IIU | INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT OF MANITOBA

# IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO AN INCIDENT INVOLVING SERIOUS INJURIES WHILE IN RCMP CUSTODY

## FINAL REPORT OF THE CIVILIAN DIRECTOR

## OF THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT

| | |
|---|---|
| Acting Civilian Director: | Bruce M. Sychuk |
| IIU File Number: | 2026-0011 |
| Date of Release: | September 24, 2026 |

## Introduction

On May 19, 2026, 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 May 20, 2026:

On May 13, 2026, Steinbach RCMP members attended the cell block at the Steinbach Detachment as AP had covered the camera with a wet blanket and had a piece of a plastic spoon tucked in his pants that he had used to carve into the cell door.

AP was given verbal commands from members to go to his knees, drop the sharp object in his hands and turn away so members could cuff him in an effort to search him and the cell for safety reasons. AP refused to comply with demands after being asked several times to comply and began clenching his fists and refusing to drop the sharp object.

Members entered the cell and AP was taken to the ground, but he began demonstrating assaultive behaviour and managed to latch on to SO's fingers and attempting to twist them. AP was advised to stop his behaviour, but he refused to comply which resulted SO striking AP in the face with a closed fist.

AP later complained of pain to his face and was transported to Bethesda Hospital, then to HSC where it was determined he had facial fractures and was referred to a plastic surgeon. AP was released from hospital and cleared for incarceration at the Remand Centre. AP caused significant damage to the cell and continuously tried to intimidate members during his time at Steinbach Detachment.

As this matter concerned injuries while in custody, 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 , among other items:

- notes, narratives and reports of officers
- body-worn cameras
- cell surveillance
- use of force report
- medical reports

The civilian director designated one subject officer (SO1) and four witness officers (WO1 to WO4). IIU investigators also received information from one police associate (PA1) and AP.

## Facts and Circumstances

### Scene Examination and Canvass

Investigators did not attend the scene because notice to the IIU occurred four days after the incident. The entire incident was caught on cell footage or body-worn camera, making attendance unnecessary. Investigators did not canvass the area because the entire incident occurred in the jail cell.

## Interviews

Affected Person

IIU investigators interviewed AP on May 27, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

AP confirmed that he was held in custody because of outstanding criminal matters. He complained about his treatment at the detachment. He suggested that he was not given adequate food or toilet paper. He confirmed that he was kicking, yelling and striking the cell door. He acknowledged that he was coming down from meth use at the time.

AP stated that members told him to calm down and he refused to comply. Members then entered the cell, took him to the ground and restrained him. AP was punched in the ribs, so he grabbed an officer's hand. He recalled that an officer told him to let go or he would break his nose. AP stated that he released the officer's hand, and then he was struck in the face, causing his nose to break.

AP went for medical treatment for a broken nose, fractured ribs and concussion symptoms.

NOTE: Medical records only confirm the broken nose and concussion symptoms.

Police Associate 1 (PA1)

IIU investigators interviewed PA1 on July 7, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

PA1 began her shift after AP was in custody. Her colleague warned her that AP was agitated and that he had a spoon with him in the cell. She saw AP using the spoon to scrape along the window seal. PA1 requested AP to give her the spoon and he refused.

She watched AP take the spoon and try to rub it against the side of the bed frame. She was concerned he was trying to sharpen the spoon into a weapon. AP also moistened his wrist band from the hospital and took it off, placing it over the cell camera.

PA1 reported this to the officers and they attended his cell to address the concerns. She could not see anything from where she was positioned in relation to AP's cell. After the interaction, she saw that AP was bleeding from his nose and was wiping the blood in an attempt to write on the cell walls. Medical services arrived and took him to the hospital.

Witness Officers

Witness Officer 1 (WO1)

IIU investigators interviewed WO1 on June 30, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO1 was working on the date of the incident. He was aware of AP because of his disruptive and agitated behavior. He knew that AP was yelling, kicking and screaming in the cell because they could watch it on the cell camera. WO1 recalled that PA1 told him and some other officers that AP had tried to obstruct the camera by placing his wrist band over the lens. WO1 noted that this was a safety concern, so they attended to AP's cell.

While outside his cell, officers directed AP to face the rear wall and get on his knees, which he refused to do. Officers then entered his cell to restrain him. AP tensed up his body, clenched his fists, refused to go to the ground and tried to pin WO1's arm between his legs. WO1 confirmed that AP was holding a plastic spoon that could have been used as a weapon.

WO1 confirmed that he delivered strikes to AP's side and thigh, while SO delivered a punch to his face or head area. AP eventually stopped resisting and was handcuffed. WO1 saw bleeding from AP's nose, and he was offered medical attention, which he declined. Later, he asked for medical assistance, and he was taken to the hospital.

WO1 stated that the use of force that officers used was in direct relation to AP's resistance.

Witness Officer 2 (WO2)

IIU investigators interviewed WO2 on July 10, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO2 recalled that members entered AP's cell because he had covered the cell lens and possessed an object that could be used as a weapon. WO2 was directed to enter the cell after AP had been detained on the ground. His main role was to hold AP's legs as he continued to resist.

WO2 recalled an officer yelling that AP was twisting his fingers. WO2 did not see any officer strike AP because he was entirely focused on restraining AP's legs. WO2 did not know how AP sustained his injuries.

Witness Officer 3 (WO3)

IIU investigators interviewed WO3 on July 14, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO3 confirmed that AP was being disruptive and aggressive while he was in the cell. At one point, he covered the cell lens and had a sharp object in his hand. Officers went into the cell to address the concerns.

WO3 assisted in detaining AP by grabbing onto his right arm. His entire focus was on keeping control of the arm. WO3 recalled SO issuing a warning to AP and then heard what he thought sounded like a strike. WO3 did not see anyone actually strike AP.

WO3 did observe injuries to AP's face and confirmed medical services attended.

Witness Officer 4 (WO4)

IIU investigators interviewed WO4 on Aug. 10, 2026, and were provided with the following information:

WO4 recalled PA1 telling officers that AP was agitated and disruptive. PA1 informed them that AP had covered the cell lens and was in possession of an object that could be used as a weapon. The officers attended AP's cell to remove the paper from the lens because it was a safety issue. While one officer would remove the cover from the lens, the other officers were to keep AP under control while the obstruction was removed.

WO1 opened the door and gave verbal directions to AP, which he refused to comply with. Officers then entered the cell to take AP to the ground while the obstruction was removed. WO4 confirmed that AP was struggling and resisting the officers.

WO4 removed the obstruction from the lens while the other officers were attempting to detain AP. WO4 came over to assist the officers after removing the obstruction. WO4 described the situation as a "dog pile" with officers attempting to control AP while he actively resisted. WO4 recalled a lot of screaming and something about AP twisting someone's fingers or hand. WO4 did not see any officer strike AP during the incident, but he was told afterwards that AP was struck. He saw AP bleeding after he was detained.

WO4 recalled that AP was holding some form of plastic cutlery that could have been used as a weapon. AP was actively resisting letting go of the object while the officers detained him. WO4 denied using any force other than assisting to restrain AP.

**Subject Officer (SO)**

In accordance with his rights, SO declined to be interviewed by the IIU. He did agree through counsel to provide a copy of his report, which provided the following information:

SO confirmed that PA1 had told officers AP was blocking the cell lens, which was a safety issue. Before entering the cell, SO observed AP to be holding a spoon with the handle facing outwards. This was noted to be a safety concern as well for its potential use as a weapon or for self-harm purposes.

WO1 directed AP to move away from the door and turn away from the officers. He refused to comply, clenched his fists and tensed up. WO1 opened the door and went to detain AP with assistance from WO3. AP resisted the officers while he was being taken to the ground. SO went to assist and held AP's head and shoulder area. SO commented that the space was quite small for the number of individuals present.

SO confirmed that at one point while AP was resisting, his knee came into contact with AP's neck and shoulder area. AP continued to resist the officers attempts to extract the spoon from his hand. SO delivered a distraction strike, which allowed the officers to remove the spoon from AP's hand. AP then grabbed SO's hand and began to twist his fingers. SO warned him to let go without success. SO then delivered a closed-handed strike to AP's face, which forced him to let go of SO's hand. Officers were then able to place AP in handcuffs.

SO confirmed that AP was bleeding from his nose, but did not appear to be bothered by the injury. He continued to yell and scream in the cell while SO was writing up his report about the incident.

## Other evidence

Medical reports

Investigators were able to obtain medical information related to this incident. AP suffered a broken nose and concussion-like symptoms. The reports did not confirm a broken rib.

Cell and Body-Worn Camera Footage

In reviewing the video footage, the following observations can be made:

1. Before any officer attends the cell, AP can be seen acting in an agitated and disruptive state. He's yelling, kicking, posturing and scraping the cell window with the spoon. He is clearly unsteady on his feet.
2. AP places some kind of paper object on the cell lens, causing it to be partially covered.
3. Officers issue verbal commands to AP without success.
4. Officers enter the cell and a struggle ensues. AP is actively resisting the officers while they attempt to gain control of him.
5. You can hear SO say "let go of my hand," followed by "I'll break your nose." AP does not comply and SO strikes AP once in the face. Soon after, officers handcuff AP.
6. AP begins to bleed from his nose almost immediately.
7. During the struggle, there are five individuals present in the cell. Movement is noticeably restricted, causing officers to fumble over each other while trying to detain AP.

## 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

AP was in custody for outstanding criminal matters. He was coming down from taking meth and acknowledged he was not following directions. Officers were required to enter his cell for his safety because he had obstructed the camera lens. Officers provided verbal directions before entering the cell. AP did not comply and a use of force incident occurred. During the incident, AP was actively resisting and grabbed SO's hand. SO warned AP to release his hand or he would strike him. AP did not comply with the verbal direction, and he was struck by SO in his face, causing his nose to break. Medical attention was provided. In the circumstances, the use of force by SO was reasonable and would not meet the charging standard. Therefore, no charges are recommended, and the IIU investigation is now completed and closed.