IIU | INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT OF MANITOBA

IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO AN OFFICER-INVOLVED SHOOTING DURING WPS ARREST

FINAL REPORT OF THE CIVILIAN DIRECTOR

OF THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT

Acting Civilian Director:	Bruce M. Sychuk
IIU File Number:	2025-0019
Date of Release:	June 1, 2026

Introduction

On April 11, 2025, the Winnipeg Police Service (WPS) 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 April 11, 2025:

On Friday, April 11, 2025, Winnipeg Police Communications Centre received a report of a possible impaired driver who had just exited a parking lot on Portage Avenue. The initial report indicated that the male and female occupants had been observed smoking a pipe, and that the driver had trouble speaking and could hardly walk. The vehicle was described as a red truck.

This vehicle was the subject of an earlier medical call for service on Toronto Street. Background information was two people "passed out" in a red Ford F250 pick-up truck. Winnipeg Fire and Paramedic crews attended the original call for service. This same vehicle was subsequently reported as stolen.

SO1 and SO2 observed the stolen vehicle on Home Street between Portage Avenue and St. Mathews Avenue. They positioned their vehicle across the street to prevent the stolen vehicle from fleeing. The driver of the stolen vehicle then reversed, striking a civilian vehicle that was behind it. The driver then drove towards the police vehicle. SO1 and SO2 were outside of their cruiser car, which resulted in the officers discharging their firearms. The truck mounted the east boulevard of Home Street in an effort to escape from the scene, then proceeded north bound on Home Street towards St. Mathews Avenue.

Later, the stolen vehicle was struck by a police vehicle, subsequently losing control and crashing into the residence on Home Street. The collision resulted in a fire which spread to a large fuel tank located in the bed of the pick-up truck, which subsequently exploded igniting the house and the truck on fire.

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

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

The civilian director designated two subject officers (SO1 to SO2) and one witness officer (WO1). IIU investigators also received information from sixteen civilian witnesses (CW1 to CW16), including three professional witnesses. One AP cooperated with investigators while one AP refused, and one AP could not be located despite repeated efforts.

Facts and Circumstances

Scene Examination and Canvass

IIU investigators canvassed the area for further witnesses and video footage and were successful.

Interviews

Affected Persons

Affected Person 1 (AP1)

IIU investigators interviewed AP1 on April 16, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

AP1 confirmed that he was present in the red truck and seated in the front passenger's seat. He did not know the driver (AP2) and stated AP3 was in the back seat behind the driver. AP1 noted that the police had blocked the street with a marked police vehicle without the lights activated. AP2 tried to reverse the truck, but he hit something behind them, so they started to drive forward.

AP1 stated that as the truck went forward, the police started shooting at them, so he ducked down. He stated that they were on the boulevard when the police started to shoot at them and the intent was to go around them, so they could flee the area. He believed that they fired eight or nine times, but acknowledged that he was more focused on ducking down to avoid getting hit.

Soon after, the truck was rammed by a police vehicle and while they tried to evade arrest, the truck collided with a house. AP1 tried to flee on foot after the truck collided with the house but police arrested him at gun point soon after.

AP1 confirmed that police were yelling at them before firing their pistols, but he did not know what they were saying. AP1 suffered minor cuts to his chin. He stated AP2 did not say anything before he tried to flee from the police.

AP1confirmed that he had consumed meth before the IIU interview.

Affected Person 2 (AP2)

IIU investigators attempted to interview AP2 on June 16, 2025, and he made it clear that he would not participate in our investigation.

Affected Person 3 (AP3)

Despite repeated efforts, IIU investigators could not locate AP3 for an interview.

Civilian Witnesses

Civilian Witness 1 (CW1)

IIU investigators interviewed CW1 on April 14, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW1 was outside having a smoke when he heard roughly 12 or 13 gunshots fired at a red truck. CW1 ran back inside once the shots were fired. CW1 gave IIU investigators a video he had taken with his phone.

Civilian Witness 2 (CW2)

IIU investigators interviewed CW2 on April 14, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW2 was in his residence when he could hear outside voices yelling, “Stop the truck! Get out of the vehicle with your hands up!” He heard that statement twice before he ran downstairs and saw a red truck back into another vehicle. CW2 could not originally see the police vehicle that was blocking the street in front of the red truck. As he was coming down the stairs, he could hear gunshots, but he did not know it was police firing their guns because he could not see them from inside his residence.

CW2 went outside his residence, and he was going to film or take photos of what was happening with his phone. He could now see two officers holster their pistols and get back into their vehicle to chase the truck. He confirmed that he did not see any officer fire their pistol and only heard noises that he assumed were gunshots.

CW2 confirmed that he was concerned the gunshots would hit his residence when he was still in the house. His son was also present during the incident and was yelling for CW2 as he was running into the residence.

CW2 confirmed that he saw two police officers enter a marked police vehicle with the lights activated but no siren. He could not see any of the occupants of the truck.

Civilian Witness 3 (CW3)

IIU investigators interviewed CW3 on April 14, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW3 was eating dinner in her residence when she heard shouting outside. She saw a red truck and police officers standing outside their police vehicle. She heard the officers yell, “get out of the truck”. The truck then reversed, hit something and went forward quickly. At this point, police opened fire at the truck. She estimated seven or eight shots were fired. The truck went around the police vehicle on the boulevard and went out of her view.

Civilian Witness 4 (CW4)

IIU investigators interviewed CW4 on April 14, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW4 was with his dog when he saw a marked police vehicle in front of his residence. He saw two officers with their guns drawn, yelling, “Stop! Get out of the vehicle!” CW4 saw a red truck reverse and hit a vehicle behind it. The truck had a brief pause before it moved forward and climbed the boulevard to evade the police. At this point, the police opened fire on the truck as it passed their police vehicle. CW4 estimated hearing 12 to 15 shots and seeing ten bullet casings on the ground. He saw the driver’s side and passenger windows shatter as the shots were fired. CW4 noted two occupants in the vehicle, but he was unable to provide any description.

CW4 noted that one of the bullets fired by the officers struck his residence. WPS forensics confirmed that a bullet struck the residence.

Civilian Witness 5 (CW5)

IIU investigators interviewed CW5 on April 14, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW5 was in the shower when she heard shots being fired. She dried off quickly and looked out the window where she saw a red truck speeding down the road, followed by a crash and then visible smoke. She could also hear a voice yelling and she thought it was a young boy's voice.

Civilian Witness 6 (CW6)

IIU investigators interviewed CW6 on April 17, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW6 was on the porch of his residence when he saw two police vehicles in the middle of the road. They were at an angle to block a red truck from going anywhere. Suddenly, the red truck screeched its tires and backed into a car before it started to move towards the police vehicles to escape.

CW6 noted that two police officers had their guns drawn as they exited their vehicle. They yelled, "Get out with your hands up!". As the truck started moving towards them, they aimed their guns at the truck and started yelling, "Stop!" and "Get out with your hands up!". The truck started to drive up the boulevard and shots were fired with glass shattering everywhere. CW6 saw children running into their houses for safety.

He believed that the police did not shoot at the truck until it had moved roughly the same distance as three houses towards them. He felt the truck was roughly six feet from being parallel to the officers before they discharged their guns. They stopped firing at the truck once it went past them onto the boulevard and then back on the street.

CW6 was shocked that no one on the street was injured, because he noted children and individuals walking their dogs in the general area of the shots the police fired.

Civilian Witness 7 (CW7)

IIU investigators interviewed CW7 on April 15, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW7 was in her bedroom when she heard a male voice yelling aggressively. She did not know what was being said, but she went to her window and saw a red truck back into a black car. Originally, CW7 thought it was just a road rage incident, but then she saw a police vehicle with two officers standing outside of it. The truck started moving forward and she heard the police yelling something before they fired their guns seven to ten times at the truck. She believed the shots were fired as the truck was close or just passing the officers. The officers just stood there for a few seconds after the truck had passed by them and it went back onto the street.

Civilian Witness 8 (CW8)

IIU investigators interviewed CW8 on April 15, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW8 heard someone yelling and went to her front porch to see what was going on. She observed two officers out of their vehicle with guns drawn and pointed at a red truck. CW8 noted that in

the area, there were children playing, people walking their dogs and other individuals either biking or walking.

CW8 confirmed that she heard the police directing multiple times for the people in the truck to get out of the vehicle and to stop the truck and exit with their hands up. She confirmed the truck backed into a vehicle behind it and then drove forward towards the boulevard to avoid and escape the police. She confirmed that both officers discharged their guns at the truck. She believed that both officers shot their guns at the truck until they had emptied their respective clips.

CW8 noted that the individuals in the truck did not appear to have any weapons in their hands and were not shooting back at the officers. She said that two individuals were in the front seat with a female in the passenger's seat. She stated that the red truck went up the boulevard in front of her house as police discharged their guns. She confirmed the red truck drove past the officers and a short while later, she saw smoke and heard sirens. She assumed that the truck had hit something.

CW8 was extremely critical of the officers discharging their guns. She said that she was shocked she wasn't shot or her neighbour wasn't shot because they were roughly 20 feet away from where the officers were firing their guns. She was critical that police decided to deploy their guns when there were civilians in the area, including children in the same area. She noted that she yelled at the officers after they had stopped shooting their guns before they got back into their vehicle. She was amazed that no one was injured by a stray bullet. It made her wonder if the police were even using real bullets.

Civilian Witness 9 (CW9)

IIU investigators interviewed CW9 on April 15, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW9 was preparing supper while her children were outside with other children in the area. She stepped out of her door and saw a marked police vehicle with the lights activated and a red truck in front of the police vehicle.

CW9 told all the children to get into the house. As the last child was about to enter the residence, the officers started to fire at the red truck. The red truck drove past her residence while the police were firing at it. She stated that the shots were continuous, and she estimated hearing ten shots. She confirmed that she heard police yelling at the people in the truck before they discharged their guns, but she could not make out what they said. She could only identify the driver of the truck as a male.

Civilian Witness 10 (CW10)

IIU investigators interviewed CW10 on April 17, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW10 was on his porch with a friend when he saw police vehicles coming from the north. He then saw a red truck back into a black vehicle. He started to film the incident, so the black car could provide it to their insurance company, because he suspected the red truck was going to drive away.

CW10 saw two officers outside their vehicle. He noted that the red truck started to move forward "pretty fast," and he thought for sure that the truck would hit the officer's vehicle. He estimated that the truck was roughly three feet away from the officers when they started to discharge their guns. He confirmed that both officers were discharging their guns, and he commented that children were playing in the area. He estimated the officers fired their guns ten times.

CW10 noted that the police vehicle had its lights activated. He confirmed that the police were yelling at the red truck before firing their guns, but he did not know what they were saying. He confirmed that a few minutes after the police vehicles left the scene, he saw fire and smoke coming from a house and assumed the truck hit the house.

Civilian Witness 11 (CW11)

IIU investigators interviewed CW11 on April 30, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW11 was double parked and waiting for a friend when she heard roughly fourteen shots in the area in front of her. She went to park and saw a red truck driving with a police vehicle following it. She noted the truck was making some erratic moves trying to evade the police. The truck went up a back alley, the police followed and then she heard an explosion. She confirmed that the police vehicle was marked and that their lights and sirens were activated.

Civilian Witness 12 (CW12)

IIU investigators interviewed CW12 on May 23, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW12 was in her vehicle, behind a red truck, with her children in the back seat. She saw the police vehicle coming towards them and thought they were going to drive by when the vehicle pulled in front of the truck. The passenger's side officer got out of the vehicle with his gun drawn and pointed at the truck. She confirmed that the officer was yelling, "get out of the truck, get out of the truck!" She did not hear anyone in the truck respond.

The truck started to back up, so she started to back up her vehicle to avoid a collision. The truck backed into her twice. She noted that the truck was a lot higher than her vehicle. She believed that it would have caused significantly more damage and potential injury if she had not backed up. She estimated that the truck backed up the distance of three houses before it collided with the front of her vehicle.

CW12 said that after it hit her, the truck accelerated towards the officers while they pointed their guns at it. She thought the truck was going to hit the officers' vehicle until she heard the shots being fired. She confirmed that the truck went to go around the police vehicle while the shots were being fired. CW12 confirmed that both officers were out of the vehicle with their guns drawn. She could not see from her view if both officers were discharging their guns. She was confident that the passenger's side officer fired his gun. She estimated hearing fifteen to twenty shots being fired. She confirmed that the truck was able to get around the officer's vehicle and that the officers went back into their vehicle to follow the truck. CW12 noted that she was quite frazzled after the incident and that some civilians came up to her vehicle to see if she was okay.

CW12 recalled that the truck had a huge gas container in the bed. She was shocked that the officers decided to fire their guns because there were children and civilians in the area and that

the gas container could have caused a huge explosion if they had hit it with a bullet. She felt the officers should have sacrificed the police vehicle instead of firing their guns with all the civilians in the area and the risk of an explosion.

Civilian Witness 13 (CW13)

IIU investigators interviewed CW13 on May 23, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW13 was in her kitchen preparing supper when she felt something hit her house. She went out her back door and saw a police officer in the back lane yelling at someone to get on the ground. She then saw flames coming from the side of her house and the officer was directing her to get out of the house. CW13could not exit her backyard without key, and she wasn't going to go back into her house to get them. Then she heard an explosion and assumed it was her gas line or meter. She stated it looked like a blow torch coming from her basement window area.

Another officer attended and pushed the gate open and took her out of the yard. CW13 was concerned for her animals, but he advised her that she was his priority at this moment. She was ushered to the front of the house when she heard the second explosion. When she was at the front of the house, she saw the truck with the gas tank in the back of the bed had hit her house.

Civilian Witness 14 (CW14)

IIU investigators interviewed CW14 on May 29, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW14 was part of the crew with CW15 and CW16. They were tasked with assisting a driver of a red truck, who was slumped over the wheel of the vehicle in the middle of a back lane. CW14 saw the driver and the passenger both slumped over in the front with drug paraphernalia on the dash. They stated that they ensured that the driver was not suffering some other kind of emergency despite the likely explanation being drug use.

CW14 confirmed that the driver regained consciousness. They explained to the driver that the keys for the vehicle would be at the station and they could pick it up once they were in a better condition. The driver said he had a friend a few doors down that could come and move the vehicle out of the back lane. The captain took the information from the individual who attended and gave them the keys to move the vehicle. This individual confirmed that he would take care of it.

CW14 confirmed that the station was updated and that they should contact police. He confirmed that the two individuals located in the truck did not want to provide them with any names. He confirmed that medical assistance was only provided to the driver.

Civilian Witness 15 (CW15)

IIU investigators interviewed CW15 on May 29, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW15 confirmed that they were asked to check on the individuals in the red truck. He noted that the truck had its hazards on and was parked in the middle of the back lane. Both individuals in the front of the vehicle were slouched over sleeping. He noted drug paraphernalia on the console.

After they verbally aroused the two individuals, he noted that both showed signs of being intoxicated and were unco-operative, not willing to provide their names and swearing at them.

CW15 confirmed that he gave the driver some Narcan, which seemed to rouse him. Both individuals were rejecting medical assistance. CW15 confirmed that originally, they were uncomfortable with these two individuals driving the vehicle because of their condition. He confirmed that the homeowner came to the truck and assured the crew that he would take care of the two individuals. CW16 provided the homeowner with the keys to the truck. The homeowner told the crew that these two were helping him move into the residence. CW15 confirmed that police were not at the scene.

Civilian Witness 16 (CW16)

IIU investigators interviewed CW16 on May 29, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW16 confirmed that they were asked to assist an unresponsive male. He saw two individuals slouched over in the front of the truck and a crack pipe on the seat. He confirmed that they roused the two individuals with verbal stimuli and that they became uncooperative. CW16 confirmed that the keys were removed from the truck and that they tried to convince both individuals to go to the hospital to be checked out. He confirmed that an ambulance and the police were called.

CW16 confirmed that they went to a residence and an individual spoke with the crew, assuring them he would take care of the individuals from the vehicle. This individual gave the crew his name and contact number, so they gave him the keys. He confirmed that the crew left the area before the police arrived.

NOTE: this crew dealt with the red truck earlier in the day and in advance of the shooting incident.

Witness Officer

Witness Officer 1 (WO1)

IIU investigators interviewed WO1 on Aug. 11, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

WO1 recalled that paramedics had asked for police to investigate a suspected impaired driver. The background information was that the driver received doses of Narcan and then drove away from the scene. Further information confirmed that the truck was stolen. Another call came in about an impaired driver in a red truck in the same area. WO1 was going to another incident when she heard over the radio that shots had been fired.

WO1 activated her lights and sirens and went to assist with the fleeing truck. She came upon the truck, it went down a back lane and she followed it. She made the decision to contact the individuals in the truck to stop them from evading arrest. The front of her vehicle contacted the rear passenger's quarter panel of the truck, which caused it to fish tail and drive into the side of a house, striking the gas line. The collision sparked a fire from the gas line that looked like a flame thrower. WO1 called for assistance.

Both passengers in the front of the truck exited the vehicle from the passenger's side door. WO1 was able to direct both individuals to the ground and tell them they were under arrest. Originally, both individuals complied, however, the driver decided to flee. WO1 handcuffed the female and radioed for assistance for the escaped accused.

The owner of the residence came out to see what was going on and WO1 directed the owner to evacuate her home. She noted that SO1 went to reverse her police vehicle, so it was not damaged in the fire because the flames were too big for her to access her vehicle.WO1 recalled hearing on the radio that the male suspect had been located.

WO1 handed the female suspect over to another unit. SO1 gave her the keys to her police vehicle. He stated that he and SO2 left the shooting incident to provide her with assistance. She noted that fire trucks and ambulances arrived on scene soon after. WO1 did not talk to SO2 and did not attend the scene of the shooting.

Subject Officers

Subject Officer 1 (SO1)

In accordance with his rights, SO1 declined to be interviewed by IIU investigators. SO1 gave investigators a prepared statement that provided the following information:

SO1 confirmed that he was tasked with locating a stolen red truck that might be driven by an impaired individual. He confirmed that he blocked the path of the truck with his police vehicle. The lights were activated on the vehicle as he exited the vehicle with his pistols drawn in the low ready position. SO1 stated that he drew his pistol in hopes that it would coerce the driver to comply. He stated that in his experience, seeing a firearm makes most suspects comply.

SO1 confirmed that he gave verbal directions to the driver of the truck to stop the vehicle and to exit with his hands up. He saw the vehicle reverse at a high rate of speed, hitting the vehicle behind it. He confirmed that the vehicle behind the truck also reversed and was honking at the truck. He thought the truck might be hooked on the front hood of the vehicle it just reversed into, so he started to move towards the truck. He was afraid the driver would now attempt to flee on foot.

The truck then switched gears and started to drive forwards. SO1 was terrified and believed that the driver was aiming the truck at him directly and would use it as a weapon. He felt trapped and did not have the ability to escape the path of the truck. Fearing for his, his partner's and the public's safety, he fired his gun to stop the threat. SO1 stated that before shooting his firearm, he surveyed the area and did not see any risk to any civilians if he fired his gun.

SO1 confirmed that SO2 also fired his gun at the truck. He stated that the truck only veered away from striking the officers after they had discharged their pistols. He felt that his partner was still at serious risk of danger, even as the vehicle began to mount the boulevard.

SO1 confirmed that the truck sped away and that he heard a frantic call over the radio. He did not know if there were any other police vehicles in the area, so he decided to assist and left the shooting scene with SO2. He said the entire incident felt like time had slowed down.

Subject Officer 2 (SO2)

In accordance with his rights, SO2 declined to be interviewed by IIU investigators. SO2 gave investigators with a prepared statement and his notes, which provided the following information:

SO2 confirmed that the red truck was the stolen truck they were looking for when they parked in front of it on the street. He commented that there was a black vehicle behind the truck that was blocking it in from behind. He observed the driver to be smoking a cigarette and said that he appeared to be unfazed by the situation.

SO1 exited the vehicle and drew his pistol, instructing the driver to get out of the truck. As he was exiting the vehicle, the truck reversed at a high rate of speed into the black vehicle behind it. It looked like the truck was now hooked up on the front of the black vehicle.

SO2 was concerned that the driver had intentionally reversed into the vehicle behind it and it was still pointed directly at the police vehicle. He was afraid that if the truck went forward, he and his partner would be in imminent danger. SO1 was still yelling at the driver to stop the vehicle, but the driver did not comply.

The truck then started to drive towards them at a high rate of speed. SO2 saw his background quickly and saw that it was clear. He then discharged his firearm approximately eight times, taking aim at the driver because he feared for his life. He felt the truck was a lethal threat as it drove forward. He stopped shooting once he felt the truck was no longer a lethal threat.

SO2 confirmed that he heard an officer requesting assistance over the radio. They attended to the house that was hit by the truck and flames were engulfing the house and truck. SO2 believed the entire incident happened in mere seconds.

Other evidence

Video Footage

In reviewing the video footage available, the following comments can be made:

1. The police vehicle stopped approximately six feet in front of the red truck. The lights were activated.
2. The officers gave verbal directions to the individuals in the truck to stop and show their hands. The officers were out of their police vehicle with their firearms pointed at the truck.
3. The truck reversed into the black car behind it. The black car was also backing up from the truck and honked its horn.
4. The truck damaged the black car and then proceeded to drive forward.
5. Initially, the truck drove forward a few feet, but then started to move towards the boulevard to flee and go around the police vehicle.
6. In the video, you could hear approximately 16 gunshots fired at the truck. Some of the shots appeared to be fired while the vehicle was on the boulevard and either parallel or just passing the officers.
7. The shots were fired in a total of less than four seconds.
8. The truck hopped the boulevard and managed to get around the police vehicle and drove away. You could see the passenger's side window break because of the gunshots.

9. An officer radioed that shots had been fired.

Use of Force Report

The IIU retained the services of a use of force expert to assist in understanding the subject officers' actions. The author of the report deemed that the subject officers' use of force was reasonable, necessary and proportionate when measured against the actions of similarly-trained officers in Canada. The author made it clear that it is reasonable for an officer to discharge their weapon for a brief period once the threat may have passed. He suggested that although the mind has decided the threat has passed, there is a delay to the motor skills to the same effect. It is referred to as a response inhibition lag.

Applicable Law

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

The subject officers confirmed that the truck was stolen and attempted to block the vehicle from being able to drive forward. They gave verbal directions to the driver to stop and get out of the vehicle. They also drew their firearms to pressure the driver to comply. The driver did not comply and attempted to flee by reversing the truck without success, because it hit the vehicle behind it. The vehicle behind the truck was significantly damaged. The driver still did not comply and made the decision to drive forward at or near the subject officers. Both subject officers expressed fear for their own well-being, and the well-being of members of the public in the area. The officers discharged their firearms at the driver of the truck. All the shots were fired in just under four seconds. No one in the truck was injured nor was anyone in the vicinity of the shooting incident. The truck then drove away and later crashed into the side of a house, causing a fire. The officers made a split-second decision while their well-being could be in jeopardy after already watching the truck ram another vehicle. Considering all the evidence available, I am of the opinion that the subject officers' actions were reasonable in the circumstances. Therefore, no charges are recommended and the IIU investigation is now completed and closed.