Date of Release:	July 16 , 2025

Introduction

On Nov. 22, 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:

Excerpt from Part 7 Notification received on Nov. 22, 2024:

On November 22, 2024, Norway House RCMP received a call for service for a report of a youth, AP (17), high on pills and armed with a knife.

SO and WO1 attended the residence where AP was located outside on the driveway, armed with a knife. Members conveyed numerous commands to AP, instructing him to drop the knife, but he failed to comply. AP then proceeded to move towards the members with the knife in hand. This led to SO discharging his firearm. CPR was initiated and EMS was contacted. Despite life-saving efforts, AP was pronounced deceased.

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 RCMP, among other items:

- notes, narratives and reports of officers
- audio transmissions
- watch guard video
- video footage from the area
- use of force report
- medical reports

The civilian director designated one subject officer (SO) and three witness officers (WO1 to WO3). IIU investigators also received information from three civilian witnesses (CW1 to CW3). It should be noted that IIU investigators were able to identify further civilian witnesses in this matter. The individuals were unwilling or unable to participate, despite repeated efforts by the IIU to obtain further information.

Facts and Circumstances

Scene Examination

IIU investigators immediately attended the scene and began gathering evidence in relation to the incident. CCTV video of the area was copied and provided to IIU investigators. Further, IIU investigators canvassed the area for potential witnesses to the incident. Although some individuals were identified as potential witnesses, these individuals were unwilling or unable to participate.

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.

Interviews

Civilian Witnesses

Civilian Witness 1 (CW1)

CW1 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Nov. 22, 2024, and provided the following information:

CW1 was working at the time of the incident. The dispatch received a call about a young male walking around a residence with a large knife and scaring young children at the residence. CW1 confirmed that such a call would then be forwarded onto RCMP for police assistance.

CW1 confirmed that he was not the call taker on this matter, however, he was able to confirm the process for this type of call was followed by the call taker.

CW1 did not know at the time what members of the community were involved as he did not take the call. CW1 heard the next day what had happened in the community.

Civilian Witness 2 (CW2)

CW2 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Jan. 1, 2025, and provided the following information:

CW2 was having a cigarette when they heard noises of vehicles pulling up to the area and multiple doors shutting. CW2 was just trying to turn on their phone camera when they heard police officers yelling at somebody to stop, followed by what they believed was two gun shots.

CW2 was scared and was kneeling down to see what was going on in the area. CW2 saw three police officers in the area with their guns drawn. CW2 noted the time between the cars pulling up to the area and the gun shots to be very short in duration.

CW2 went back into their residence and told their siblings what had happened. All three were looking out the window where they could see an individual on the ground with officers providing CPR. CW2 did try to record parts of what they were observing on their phone, however, this was after the shooting had already occurred.

CW2 confirmed that the officers administered CPR to the individual before calling for an ambulance. CW2 heard someone say “he’s gone” before the ambulance was called for by police.

Civilian Witness 3 (CW3)

CW3 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Nov. 22, 2024, and provided the following information:

CW3 was working in the area at the time of the incident. CW3 saw two RCMP vehicles in the area and he drove over to see if they required any assistance. CW3 stepped out of his vehicle and was told by an officer to leave the area because it was now a crime scene. CW3 left the area as directed.

CW3 confirmed that he observed the officers at the scene to be in full RCMP uniform. CW3 did not see a body on the ground and did not know what had happened at the time he interacted with the officers.

Witness Officers

Witness Officer 1 (WO1)

WO1 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Jan. 27, 2025, and provided the following information:

WO1 was partnered with SO at the time of the incident. The two were originally assigned a less serious matter when a weapons call resulted in a re-assignment. Background information was that the male had a large knife and was scaring children at the residence.

WO1, SO, WO2 and WO3 went to the area. WO1 immediately saw AP as they parked the police vehicle. WO1 recalled that AP was looking straight at them and then started to reach into his jacket pocket. WO1 noticed that AP now had a large knife in his right hand, so WO1 yelled “Knife! Knife!” to alert his fellow officers of the risk.

WO1 and SO stepped out of the vehicle, drew their pistols and AP immediately started to advance towards them. WO1 directed AP to stop multiple times, but he did not comply. WO1 noted that AP switched his stare from WO1 to SO and started to advance in SO’s direction. Multiple directions to stop were given to AP without success, at which point WO1 heard two gunshots.

AP’s relative attempted to leave the residence to check on him, but WO1 directed them to stay in the residence. WO1 went around to the other side of his police vehicle where he saw AP on the ground near the vehicle. WO1 provided cover for WO2 and WO3 while they took AP into custody and then went into the residence to check on the well-being of the people inside. WO1 directed the residents to stay inside and then he went back to the scene to provide medical assistance to AP. WO1 was advised that AP’s weapon had been secured and placed in the back of a police vehicle.

WO1 observed a gunshot wound to AP’s chest and one to his neck area. WO1 applied dressing to his chest and observed AP to be responsive at that point. WO1 noted that while the officers continued medical assistance, AP became unresponsive and they requested an ambulance. Officers continued to provide medical assistance to AP until the ambulance arrived and paramedics took over care of AP. WO1 and SO remained at the scene while AP was taken away in the ambulance.

WO1 confirmed that he did not see who fired the two gunshots, however, he was aware that the shots came from the passenger’s side of his police vehicle, where SO would have been situated.

WO1 estimated that it was within seconds of arriving that AP started to advance towards the officers with the knife. WO1 estimated the entire incident was ten seconds in duration.

Witness Officer 2 (WO2)

WO2 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Jan. 27, 2025, and provided the following information:

WO2 confirmed that he was partnered with WO3 at the time of the incident. WO2 noted that they were reassigned to assist WO1 and SO with a weapons call. WO2 recalled the background information was that a suicidal male had taken a bunch of pills and was armed with a knife.

WO2 and WO3 arrived on-scene just behind WO1 and SO and parked their vehicle. WO2 immediately saw AP. WO2 exited his vehicle and heard SO yelling that AP had a knife. WO2 recalled that SO was yelling at AP “don’t do that” multiple times. WO2 saw AP charging at SO and went over to assist him just in case. WO2 estimated that he was five to seven feet away from SO when he heard two gunshots that were fired from SO’s pistol. WO2 had not seen the knife at this point and only recalled hearing SO saying that AP had a knife.

WO2 recalled that SO was slowly backing away from AP just before he fired his pistol. WO2 noted that AP was in very close proximity to SO and that the knife was located beside AP’s body on the ground. WO2 noted that AP was still moving on the ground after being shot.

WO2 switched from his pistol to a taser after AP was shot while they took AP into custody and initiated CPR. WO2 saw a bullet wound in AP’s chest and his neck. WO2 applied dressing to the neck wound while SO was caring for the chest wound. WO2 recalled that officers continued medical efforts while waiting for the ambulance.

WO2 went in the ambulance with AP on the way to the hospital. WO2 recalled that medical assistance was provided to AP until the doctor pronounced him dead at the hospital.

Witness Officer 3 (WO3)

WO3 was interviewed by IIU investigators on Jan. 27, 2025, and provided the following information:

WO3 confirmed he was partnered with WO2 and that they were assisting WO1 and SO on a weapons call. WO3 recalled the background information was that the male had taken a bunch of pills, was armed with a knife and was scaring people.

WO3 confirmed that they arrived at the scene just after WO1 and SO. WO3 stepped out of the vehicle and saw AP with a knife. WO3 immediately walked around his side of the vehicle to get to the other side because he believed this was a serious matter.

AP started to stagger towards SO with the knife in his hand. SO was saying “Don’t do that! Don’t do that!”. WO3 recalled all officers had their weapons drawn and that everything happened so quickly. WO3 recalled AP falling to the ground and that WO2 secured the knife, which was beside AP on the ground. WO3 confirmed that SO fired two shots. WO3 estimated the blade of the knife to be six inches in length.

WO3 confirmed that officers were trying to provide AP with medical assistance as he was still breathing. WO3 went into the nearby residence and grabbed a pillow and blanket for AP. WO3 recalled that the ambulance arrived soon after and took over caring for AP. WO3 followed the ambulance while his partner was inside the ambulance.

Subject Officer

In accordance with his rights, SO declined to be interviewed by IIU investigators. SO provided a statement to IIU investigators, which contained the following information:

SO confirmed that he was in full uniform and in a marked police vehicle on the date of the incident. SO confirmed that he was re-assigned to a weapons call with WO1 as his partner. SO saw AP outside the residence as they pulled into the driveway and parked.

SO noted that AP faced the officers and that he was holding a knife in his right hand. SO heard WO1 yelling “Knife! Knife!” and drew his pistol, pointing it at AP. SO yelled “Police! Drop the knife!”. SO commented that AP locked eyes with him and slowly started walking towards him with the knife in his hand. AP was halfway down a ramp when he transitioned from a walk into a sprint. SO stated that the entire time, he was yelling at AP to stop.

SO started walking backwards while still pointing his pistol at AP while he continued to run. SO estimated that AP was roughly five metres away from him when he fired his pistol twice. SO confirmed that he saw AP fall to the ground after being shot. SO commented that all four officers were in shock immediately after the shooting.

SO regained his composure and initiated medical assistance to AP. SO confirmed that they handcuffed AP and located his knife under his body after he was rolled over. SO confirmed that he saw a bullet wound in AP’s chest and neck area. SO confirmed that officers placed dressings on the wounds and gave other medical assistance while waiting for the ambulance. SO noted that as time passed, AP’s breathing and responses started to weaken. SO confirmed that he stepped aside once the ambulance arrived. SO stayed at the scene until it had been secured to the best of their ability while waiting for more officers to attend.

Other evidence

911 calls

Two phone calls were placed in relation to this matter. The first was AP’s family member stating that AP was high on pills, walking around the house with a knife and that younger family members were present. The second call was from a different family member stating that AP had attempted suicide. Officers were on-scene by the time the second call was received.

Medical reports

The autopsy noted the cause of death as multiple gunshot wounds. The toxicology report noted a trace amount of cannabis in AP’s blood stream, along with a high dose of acetaminophen.

Video footage

All video footage was reviewed by IIU investigators. Most of the footage was unremarkable because of the quality of the footage or the distance from the scene. The watchguard video footage provided the following:

1. AP can be seen in all black reaching into a pocket or waistband for something.
2. AP starts to shuffle his feet down a ramp towards the officers.
3. AP starts to pick up speed as he nears the bottom of the ramp.
4. AP has a large knife in his right hand as he passes by the police vehicle.

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.

The actual shooting occurs out of the camera's view.

Photo of AP's Knife



Knife is approximately twelve inches in length with the blade being approximately eight inches in length

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,*

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.

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

Having reviewed all the evidence available in connection with the relevant case law, the civilian director is of the opinion the actions of the subject officer were reasonable, under these tragic circumstances. Therefore, no charges are recommended and the IIU investigation is now completed and closed.

