



**IN THE MATTER OF THE INJURY OF A MAN
WHILE BEING ARRESTED BY MEMBERS OF THE
RCMP IN
PRINCE GEORGE, BRITISH COLUMBIA
ON APRIL 25, 2025**

**DECISION OF THE CHIEF CIVILIAN DIRECTOR
OF THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATIONS OFFICE**

Chief Civilian Director: Jessica Berglund

IIO File Number: 2025-108

Date of Release: August 25, 2026

Introduction

On the evening of April 25, 2025, Prince George RCMP officers responded to a 911 call that a man was shouting in a gas station and creating a mess. Officers responded and located the man (the Affected Person or “AP”), who was in a parking lot trying to open car door handles and shouting at people. A struggle with officers occurred during the AP’s arrest, and the Subject Officer (“SO”) deployed a Conducted Energy Weapon (“CEW”) on the AP, who was later transported to hospital in serious condition.

The Independent Investigations Office (“IIO”) was notified of this incident shortly thereafter by the RCMP and commenced an investigation.

The narrative that follows is based on evidence collected and analyzed during the investigation, including the following:

- the AP’s statement;
- statements of four civilian witnesses;
- statement of one medical witness;
- Police Computer-Aided Dispatch (“CAD”);
- Police Records Information Management Environment (“PRIME”) records;
- BC Emergency Health Services records;
- AP’s medical records;
- CEW download records;
- police radio to radio transmissions;
- 911 call;
- RCMP policy and training records;
- Officer body-worn camera footage; and
- CCTV video.

The IIO did not request interviews from involved officers in this case, instead relying on the officers’ written reports and their body-worn camera footage.

Narrative

On April 25, 2025, at 5:18 p.m., Civilian Witness 1 (“CW1”) called 911 to report that the Affected Person (“AP”) was shouting and making a mess inside the gas station that CW1 worked at. Loud shouting could be heard as CW1 spoke to the 911 call taker, and the call ended with CW1 providing a description of the AP, advising that he had left the gas station.

Prior to entering the gas station, the AP had been on the road shouting and trying to open door handles on vehicles. Civilian Witness 2 (“CW2”) was nearby and said that the AP attempted to enter CW2’s vehicle while CW2 was in it, and that he caused damage to it. CW2 described the AP as “super high.”

Witness Officer 1 (“WO1”) was dispatched to the area and located the AP approximately 10 minutes later. CCTV footage captured the interaction between WO1 and the AP. At one point, the AP appeared to try to get into WO1’s police vehicle, before moving away from WO1.

WO1 followed the AP in their police vehicle into a parking lot. WO1 described the AP as “sweating, appeared delirious, was pacing erratically, was shouting and could not answer questions.” Video showed that as WO1 approached, the AP ran up a flight of stairs on the outside of a building. WO1 engaged in conversation with the AP, who eventually came down to sit at the bottom of the stairs. WO1 broadcasted over the radio requesting other officers to come to the area to assist.

The video captured a brief struggle between WO1 and the AP before Witness Officer 2 (“WO2”) and Witness Officer 3 (“WO3”) arrived. The AP tried to get past WO1, and all three officers attempted to restrain the AP. The AP bit WO2’s gloved hand during the struggle with the officers. Civilian Witness 3 (“CW3”) was watching from a short distance away and said that the officers struggled to get the AP into handcuffs. CW3 said that the AP would not allow the officers to place his hands in handcuffs and was yelling and screaming incoherently.

Body-worn camera footage from WO2 captured the struggle between the officers and the AP, including the AP’s resistance.

A fourth officer (Witness Officer 4 or “WO4”) arrived at 5:33 p.m. to assist in trying to arrest and put handcuffs on the AP. All officers attempted to hold down the AP and get his hands in handcuffs. WO1 deployed their CEW on the AP at least four times during the struggle. No punches, kicks or other uses of force were utilized by the officers during the handcuffing process. Eventually, the officers were able to overpower the AP, and he was placed in handcuffs.

By 5:35 p.m., the AP was placed into an RCMP vehicle for transport to the RCMP detachment cells. The AP remained resistant to the officers’ attempts. CCTV footage captured the AP kicking his legs in the direction of WO4 after he had been placed in the rear of a police vehicle.

Officers then drove the AP to cells, where he was placed into a cell at 5:45 p.m. BC Emergency Health Services was called a short time later because officers were concerned that the AP was in a mental health crisis and/or drug psychosis. Paramedics arrived and sedated the AP before transporting him to a hospital.

The AP was taken to the hospital and records showed that he was experiencing delirium and a suspected relapse of schizophrenia. The AP was diagnosed with rhabdomyolysis, which is significant muscle breakdown that leads to toxins in the body. This led to his kidneys shutting down, which resulted in him requiring dialysis. Medical records indicated that rhabdomyolysis likely had multiple causes “in the background of suspected relapse of schizophrenia.” The critical care doctor who was responsible for the AP during part of his hospital stay advised that CEW use can cause rhabdomyolysis, but that it would not be appropriate for him to opine on whether the use of the CEW caused the rhabdomyolysis in this case.

The AP survived and was interviewed by IIO investigators a few weeks after the incident. The AP told investigators that he been released from a correctional facility on the day of the incident. The AP said that he was experiencing psychosis leading up to his release from prison, and that he had no recollection of the incident involving officers that day. The first thing he remembered was waking up in the hospital.

Analysis

The Independent Investigations Office of British Columbia is mandated to investigate any incident that occurs in the province in which an Affected Person has died or suffered serious physical harm and there appears to be a connection to the actions (or sometimes inaction) of an officer or detention guard. The goal is to provide assurance to the public that when the investigation is complete, they can trust the IIO’s conclusions, because the investigation was conducted by an independent, unbiased, civilian-led agency.

In most cases, those conclusions are presented in a public report such as this one, which completes the IIO’s mandate by explaining to the public what happened in the incident and how the Affected Person came to suffer harm. Such reports are generally intended to enhance public confidence in the police and in the justice system as a whole through a transparent and impartial evaluation of the incident and the police role in it.

In a smaller number of cases, the evidence gathered may give the Chief Civilian Director (“CCD”) reasonable grounds to believe that an officer or detention guard may have committed an offence in connection with the incident. In such a case, the *Police Act* gives the CCD authority to refer the file to the BC Prosecution Service for consideration of charges.

In a case such as this one, involving the use of force by officers, the IIO investigators collect evidence with respect to potential justifications for that use of force. The CCD then

analyzes this evidence using legal tests such as necessity, proportionality and reasonableness to reach conclusions as to whether the officers' actions were lawful.

A police officer must be acting in the lawful execution of their duties when they arrest or detain someone. In this case, officers were initially called because the AP was shouting and making a mess inside a gas station. The AP's behaviour escalated to trying to open car doors and damaging property. Members of the public were frightened by the AP's actions, and officers needed to intervene to protect the public and prevent the AP's behaviour from escalating further.

It was reasonable for the officers to use some force to arrest the AP and put the AP into handcuffs, including by restraining him initially. The video evidence shows that despite multiple officers attempting to restrain the AP, he continued to resist their efforts. Civilian witnesses also verify this. At that point, it was reasonable and proportionate for the CEW to be deployed by WO1.

I have determined that there is no evidence to suggest that the level of force used by any of the officers was excessive throughout the incident, given the video evidence that the AP was resisting arrest. Notably, no punches, kicks or other uses of force were utilized by the officers as they interacted with the AP. The officer's body-worn camera video was valuable evidence to support that the officers acted in a measured way.

The detachment cell video shows that the officers took appropriate steps to provide the AP with medical attention.

Accordingly, as the Chief Civilian Director of the IIO, I do not consider that there are reasonable grounds to believe that an officer may have committed an offence under any enactment and therefore the matter will not be referred to the BC Prosecution Service for consideration of charges.



Jessica Berglund
Chief Civilian Director

August 25, 2026
Date of Release