



**IN THE MATTER OF THE SERIOUS HARM OF A MAN
WHILE BEING APPREHENDED BY MEMBERS OF THE
VANCOUVER POLICE DEPARTMENT
ON JUNE 7, 2025**

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

Chief Civilian Director:

Jessica Berglund

IIO File Number:

2025-141

Date of Release:

January 16, 2026

INTRODUCTION

In the early morning hours of June 7, 2025, the Vancouver Police Department received several 911 calls indicating a man had been stabbed multiple times at a hotel on the Downtown Eastside. Officers arrived and interacted with the Affected Person (“AP”), who had a knife. The Subject Officer (“SO”) shot the AP with a bean bag shotgun multiple times, injuring the AP’s hand in a way that required reconstructive surgery to fix.

Because the injury occurred in connection with the actions of police officers, the Independent Investigations Office (“IIO”) was notified and commenced an investigation. The narrative that follows is based on evidence collected and analyzed during the investigation, including the following:

- statements of two civilian witnesses;
- statements of three witness police officers;
- video of the incident;
- PRIME and CAD records;
- recordings of the police radio transmissions;
- police training records and policy; and
- medical records of the AP.

The IIO does not compel officers who are the subject of an investigation to submit their notes, reports and data. In this case, the Subject Officer did not provide evidence to the IIO.

NARRATIVE

On June 7, 2025 at 2:51 a.m., the Vancouver Police Department received three 911 calls from a hotel on the Downtown Eastside. Callers reported that a man (Civilian Witness 1 or “CW1”) had been stabbed multiple times by someone on the third floor. One caller reported:

On the third floor of the hotel, there's been a home invasion. There are people being beaten and stabbed right now. We're outside the door. Hurry, man, can't talk. There's people being stabbed, on the third floor.

The first officers arrived at 2:54 a.m. and located the victim of the stabbing (CW1) outside the hotel. CW1 was bleeding and had been stabbed multiple times. Witness Officer 1 (“WO1”) and Witness Officer 2 (“WO2”) stayed outside to provide medical treatment to CW1 while Witness Officer 3 (“WO3”), and Witness Officer 4 (“WO4”) entered the hotel to attempt to locate the suspect of the stabbing, the Affected Person (“AP”), and to ensure there were not any more victims.

Witness Officer 5 (“WO5”) and the Subject Officer (“SO”) arrived together at 2:56 a.m. The SO retrieved his bean bag shotgun from a police vehicle before entering the hotel. As the officers entered the front double doors of the hotel, Civilian Witness 2 (“CW2”), a resident of the hotel, was leaving the building and said to the officers, “He’s coming down.”

WO5 walked into the hotel and saw the AP in the vestibule area of the lobby holding a metal rod in his left hand. WO5 described the AP as a large male, weighing approximately 250 pounds, or 113 kilograms, and being 6’3”, or about 191 centimetres, tall. WO5 described the AP as “staring wide-eyed,” “tensing up” and not responding to the officers. Unsure if he was connected to the incident, WO5 attempted to grab the AP and told him to “come on outside.” The AP then pulled away from WO5 and flashed a knife in his right hand. WO5 drew his firearm and backed out of the hotel lobby, yelling at the AP to “drop the knife.” The AP turned around and moved towards the outside of the hotel.

WO2 approached the AP with his Conducted Energy Weapon (“CEW” or Taser) and deployed it on the AP. WO2 saw one prong hit the AP, but it was ineffective in gaining AP’s compliance. At the same time, the SO fired bean bag rounds that hit the AP, also with no effect. WO5 said that the AP “did not even flinch” when struck by the bean bag rounds.

CCTV captured the events as they unfolded. The officers can be seen backing slowly out of the hotel with their weapons pointed at the AP as he moved towards them. WO2 deployed the CEW a second time, which was ineffective, and the SO continued to fire bean bag rounds towards the AP, striking him on various points on his body with little to no effect. The AP took approximately seven steps while still holding the metal rod and knife in his hands. Officers repeated commands to “drop the knife.”

The AP dropped to the sidewalk on one knee, and the metal rod fell in front of him while he continued to hold the knife in his right hand. The AP then laid on his stomach on the sidewalk, with the metal rod underneath his body and the knife still clutched in his right hand. Officers stood with their weapons drawn approximately 4-5 feet away and gave the AP commands to “drop the knife” for approximately 13 seconds. The AP then dropped the knife from his hand while laying on the ground, with the knife still in reach. Within a second of the AP dropping the knife, the SO discharged his bean bag shotgun and struck the AP on the palm of his right hand. The officers approached the AP to place handcuffs on him, kicking away the knife.

WO5 explained the risk that the AP presented throughout the incident. WO5 noted that the AP had allegedly stabbed CW1, and said that the AP’s strange behaviour and ability to withstand multiple bean bag rounds heightened his already high risk assessment. WO5 explained that even when the AP was on the ground with the knife beside him, the AP still presented a risk because, “This guy can jump up, grab the knife, go towards a bystander on the street.” WO5 also explained there was a risk that the AP could return back into the hotel with the knife.

Once the AP was safely in handcuffs, WO5 noticed that a bean bag projectile had penetrated the AP’s hand and caused injury. The AP was transported to hospital for treatment, and received reconstructive surgery on his hand several weeks later.

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 police. 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 has committed an offence in connection with the incident. In such a case, the *Police Act* gives the CCD authority to refer the file to Crown Counsel 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 the use of force and any potential justifications for it. The CCD then analyzes this evidence using legal tests such as necessity, proportionality and reasonableness to reach conclusions as to whether officers' actions were lawful, or whether an officer may have committed the offence of assault.

The officers responded to a high risk call where someone had just been stabbed and the suspect (the AP) was still at large. Once officers arrived, they came face-to-face with a large man that had a knife in his hand and refused to drop it. Despite multiple commands for the AP to drop the knife and attempted use of the CEW and bean bag shotgun, the AP still did not comply with police direction. The video evidence corroborated the officers' accounts that the AP had a knife in his hand and was moving towards police without dropping it.

It was reasonable for the SO to deploy the bean bag multiple times to get the AP to drop the knife. It would not have been appropriate for members to approach the AP and attempt to lay hands on him when he was brandishing a knife that could be used against the officers. The risk to the officers' safety in that situation warranted the use of the bean bag weapon.

Once the AP went to the ground, he still had the knife in his hand and was refusing to drop it. It was both necessary and reasonable, in those circumstances, for the police to use the bean bag shotgun to get the AP to drop the knife. A final bean bag shot was deployed when the knife was no longer in the AP's hand, but was in close proximity and reasonably accessible to the AP. The officers believed that the AP had just stabbed someone and he still had a knife nearby him. There

was a hotel full of residents nearby. The AP remained a threat to the officers and the public until he was securely in handcuffs. The force used was necessary and reasonable in the circumstances, given the danger that the AP still presented with the knife so close to him.

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 Crown counsel for consideration of charges.



Jessica Berglund
Chief Civilian Director

January 16, 2026
Date of Release