

LEVEL 2

ASIRT DECISION

**IN THE MATTER OF A POLICE DOG BITE IN
EDMONTON ON DECEMBER 23, 2025**

Acting Executive Director: Matthew Block

File No.: 2025-2004(N)

Date of Release: April 29, 2026



Introduction

On Dec. 23, 2025, pursuant to s. 43.4(1) of the *Police Act*, the Chief Executive Officer of the Police Review Commission directed the Alberta Serious Incident Response Team (ASIRT) to investigate a Level 2 incident in Edmonton where a police dog bit the affected person (AP). The suspect officer (SO), an Edmonton Police Service (EPS) officer, was not formally designated as a subject officer. ASIRT's investigation is now complete.

This decision relates to a Level 2 matter under the *Police Act*. Level 2 matters involve allegations of criminal conduct by a police officer that do not meet the threshold for a Level 1 matter and are investigated by ASIRT following classification by the Police Review Commission.

ASIRT's Investigation

ASIRT's investigation was comprehensive and thorough, conducted using current investigative protocols, and in accordance with the principles of major case management.

ASIRT investigators reviewed a statement the AP made to EPS, and met with the AP.

ASIRT investigators obtained notes and a report from the witness officer (WO), who was with the SO and his police dog.

ASIRT investigators obtained video from the following sources:

- A building near where the incident occurred; and
- Air1, the EPS helicopter.

ASIRT investigators obtained police communications from the incident.

Circumstances Surrounding the Incident

On Dec. 23, 2025, the SO and the WO were investigating a break and enter at a building under construction in Edmonton. The SO was a canine unit officer and had his police dog with him. As they pulled up to the building, the break and enter suspect went under a fence and started to run away. The SO got out of his police vehicle, released his police dog, and began to run after the suspect.

At the same time, the AP was walking on the sidewalk across the street from the SO's vehicle. As captured on the building's video, the police dog ran across to the AP instead of following the SO and the suspect. The police dog bit the AP on her right arm and hand.

The SO, once he noticed that the police dog had attacked the AP, went to the AP and released the dog. The AP received puncture wounds to her arm and hand and was traumatized by the incident.

Analysis

Police dogs are valuable tools that assist in solving crimes and apprehending suspects. They are also weapons and, like any other police weapon, they must be used carefully. When a police officer sends a dog after a suspect, a serious injury is likely to result. Similarly, if a police dog is used without proper care, innocent bystanders can be injured.

In this situation, the SO's intended target for his police dog was the fleeing suspect. The analysis should therefore be of whether the SO released the dog when he should not have and whether that act constitutes criminal negligence.

Criminal negligence requires evidence that the SO's act showed a wanton or reckless disregard for the

AP's safety and that this act was a marked and substantial departure from the standard of care of the reasonably prudent police officer.

While the police dog's attack on the AP was very serious, there is not evidence to the level required for a criminal offence for the SO. The SO did not show wanton or reckless disregard, and there was not a marked and substantial departure from the standard of care.

Conclusion

There are not reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence.

Original signed

Matthew Block

Acting Executive Director

April 29, 2026

Date of Release