PRC Police Review Commission

ASIRT

LEVEL 1

ASIRT DECISION

IN THE MATTER OF USE OF FORCE BY RCMP OFFICERS ON JANUARY 18, 2026

Executive Director: Matthew Block

File No.: 2026-0004(N)

Date of Release: Nov. 4, 2026

Classification: Public

Introduction

On Jan. 22, 2026, pursuant to s. 43.2(4)(c) of the *Police Act*, the CEO of the Police Review Commission directed the Alberta Serious Incident Response Team (ASIRT) to investigate a use of force during an arrest by Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) officers in Leduc as a Level 1 incident. The arrest of the affected person (AP) arose in the context of a call for service about an assault.

ASIRT designated two subject officers and provided them with notice. 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.

As the subjects of a criminal investigation, the subject officers were entitled to rely on their right to silence and not speak to ASIRT. In this case, both subject officers provided ASIRT investigators with their reports and notes and answered questions in an interview.

Circumstances Surrounding the Incident

On Jan. 18, 2026, at approximately 9 p.m., subject officer #1 (SO1) and subject officer #2 (SO2) went to a home in Leduc in response to a reported assault. Upon arrival, they were shown video footage of the incident, provided with a description of the suspect, and given the name of a person believed to be the suspect's wife. Based on this information, the officers identified the AP as the suspect.

SO1 and SO2 subsequently went to the AP's nearby residence to arrest him. The AP's former spouse told the officers that the AP lived in a trailer behind the home and was intoxicated. She also indicated that she was aware of an ongoing financial dispute between the AP and the people who had reported the assault. At her request, one of her children went to retrieve the AP.

At 9:43 p.m., the AP came to the front of the residence, where SO1 told him that he was under arrest for assault. The AP immediately denied that he was under arrest and refused to allow the officers to place him in handcuffs. He clenched his fists, stiffened his arms, and refused to place his hands behind his back. During the interaction, another family member was present and repeatedly encouraged the AP to comply with the officers' directions.

In response to the AP's resistance, SO2 took him to the ground by pulling him backward. Both officers then tried to turn the AP onto his stomach; however, he continued to actively resist their efforts. During the struggle, SO1 delivered several punches to the AP's torso and several knee strikes to his rib area, while SO2 delivered several strikes to the AP's facial area. After approximately one minute, the officers were able to roll the AP onto his stomach and secure him in handcuffs.

Officers transported the AP to the Leduc RCMP detachment, arriving at 10:12 p.m. Upon arrival, the AP had a bloody nose and significant swelling to his right eye. EMS arrived at the detachment three minutes later, at 10:15 p.m. Although the AP initially declined medical treatment, he subsequently agreed to be transported to hospital for further assessment.

Affected Person (AP) and Civilian Witnesses

The AP declined to participate in an interview with ASIRT investigators and did not provide consent for the release of his medical records for investigative review. Consequently, ASIRT's ability to assess the

Classification: Public

nature and extent of the AP's injuries was limited. The available evidence regarding the AP's condition was restricted to the subject officers' observations that he had a bloody nose and significant swelling to his right eye, both of which were also captured on BWC footage.

ASIRT investigators also made numerous efforts over a six-month period to interview the AP's former spouse and adult children, who were present during the incident. Although several interview dates were scheduled, each was subsequently cancelled by the civilian witnesses. Further attempts to contact them did not receive a response.

Video Evidence

ASIRT investigators obtained and reviewed BWC footage from both subject officers.

The footage confirmed that the AP's former spouse told officers that she was aware of the financial dispute between the AP and the complainants but did not know what had occurred between them that evening. She told the officers that the AP was in a trailer at the rear of the property and was intoxicated. She also said that the AP owned two large dogs. When the officers expressed concern about the dogs' presence, she asked her son to retrieve the AP and assist in controlling the animals. She subsequently told the officers that the AP would come to the front of the property to meet with them.

The AP approached the officers with both hands in his pockets. SO1 told the AP that he was under arrest for two counts of assault, to which the AP responded, "No, I'm not." He further commented, "I want payment," appearing to refer to the underlying financial dispute and indicating an understanding that it had precipitated the police attendance. SO2 then took hold of the AP's left wrist and secured a handcuff to it, while SO1 attempted to remove the AP's right hand from his pocket and directed him to place his hands behind his back. The AP replied, "No" and began pulling away from the officers. Throughout the interaction, SO1 spoke calmly to the AP, repeatedly instructing him not to resist and advising him that, although he appeared intoxicated, he should not worsen the situation by resisting arrest. The AP did not comply with these directions.

SO2 then moved behind the AP, brought his arm over the AP's right shoulder, and pulled him backward onto the snow-covered ground. SO2 initially maintained control of the AP's head and repeatedly directed him to "stay down." The AP continued attempting to push himself up. During the ensuing struggle, SO1 delivered several strikes to the AP's left side, which appeared to have little effect. Positioned near the AP's head, SO2 delivered three rapid strikes to the right side of the AP's face and forehead while repeatedly instructing him to stop resisting. Based on the movement of SO1's BWC and the position of his hands, it also appeared that SO1 delivered several knee strikes during the struggle.

The AP continued to resist by refusing to relinquish control of his hands and failing to comply with repeated commands. SO2 subsequently delivered three additional strikes in quick succession to the AP's facial area, followed by a final strike, after which the AP ceased resisting. At that point, the AP was observed to have a bleeding nose. During the arrest, a young female could be heard repeatedly calling on the AP to calm down and comply with the officers' efforts to arrest him. SO1 and SO2 were then able to roll the AP onto his stomach and secure him in handcuffs. The young female approached the AP and continued encouraging him to remain calm.

The available video footage most clearly depicts the strikes delivered by SO2. Those strikes are best described as a series of short-range closed-fist strikes directed at the AP's face, with either the bottom portion or back of SO2's hand making contact. There is no discernible wind-up or indication of

Classification: Public

significant force generation. The nature and manner of the strikes suggest they were intended to distract the AP and overcome his resistance, rather than to deliver maximum force.

Following the arrest, SO2 apologized to the young female, who replied, “it’s fine.” She then remarked that she believed the officers had broken the AP’s nose. When the AP expressed confusion regarding the situation, the officers advised him that he was under arrest for assaulting two neighbours, which he denied. The young female responded by stating, “Yes, you did, you drove and assaulted them,” before being called away by the AP’s former spouse.

The officers then helped the AP to his feet and escorted him to a police vehicle. While walking along the icy driveway, the AP repeatedly lost his footing, remained verbally confrontational, and threatened to sue the officers for assaulting him. In response to the young female’s inquiry regarding medical attention, SO2 advised that EMS would be contacted upon their arrival at the detachment.

The AP was assisted into the police vehicle. The young female remained present, continued encouraging the AP to cooperate, provided her mother’s contact information, and apologized for the incident. SO2 thanked her for her assistance. Prior to leaving the scene, SO2 was heard over the police radio requesting that EMS attend the police detachment to assess the AP due to ongoing bleeding from his nose.

EMS arrived at the detachment at approximately 10:15 p.m., shortly after the officers. During their initial assessment, the AP stated that officers had kicked him several times in the face. He initially declined medical attention and remained argumentative. After EMS explained the risks associated with refusing assessment, the AP agreed to go to the hospital for further evaluation and thereafter became cooperative.

Subject Officer #1 (SO1)

SO1 confirmed that, after police identified the AP as the suspect in the assault, officers went to the AP’s residence. Upon arrival, they were met by the AP’s wife, who said that the AP had been involved in a financial dispute with the original complainants. She further said that the AP was intoxicated and was staying in a trailer behind the home. SO1 told her of the officers’ intention to arrest the AP, following which she directed her son to retrieve the AP and help in securing the AP’s two large dogs. A short time later, SO1 saw the AP walking toward officers from around the side of the residence.

SO1 advised the AP that he was under arrest for assault. In response, the AP stated, “No, I’m not.” When SO1 took hold of the AP’s arm, the AP clenched his fists, stiffened his arms, and refused to place them behind his back. Both SO1 and SO2 directed the AP to stop resisting; however, he continued to struggle. SO2 then reached over the AP’s shoulder and pulled him backward onto the snow-covered ground. The AP continued to resist officers’ efforts to roll him onto his stomach and secure him in handcuffs.

SO1 acknowledged delivering several punches to the AP’s abdomen to gain compliance through distraction, but these strikes were ineffective. He subsequently delivered several knee strikes to the right side of the AP’s ribs for the same purpose, again without effect. Throughout the struggle, SO1 remained focused on controlling the AP’s hands and advised that he did not observe SO2 deliver any strikes to the AP.

SO1 noted that several members of the AP’s family were present during the arrest and were yelling at the AP to cooperate with police and submit to being handcuffed. The AP eventually complied by rolling

Classification: Public

onto his stomach, allowing officers to secure him in handcuffs. Due to the AP's size and stature, two sets of handcuffs were required. After the AP was turned over, SO1 observed blood coming from the AP's nose.

The AP was subsequently placed in a police vehicle and transported to the Leduc detachment. Upon arrival, SO1 observed that the AP's right eye was swollen shut. He explained that the arrest had occurred in darkness and under poor lighting conditions, and as a result he had not noticed the injury earlier. SO1 confirmed that the AP did not strike his face during transport or while being processed at the detachment and further advised that no force was applied to the AP after he had been handcuffed.

Although the AP initially declined medical attention, he subsequently agreed to be transported to hospital by EMS following further discussion with the paramedics and officers. He was later released on an undertaking.

Subject Officer #2 (SO2)

SO2 said that, upon arriving at the AP's home with SO1, they were met by the AP's wife, who said that the AP was intoxicated and staying in a trailer behind the residence. She further said that the AP had an ongoing financial dispute with the original complainants and cautioned officers that he was known to become volatile when intoxicated. She directed one of her adult children to retrieve the AP, who presented himself at the front of the residence shortly thereafter.

As SO1 informed the AP that he was under arrest for assault, SO2 took hold of the AP's left wrist. The AP responded, "No, I'm not," and immediately became uncooperative and confrontational. SO2 succeeded in securing a handcuff to the AP's left wrist but noted that doing so required both hands, as the AP was pulling away, raising his arm toward his chest, and physically overpowering him. Despite repeated commands to stop resisting, the AP refused to comply. SO2 became concerned that the AP was preparing to strike either him or SO1.

In response, SO2 reached over the AP's right shoulder and pulled him backward and off his feet, while controlling his descent to prevent him from striking the ground forcefully. Once on the ground, the AP continued to resist by preventing officers from gaining control of his right arm and turning him onto his stomach. Throughout the struggle, SO1, SO2, and a young female who was present repeatedly directed the AP to stop resisting.

SO2 acknowledged delivering three strikes to the left side of the AP's face with the back of his right hand. He explained that the strikes were intended to momentarily stun the AP and gain compliance rather than cause injury. When the strikes proved ineffective, SO2 delivered three additional strikes in quick succession with the back of his fist. As the AP continued to resist, SO2 delivered a final strike, after which the AP ceased resisting and allowed officers to gain control of his right arm and complete the handcuffing.

After the AP was brought to his feet, SO2 recalled being surprised by the amount of blood present around the AP's nose, as he did not believe he had struck that part of the AP's face. The AP continued to resist as officers escorted him to the police vehicle. SO2 subsequently requested that EMS attend the detachment to assess the AP's condition.

Analysis

Section 25 Generally

Under s. 25 of the *Criminal Code*, police officers are permitted to use as much force as is necessary for

Classification: Public

the execution of their duties. 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 to which it responds. As noted above, where force is intended or is likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm, s. 25(3) codifies a requirement that 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.

Necessity requires that there are not reasonable alternatives to the use of force that would also accomplish the same goal. These alternatives can include no action at all. 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 as a whole 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

Both subject officers were lawfully engaged in the execution of their duties to investigate reported offences. They went to the residence to arrest the AP after receiving information from two complainants that he had assaulted them earlier that evening at a neighbouring property and after reviewing video footage that captured the alleged assaults. In these circumstances, SO1 and SO2 were authorized to arrest the AP, and all actions taken during the incident were undertaken in furtherance of those lawful duties.

Upon approaching the officers, the AP had his hands clenched into fists and tucked inside his pant pockets. Officers had also been cautioned by the AP's former spouse that he was intoxicated and known to become volatile when under the influence of alcohol. From the outset of the interaction, the AP appeared to understand the reason for the police attendance without explanation from the officers and was seemingly motivated to avoid arrest. He denied being under arrest, attempted to justify his earlier conduct by asserting he was entitled to monies owed to him, repeatedly refused police commands to place his hands behind his back, and actively resisted officers' efforts to secure him in handcuffs.

SO2 reported that the AP began forcefully pulling forward the arm he was attempting to control, causing him to believe that the AP was overpowering him and attempting to prevent the application of handcuffs. SO2 further believed that the AP might be preparing to strike the officers. In these circumstances, it was objectively reasonable for SO2 to take the AP to the ground to gain control of him.

Once on the ground, the AP continued actively resisting officers' attempts to turn him onto his stomach and secure him in handcuffs. Both officers described delivering distraction strikes to gain compliance and obtain control of the AP's hands. Each officer struck the AP's body from their respective positions, with SO2 positioned near the AP's head and SO1 positioned near his torso. The evidence suggests neither officer was aware of the precise actions being taken by the other, which is

Classification: Public

consistent with SO1's account that his attention was focused on gaining control of the AP's hands. Given the rapidly evolving nature of the struggle and the poor lighting conditions, that evidence is unsurprising.

The AP sustained a bloody nose and swelling to the right side of his face during the arrest. The available video evidence indicates that these injuries were mostly likely caused by strikes delivered by SO2. There is no evidence that SO1 struck the AP in the face, nor is there evidence of any additional injuries. The video confirms that the majority of SO2's strikes landed on the right side of the AP's face and forehead, and that the AP's nose began visibly bleeding during the final series of strikes. While those strikes clearly caused injury, their manner of delivery does not suggest they were intended to do so. Their short-range nature, the absence of any apparent wind-up, and the limited force generation visible on the video are more consistent with distraction strikes intended to gain compliance and overcome the AP's resistance.

In the circumstances, the force used was necessary and proportionate to the threat presented by the AP and to the officers' need to gain control of him. The AP was lawfully under arrest, repeatedly refused police commands, actively resisted efforts to handcuff him, and was not deterred by the initial distraction strikes. He was of sufficient size and strength that both officers were required to restrain him on the ground. While continuing to resist, the AP only appeared prepared to cooperate after a young female, believed to be his daughter, intervened and repeatedly urged him to calm down and comply with the officers.

It is also noteworthy that, throughout the incident, the AP continued to make comments suggesting he remained intent on recovering monies he believed were owed to him. This supported the conclusion that he continued to present an ongoing risk to the nearby complainants and reinforced the necessity of taking him into physical custody.

On the available evidence, SO1 and SO2 were acting in the lawful execution of their duties and on reasonable grounds throughout the incident. The force used was reasonable, proportionate, and necessary in the circumstances and was directed toward gaining and maintaining control of an actively resistant individual who was lawfully under arrest. There is no evidence that either officer used more force than was reasonably necessary to accomplish that objective. Accordingly, the defence provided by s. 25 of the *Criminal Code* would likely be available to both SO1 and SO2.

Conclusion

The subject officers' uses of force were proportionate, necessary, and reasonable. As a result, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that an offence was committed.

Original signed by	November 4, 2026
Matthew Block	Date of Release
Executive Director	

Classification: Public