

ASIRT DECISION

**IN THE MATTER OF A CALGARY POLICE ARREST ON
NOVEMBER 26, 2025**

Executive Director: Matthew Block

File No.: 2026-2001(N)

Date of Release: August 5, 2026

Introduction

On Jan. 7, 2026, 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 an allegation of an illegal arrest of the affected person (the AP) by Calgary Police Service (CPS) officers as a Level 2 complaint. 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, and conducted using current investigative protocols.

ASIRT investigators interviewed the following civilians:

The AP; and

Civilian witness #1 (CW1), who was the bailiff involved in evicting the AP.

ASIRT investigators interviewed witness officer #1 (WO1), who was working with the SO. The SO, as the subject of a criminal investigation, was entitled to rely on his right to silence and did not speak to ASIRT.

ASIRT obtained internal CPS records about the incident.

ASIRT investigators obtained video from the following sources:

WO1's body-worn camera (BWC); and

In-car digital video camera from the police vehicle where the AP was held and transported.

Circumstances Surrounding the Incident

On Nov. 26, 2025, at 9:05 a.m., CPS received a call from CW1 requesting assistance with the execution of an eviction order at an apartment on 12 Ave. in Calgary. The eviction order had been granted on Nov. 21, 2025, and was served on the AP on Nov. 24, 2025. It was an unconditional order requiring the apartment to be vacated by 12 p.m. on Nov. 24, 2025.

The SO and WO1 arrived at the location at 9:30 a.m. The entire incident was captured on WO1's BWC video. CW1 told the officers he had been threatened with bear spray by the apartment occupants. The officers were aware of an unrelated complaint from Nov. 12, 2025, involving a male reportedly deploying bear spray in the apartment.

The officers knocked on the apartment door and spoke with the AP through the closed door. The AP refused to open the door and stated that she had obtained a stay of the eviction. CW1 showed the officers the eviction order. With assistance from maintenance personnel, the officers unlocked the door. The SO was only able to open the door about one foot because the AP was attempting to push it closed. The officers told the AP that the eviction order required her to permit entry. The AP replied that she had evidence showing otherwise.

The SO pushed the door open and took hold of the AP's left forearm. He advised her that she was under arrest for obstruction. The AP lowered herself to the floor while the SO retrieved handcuffs. The officers handcuffed the AP behind her back and escorted her into the hallway.

The AP repeatedly asked the officers to allow her to produce the evidence she said she possessed.

The SO and WO1 escorted the AP to a police vehicle and seated her in the rear passenger compartment. The officers later released the AP without charges.

Analysis

The SO and the WO1 were authorized by law to assist CW1 in enforcing the eviction order. They acted reasonably when they did so and provided the AP with many opportunities to comply with the order. It was clear that the AP was not willing to comply and was actively obstructing the officer by not allowing them into the apartment. The SO then moved to arresting her for obstruction and did so with minimal force.

Conclusion

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

Original Signed

Matthew Block
Executive Director

August 5, 2026

Date of Release