IIU | INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT OF MANITOBA

IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO AN INCIDENT INVOLVING 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:	2025-0027
Date of Release:	April 30, 2026

Introduction

On May 30, 2025, the Winnipeg Police Service (WPS) 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 June 2, 2025:

Friday May 30th, 2025, WPS received a 911 call from a caller advising an unknown male was in the back-lane bleeding and covered in blood. Information was also conveyed by the caller that the male was possibly seen breaking into a house. West Division General Patrol Members were dispatched shortly thereafter and arrived on scene within a few minutes.

Upon arrival, officers located AP at the rear of the residence and observed him to be armed with a screwdriver. At this time a use of force encounter occurred where SO1 discharged their firearm.

Officers immediately called for medical assistance on a rush and commenced first aid. Multiple chest seals were applied to AP. Upon arrival of the ambulance, he was transported in critical condition to the Health Sciences Center and was later 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 WPS or of their own accord:

- notes, narratives and reports of officers
- audio transmissions
- video surveillance
- use of force report
- taser download data
- medical reports

The civilian director designated one subject officer (SO1) and one witness officer (WO1). IIU investigators also received information from eight civilian witnesses (CW1 to CW8).

Facts and Circumstances

Scene Examination and Canvass

IIU investigators attended the scene on the same date as the incident and canvassed the area for witnesses and video footage. Investigators were able to gather video surveillance from the scene and identify relevant witnesses to the incident.

Interviews

Civilian Witnesses

Civilian Witness 1 (CW1)

IIU investigators interviewed CW1 on May 31, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW1 was walking his dog when he heard approximately three to five gunshots. Initially, he did not realize that what he heard was gunshots, but it became clear to him as he saw more police cars coming to the area.

CW1 did not see the incident, but he recalled that minutes before the incident, he saw a male sitting at an abandoned house behind his residence. Soon after, two police cars came down the back lane. CW1 felt that it was unusual for someone to be at the abandoned house.

Police attended to his house after the incident to see if his cameras caught any of the events. The footage was reviewed and it did not capture anything relevant.

Civilian Witness 2 (CW2)

IIU investigators interviewed CW2 on May 31, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW2 stepped outside her residence after she heard glass breaking from her basement window. CW2 saw AP in her neighbour's backyard. She stated that AP was staring at her, but he was not responding to her direction to exit the yard. CW2 contacted CW6 for assistance.

CW6 attended and tried to persuade AP to exit the backyard and to drop the object in his hand. CW6 confirmed that he would even unlock the gate for AP so he could exit without issue. CW2 felt that AP was under the influence of something and "seemed prepared for a confrontation."

CW6 went into his residence and retrieved a bat. CW6 told CW2 after the incident that AP came at him with a knife. CW2 did not see AP with a weapon at that moment. CW2 stated that tensions were escalating and that CW6 continued to yell at AP to leave the area and that he refused. CW3 attended to the scene to help CW6.

Eventually, AP did exit the backyard by jumping over a fence. CW2 heard a loud impact once AP jumped the fence and then fled the area. CW2 did not see AP again.

Civilian Witness 3 (CW3)

IIU investigators interviewed CW3 on June 30, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW3 was at his residence when he heard glass breaking outside. CW6 went outside to see what was happening and saw AP in the backyard. CW6 observed AP to be armed with a boxcutter, a fire poker, a can of brake cleaner and a lawn ornament wrapped around his arm. CW3 stated that AP had tried to enter their basement by breaking the window using a ladder.

CW3 stated that AP was shirtless and bleeding from his arm. AP was noted to be incoherent and holding a boxcutter in his left hand and a fire poker in his right. AP sprayed the brake cleaner at CW3 and lunged at him with the boxcutter. CW3 backed away and grabbed a rake for protection. Eventually, AP fled the yard by jumping over a fence.

CW3 and CW6 followed AP from a distance and provided WPS with updates on AP's location. AP went into CW4 and CW6's backyard and hid in their gazebo.

WPS arrived on scene and CW3 directed officers to AP's location. CW3 heard officers warn AP that he would be tased or shot if he fled. As CW3 was leaving the area, he heard a taser deployed followed by three gunshots. CW3 heard someone groan after the first shot followed by two shots in quick succession. CW3 did not see the actual shooting because his back was turned, nor did he see any medical assistance provided to AP as he returned to his residence.

Civilian Witness 4 (CW4)

IIU investigators interviewed CW4 on June 2, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW4 heard two bangs and initially assumed it was a car backfiring. CW4 went towards his backyard to see what was going on and saw two officers placing handcuffs on AP. The officers immediately initiated medical assistance on AP and the paramedics arrived soon after.

CW4 could only recall that AP was shirtless and bleeding from one of his arms.

Civilian Witness 5 (CW5)

IIU investigators interviewed CW5 on June 2, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW5 heard two pops and initially thought it was a car backfiring. She went to the window facing her backyard to see what was going on and saw an officer placing AP in handcuffs. CW5 recalled that AP was shirtless and was bleeding from his arm.

She saw an officer retrieve a medical bag and start to apply some kind of package to AP's wounds. Soon after, more officers arrived at the scene. CW5 did not hear any verbal exchanges because she remained inside her residence.

Civilian Witness 6 (CW6)

IIU investigators interviewed CW6 on June 3, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW6 received a phone call from CW2 stating that AP had broken their basement window. CW6 exited his residence and saw AP approaching his back door. CW6 saw that AP had blood on his chest and stomach and was holding an aluminum lawn ornament in his left hand. CW6 observed AP to be holding either a boxcutter or a shard of glass in his right hand. He described AP as incoherent.

CW6 directed AP to leave his yard and said that police were on their way to the scene. He offered to unlock the gate for AP so he could leave, but AP did not comply. CW6 went and retrieved a baseball bat while CW3 exited the residence for assistance. AP sprayed brake cleaner at CW3 and attempted to swipe at him with the boxcutter or shard of glass in his right hand. CW6 grabbed a log from his fire pit and threatened AP with it. AP tried to flee the area by jumping on a parked car, but he missed and fell to the ground. He got up, ran around the garage and exited the yard.

CW6 and CW3 followed AP down the back lane. AP rummaged through a bag and then placed some kind of helmet or hat on his head. CW6 went back to his residence briefly while CW3 continued to follow AP. CW3 told CW6 that at some point, AP attempted to climb a fence using an old bookcase, but he fell instead. AP then entered another backyard and hid in the gazebo.

CW3 directed officers to AP's location and CW6 noted police vehicles at both ends of the back lane. CW6 heard what he thought was a taser followed by officers shouting "stay down, stay down, don't run, don't run," and then three gunshots. CW6 did not hear the officers giving any directions before the taser was deployed. CW6 believed that it was approximately a couple of minutes from police arriving to the discharge of the firearm.

Civilian Witness7 (CW7)

IIU investigators interviewed CW7 on June 3, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW7 was at CW6's residence when she heard CW2 phone and say "someone smashed your basement window." CW7 was assisting her daughter-in-law in calling 911 and then left the residence to see what was going on. CW7 noted that AP had already exited the yard by the time she went outside. She believed that police arrived on scene within four minutes.

CW7 recalled hearing officers shout "stay down" multiple times, followed by "don't run" and then she heard three gunshots. CW7 was near her residence when the gun was discharged. She never saw AP.

Civilian Witness 8 (CW8)

IIU investigators interviewed CW8 on July 7, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

CW8 was a paramedic on scene. In his notes, it suggested that AP told him where he had been shot. CW8 acknowledged that that was an error and it was not AP that told him about the gunshot wounds. CW8 confirmed that it was the police officers on scene who told him about the gunshot wound locations. CW8 confirmed that AP lost vital signs once he had been placed in the ambulance.

Witness Officers

Witness Officer 1 (WO1)

IIU investigators interviewed WO1 on June 26, 2025, and were provided with the following information:

WO1 confirmed that he was partnered with SO1. They were asked to deal with an emergency call about a blood -covered male attempting to break into houses. They attended AP's last known location.

WO1 entered the yard while SO1 remained in the lane. WO1 heard yelling and banging, so he climbed on top of a vehicle and garbage bin and saw AP inside a shed. SO1 opened the back gate, and both officers entered the yard. AP exited the shed and was holding a screwdriver and a wooden brush with metal bristles. AP was holding the screwdriver in a "stabbing posture" and was extremely agitated. AP advanced towards the officers and was yelling incoherently.

Despite repeated demands to drop the weapons, AP continued to close the distance. WO1 deployed his taser twice without effect. AP threw the screwdriver and it struck a nearby fence, and he continued to advance closer to the officers while yelling and acting aggressively. WO1 estimated that AP was approximately four to six feet from the officers and still moving forward.

WO1 noted that neither officer was wearing protective goggles and that AP was still holding the wooden brush while moving forward. Fearing that he was about to be harmed, WO1 transitioned from his taser to his firearm. He noted that because there were civilians in close proximity to the scene, that added another level of concern for him. AP continued forward when SO1 discharged his firearm three times. AP dropped to his knees and let go of the wire brush. WO1 estimated that AP was roughly two to four feet from the officers.

SO1 radioed that shots had been fired and both officers handcuffed AP and initiated medical assistance. WO1 applied chest seals and a tourniquet while SO1 tried to keep AP conscious. Soon after, other officers arrived, along with paramedics, and WO1 was relieved from providing medical assistance.

Subject Officer

In accordance with his rights, SO1 declined to be interviewed by IIU investigators. SO1 provided his handwritten notes and narratives by consent through legal counsel. The following information was provided:

SO1 confirmed that they were asked to answer an emergency call. The background information was that there was a blood-covered male possibly attempting to break into residences. SO1 confirmed that a civilian directed the officers to AP's last known location.

SO1 heard banging noises behind a wooden fence and then located AP, shirtless and hiding under an enclosed structure. AP appeared agitated and under the influence of meth, actively trying to hide from police.

SO1 made eye contact with AP, at which point AP abruptly stood up and revealed a screwdriver in his hand in a "throwing knife grip." Despite demands to drop the weapon, the male flicked the screwdriver towards the officers and then retrieved it, while continuing to act aggressively. WO1 deployed his taser, striking AP without effect.

AP charged at the officers while still armed. SO1 feared imminent death or bodily harm and discharged his service pistol three times. AP collapsed after the third shot and dropped the screwdriver.

Officers secured AP with handcuffs and SO1 radioed that shots had been fired. SO1 retrieved the medical kit and WO1 applied chest seals and a tourniquet. SO1 noted multiple hesitation cuts on AP's forearms. Paramedics arrived on scene and provided further medical assistance to AP.

Other evidence

Medical Reports

The autopsy states the cause of death to be from gunshot wounds.

Toxicology results stated the following:

Drug or Metabolite	Specimen	Result	Remarks
Ethanol:	Antemortem Blood/01 - [No collection date: no collection time]	none detected	
	Postmortem Blood/09	none detected	
Methamphetamine:	Antemortem Blood/02 - [No collection date: no collection time]	0.138 mg/l	
	Postmortem Blood/06 - Abdominal cavity blood	0.145 mg/l	
Amphetamine:	Antemortem Blood/02 - [No collection date: no collection time]	0.018 mg/l	
	Postmortem Blood/06 - Abdominal cavity blood	0.019 mg/l	
Cocaine:	Antemortem Blood/02 - [No collection date: no collection time]	none detected	
	Postmortem Blood/06	none detected	
Benzoylecgonine:	Antemortem Blood/02 - [No collection date: no collection time]	<0.025 mg/l	
	Postmortem Blood/06 - Abdominal cavity blood	<0.025 mg/l	
Clonazepam:	Antemortem Blood/02 - [No collection date: no collection time]	12.8 ug/l	
	Postmortem Blood/06 - Abdominal cavity blood	5.15 ug/l	
Aminoclonazepam:	Antemortem Blood/02 - [No collection date: no collection time]	29.0 ug/l	
	Postmortem Blood/06 - Abdominal cavity blood	38.7 ug/l	
Diazepam:	Antemortem Blood/02 - [No collection date: no collection time]	detected	trace
	Postmortem Blood/06 - Abdominal cavity blood	detected	trace
Nordiazepam:	Antemortem Blood/02 - [No collection date: no collection time]	<0.050 mg/l	
	Postmortem Blood/06 - Abdominal cavity blood	detected	trace
Rocuronium:	Antemortem Blood/01 - [No collection date: no collection time]	detected	

The toxicologist added the following commentary:

Methamphetamine
Methamphetamine is available in both d- and l- isomeric forms; the l- form is used in certain non-prescription inhalers as a decongestant (not routinely available in Canada), whereas the d- form is a commonly abused and highly addictive central nervous system stimulant. The UK established a threshold blood concentration of 0.01 mg/L as being indicative of impaired driving. Methamphetamine in overdosage can cause confusion, anxiety, hallucinations, cardiac arrhythmias, hypertension, circulatory collapse, convulsions and coma. Chronic abusers may develop paranoid psychosis. Postmortem methamphetamine concentrations averaged 1.0 mg/L (range, 0.09 to 18) in a series of 13 adult deaths attributed to methamphetamine overdosage. Concentrations averaged 3.6 mg/L in 10 adults who died following intravenous overdosage and 13 mg/L in another 6 who succumbed to oral overdosage. NOTE: Amphetamine is the major active metabolite of methamphetamine; this offers the most likely explanation for its presence in this case.

Cocaine
Blood concentrations of cocaine resulting from non-fatal recreational abuse are generally less than 0.5 mg/l; concentrations greater than 1 mg/l are potentially life-threatening. However, cocaine has a plasma half-life of 30 - 90 minutes, therefore low postmortem blood cocaine concentrations may not be a reliable indicator of the dose ingested/injected. Benzoylecgonine is a chemical/metabolic breakdown product of cocaine.

Clonazepam
In one study reported in the literature, single oral doses of 2 mg clonazepam are reported to produce an average peak blood plasma concentration of 17 ug/l. In a separate study, blood plasma concentrations in the range 29 to 75 ug/l were measured in 25 patients receiving chronic therapy of 6 mg/day. Substantial adverse effects were noticed in most patients with a blood plasma clonazepam concentration exceeding 100 ug/l. Aminoclonazepam is a metabolite and postmortem artifact formed from clonazepam.

Diazepam
Blood concentrations of diazepam and its major metabolite, nordiazepam expected from therapeutic doses are generally less than 0.5 mg/l. In one study, single doses of 10 mg diazepam resulted in peak blood plasma concentrations in the range 0.14 - 0.19 mg/l (mean 0.15). In a separate study, chronic dosing of 5 mg twice daily produced steady state blood plasma diazepam levels in the range 0.09 - 0.37 mg/l (mean 0.23), and nordiazepam levels of 0.13 - 0.46 mg/l (mean 0.29). NOTE: Diazepam is metabolised to nordiazepam and temazepam, which are further metabolised to oxazepam.

Taser Downloads

The taser download report confirmed that only WO1 deployed his taser on two occasions. The first taser deployment was 0.383 seconds long with the second deployment being 5.067 seconds long.

Use of Force

The IIU retained the services of an independent use of force expert to review the incident and provide feedback. The expert deemed the use of force reasonable in the circumstances, relying on the following:

1. Both officers gave AP verbal directions that he did not comply with before SO1 discharged his firearm.
2. Both officers stated that they feared grievous bodily harm.
3. WO1 deployed his taser twice without success, and was in the process of switching to his firearm when SO1 discharged his gun.
4. AP was moving towards the officers with a weapon in his hand that could have caused grievous bodily harm. It did not matter if it was a screwdriver or wire brush as both have the capacity to cause bodily harm.
5. AP's state of mind (under the influence/intoxicated) along with his physical state (bloody, incoherent, aggressive and non-compliant) were relevant factors in the officers' assessment of grievous bodily harm.
6. Previous attempts at de-escalation were not successful as AP was not compliant. Lethal force became a reasonable option to consider.

Video Surveillance

IIU investigators were able to obtain video surveillance from the area that showed AP's actions before the police officers arrived on scene. IIU investigators were also able to obtain AP's

movement just before the use of force incident. No video surveillance was available in the area of the use of force incident. The following comments can be made from reviewing the footage:

1. AP was under the influence of some form of intoxicants as he was unsteady on his feet and his thought process was clearly impaired.
2. At one point, AP was either trying to hide under or use a BBQ pit grill as a shield.
3. AP was causing various forms of property damage such as breaking windows or throwing items around the yard. The actions did not seem to have a purpose or objective at the end of the day.
4. At one point, AP took a propane tank and tried to release the propane gas without success. AP then started to hit the propane tank with a tool or brush. Again, it was not clear what the purpose was of these actions.
5. AP grabbed a glass shard from a broken window and initiated self-harm to his neck and wrist areas. As a result, a significant amount of blood could be seen on AP's body.
6. Just before the incident, AP could be seen exiting the backyard and move towards the area where the officers attended. AP appeared to be carrying some form of object in his hand.

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

A civilian witness called officers to the scene because AP's actions. Once they arrived, officers attempted different techniques to de-escalate AP and gain compliance. AP was not in a state to comply with officer directions and started to move towards the officers while holding an object in his hand. WO1 attempted other intervention tools by tasering AP twice without success. At this point, SO1 discharged his firearm. Medical interventions were provided to AP immediately after SO1 discharged his weapon. AP was taken to the hospital where he was pronounced deceased.

In reviewing all the evidence available in the circumstances, I am of the opinion that the subject officer's actions were reasonable. This incident would not meet the criminal charging standard. Therefore, no charges are recommended and the IIU investigation is now completed and closed.