

ASIRT DECISION

**IN THE MATTER OF AN RCMP SHOOTING NEAR GRANDE
PRAIRIE ON JANUARY 6, 2026**

Acting Executive Director: Matthew Block

File No.: 2026-0001(N)

Date of Release: April 15, 2026

Introduction

On January 6, 2026, pursuant to s. 43.2(4)(c) of the *Police Act*, the Chief Executive Officer of the Police Review Commission directed the Alberta Serious Incident Response Team (ASIRT) to investigate an RCMP Grande Prairie detachment shooting as a Level 1 incident. ASIRT designated one subject officer (the SO), with notice to him. ASIRT's investigation is now complete.

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 interviewed the following civilians:

The affected person (AP);

Civilian witness #1 (CW1), who saw the AP drive off the road and spoke briefly with him; and

Civilian witness #2 (CW2), who went to the scene after being called by CW1 and saw some of the incident.

ASIRT investigators obtained notes or reports or both from the following police officers:

Witness officer #1 (WO1), who arrived at the scene after the incident and provided first aid to the AP and the SO;

Witness officer #2 (WO2), who arrived at the scene at the same time as WO1 and assisted with arresting the AP;

Witness officer #3 (WO3), who arrived at the scene after the incident and conducted a search; and

Witness officer #4 (WO4), who arrived at the scene after the incident and seized the SO's conducted energy weapon (CEW).

Due to the video evidence and the AP's statement, ASIRT did not seek a statement from the SO.

ASIRT investigators obtained video from the following sources:

The SO's police vehicle;

The SO's body worn camera (BWC);

WO1's BWC;

WO2's BWC;

WO3's BWC; and

WO4's BWC.

ASIRT investigators processed the scene with the assistance of RCMP forensic identification section officers.

Circumstances Surrounding the Incident

Just before 2 p.m. on January 6, 2026, CW1 was driving to his farm in the County of Grande Prairie. As he approached an intersection, he saw an SUV driving very quickly and approaching the intersection from another side. The driver of the SUV ignored the traffic control at the intersection and went off the

road, resulting in the SUV going airborne before it came to a rest in the snow.

CW1 approached the vehicle and the AP exited. The AP stared blankly and slurred his words. CW1, who did not smell any alcohol, could not tell if the AP had been drinking or was in shock. After CW1 asked repeatedly, the AP said he was okay. CW1 had a weird feeling about how the AP was acting so he left, telling the AP that he would return with equipment to get the SUV out of the snow.

CW1 then called CW2, and they discussed using CW2's tractor to get the SUV out of the snow. CW2 went to the scene and saw footprints in the snow leading off into the trees but could not see the AP. CW2 did not follow the footprints and told CW1 to call the police.

At 2:16 p.m., the SO was dispatched to the scene. He was wearing an RCMP uniform and in a marked police vehicle. This vehicle had the WatchGuard video system in it, which captured what happened directly in front of the vehicle with no audio. The SO drove toward the scene and, at 3:00:45 p.m., the AP walked across the road in front of the SO. The SO parked at 3:01:02 p.m., exited the vehicle, and walked in front of it toward the passenger's side. His demeanour was relaxed when he left the video frame at 3:01:19 p.m. When he came back in frame less than two seconds later, he was grappling with the AP (Figure 1).



Figure 1 - The SO's vehicle's video showing the AP (orange glove) grappling with the SO.

The AP's left hand was visible on the SO's right shoulder as they came back into the frame. The AP's right hand was less visible but in the area of the SO's left shoulder. The SO appeared to lift the AP's left arm and push the AP off him. As he did this, a knife was visible in the AP's right hand (Figure 2).



Figure 2 - The SO's vehicle's video showing the AP with a knife in his right hand.

The AP continued forward and then turned back toward the SO, still holding the knife (Figure 3).



Figure 3 - The SO's vehicle's video showing the AP turning back toward the SO with a knife in his hand.

The AP turned to face the SO. He raised his empty left hand and debris from a gunshot, believed to have been fired by the SO, was released from his jacket (Figure 4).



Figure 4 - The SO's vehicle's video at the time when debris was emitted from the AP's jacket from a gunshot. Timestamp is three seconds behind actual.

The AP stumbled and then walked forward in the direction the SO had gone. He left the police vehicle video frame at 3:01:36 p.m.

At 3:02:00 p.m., the SO activated his BWC. The BWC, as it is designed to do, stored 30 seconds of video without audio prior to being activated.

The video therefore shows back to 3:01:31 p.m., with audio starting at 3:02:00 p.m. When the BWC video began, the AP was walking toward the SO while holding the knife. At 3:01:36 p.m., the SO shot again (Figure 5).



Figure 5 - The SO's BWC video showing him shooting again.

The AP still walked toward the SO, who shot again at 3:01:41 p.m. (Figure 6).



Figure 6 - The SO's BWC video showing his final shot.

The AP continued to walk toward the SO. At 3:02:00 p.m., the audio began in the recording and the SO said, "drop the knife! Drop it!" The AP took a few more steps toward the SO. The SO drew his conducted energy weapon (CEW) with his left hand, keeping his gun in his right. At 3:02:17 p.m., he activated the CEW (Figure 7).



Figure 7 - The SO's BWC showing the first CEW use.

The CEW caused the AP to recoil and walk away from the SO. The SO repeated his command to drop the knife, but the AP continued to hold it in his right hand. The SO activated the CEW a second and third time. After those activations, the AP began to fall to the ground but got up while still holding the knife each time. The SO activated the CEW a fourth time at 3:02:45 p.m. and the AP fell to the ground.

The SO approached the AP. The knife was lying near the AP's right hand, and the SO kicked it away.

Other officers arrived on the scene and took the AP into custody. They then provided both the AP and the SO with first aid. The AP had two gunshot wounds which appeared to be the entry and exit wounds from a single shot. The SO had a stab wound through his left shoulder.

Affected Person (AP)

ASIRT investigators interviewed the AP on January 7, 2026.

The AP reported consuming significant amounts of alcohol from Sunday evening until the incident on Tuesday afternoon. He stated he drank two 26-ounce bottles of vodka and a six-pack of vodka seltzers, describing himself as "blackout drunk" and acknowledging ongoing struggles with alcohol use. He said he intentionally drank more than usual because he was attempting to build up the courage to take his own life.

According to the AP, he had a knife stored in his vehicle and intended to use it to harm himself. He left his residence, drove to his ex-girlfriend's home to write a suicide note, and then drove to the end of a range road, where he crashed his vehicle. A passerby offered to retrieve equipment to help remove the vehicle, and while the bystander was gone, the AP walked into a wooded area with paper, a pen, and a bottle of vodka. After writing a suicide note, he returned to his vehicle to retrieve the knife from the glovebox.

The AP recalled seeing a white pickup truck behind his vehicle and believed it might have been a police vehicle. He confirmed that he recognized the SO's vest marked "police" and believed he saw a radio. He remembered walking toward the truck, facing the SO at close range, being involved in a physical struggle, and swinging his right arm while holding the knife. He attributed his actions to impulsivity, intoxication, and suicidal ideation, adding that he believed he may have been attempting to provoke the SO to harm him.

The AP's next memory was of an officer ordering him to get down, hearing someone say to deploy a Taser, and then being tased twice. He remembered being on the ground with an officer pointing either a firearm or a Taser at him and then being handcuffed and placed in a police vehicle. While being assessed by paramedics, he first learned that he had been shot. He recalled asking about the SO's condition and was told that a stabbing had occurred. He described himself as making numerous suicidal statements during this time and said that everyone involved acted professionally.

Scene

Five casings were located on the scene. Four were closer to the police vehicle. The fifth was further away in the direction the SO backed up. A round count of the SO's magazines showed that he had likely fired five times.

The knife that the SO kicked away was seized (Figure 8).



Figure 8 - The AP's knife.

Analysis

Facts

The SO shot five times according to the shell casings and round count. Two of these are clearly visible on the BWC video. One is visible on the WatchGuard video only because of emitted debris. It is not possible to determine how many shots were fired during the time caught only on the WatchGuard video due to angle and lighting.

Based on the evidence, the SO shot three times in the initial moments captured on the WatchGuard video, and then two more times as captured by the BWC video.

Section 34 Generally

A police officer also has the same protections for the defence of person under s. 34 of the *Criminal Code* as any other person. This section provides that a person does not commit an offence if they believe on reasonable grounds that force is being used or threatened against them or another person, if they act to defend themselves or another person from this force or threat, and if the act is reasonable in the circumstances. For the act to be reasonable in the circumstances, the relevant circumstances of the individuals involved and the act must be considered. Section 34(2) provides a non-exhaustive list of factors to be considered to determine if the act was reasonable in the circumstances:

- (a) the nature of the force or threat;
- (b) the extent to which the use of force was imminent and whether there were other means available to respond to the potential use of force;
- (c) the person's role in the incident;
- (d) whether any party to the incident used or threatened to use a weapon;

- (e) the size, age, gender and physical capabilities of the parties to the incident;
- (f) the nature, duration and history of any relationship between the parties to the incident, including any prior use or threat of force and the nature of that force or threat;
- (f.1) any history of interaction or communication between the parties to the incident;
- (g) the nature and proportionality of the person's response to the use or threat of force; and
- (h) whether the act committed was in response to a use or threat of force that the person knew was lawful.

Section 34 Applied

While many use of force incidents may involve elements of self-defence, this incident involving a police officer being stabbed brings self-defence to the forefront. The SO was there because he was a police officer, but anyone who is suddenly attacked with a knife is entitled to defend themselves without relying on the special defences available to police officers.

The SO was responding to a call of a potential impaired driver. His demeanour, as seen on the police vehicle video, was relaxed. He was immediately attacked by the AP with a knife and stabbed in the shoulder.

Once the AP stabbed him with a knife, it was reasonable to think that the AP would do so again if he was able to. That was a lethal threat. While the AP mostly walked slowly toward the SO, walking toward someone you just stabbed at any speed is a threatening act. By not following the demands of the SO to drop the knife, the AP further demonstrated the ongoing danger he posed to the SO.

The SO responded by shooting at the AP, which was also potentially lethal. His response was proportionate.

When the AP continued to walk toward the SO while still holding the knife he had just stabbed him with, the SO brought out his CEW and used that to subdue the AP. He did so at some risk to himself, since firing his gun while holding it in one hand would be less accurate and therefore less able to stop the AP if he began to run at the SO. The use of the CEW was successful as it led to the AP eventually falling to the ground and dropping the knife.

The SO's de-escalation at risk to himself is laudable. While it would have been reasonable to keep both hands on his gun and potentially to shoot the AP if he continued to approach, the SO chose to de-escalate. The AP may not be alive if the SO had not made this choice.

The defence available to the SO under s. 34 of the *Criminal Code* is therefore likely to apply.

Section 25 Generally

Under s. 25 of the *Criminal Code*, police officers are permitted to use as much force as is necessary for execution of their duties. Where this force is intended or is likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm, the officer must believe on reasonable grounds that the force is necessary for the self-preservation of the officer or preservation of anyone under that officer's protection. The force used here, discharging a firearm repeatedly at a person, was clearly intended or likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm. The SO therefore must have believed on reasonable grounds that the force he used was necessary for his self-preservation or the preservation of another person under his protection. Another person can include other police officers. For the defence provided by s. 25 to apply

to the actions of an officer, the officer must be required or authorized by law to perform the action in the administration or enforcement of the law, must have acted on reasonable grounds in performing the action, and must not have used unnecessary force.

All uses of force by police must also be proportionate, necessary, and reasonable.

Proportionality requires balancing a use of force with the action or threat to which it responds. This is codified in the requirement under s. 25(3), which states that where a force is intended or is likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm, the officer must believe on reasonable grounds that the force is necessary for the self-preservation of the officer or preservation of anyone under that officer's protection. An action that represents a risk to preservation of life is a serious one, and only in such circumstances can uses of force that are likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm be employed.

Necessity requires that there are not reasonable alternatives to the use of force that also accomplish the same goal, which in this situation is the preservation of the life of the officer or of another person under his protection. These alternatives can include no action at all. An analysis of police actions must recognize the dynamic situations in which officers often find themselves, and such analysis should not expect police officers to weigh alternatives in real time in the same way they can later be scrutinized in a stress-free environment.

Reasonableness looks at the use of force and the situation from an objective viewpoint. Police actions are not to be judged on a standard of perfection, but on a standard of reasonableness.

[Section 25 Applied](#)

While the SO's actions are better understood through the lens of self-defence, s. 25 would also apply to his actions.

The SO started out as investigating a complaint and was then acting to protect his life. This engaged his core duty to preserve life, safety, and property. He acted reasonably in a life-threatening situation. The AP's attack and pursuit of the SO threatened the SO's life and the SO's shots threatened the AP's life, and were therefore proportionate. There were no reasonable alternatives to the SO's shots at the AP and they were necessary. Finally, as discussed above, the SO acted with significant restraint and there is no doubt his actions were reasonable.

The use of force was not excessive, and the defence available to the SO under s. 25 is likely to apply.

[Conclusion](#)

The SO, after being stabbed by the AP, was entitled to defend himself. The defences available to him under ss. 34 and 25 of the *Criminal Code* are likely to apply. There are therefore no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed an offence.

[Original signed](#)

[Matthew Block](#)

[Acting Executive Director](#)

[April 15, 2026](#)

[Date of Release](#)