



**IN THE MATTER OF THE DEATH OF A MAN
ON DECEMBER 12, 2025,
AFTER AN INCIDENT INVOLVING MEMBERS OF THE
SURREY POLICE SERVICE IN
SURREY, BRITISH COLUMBIA
ON DECEMBER 6, 2025**

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

Chief Civilian Director:

Jessica Berglund

IIO File Number:

2025-281

Date of Release:

September 16, 2026

INTRODUCTION

On December 6, 2025, Surrey Police Service (“SPS”) members responded to a domestic assault complaint and arrested the Affected Person (“AP”) at his residence. The arrest was carried out without the use of significant force other than handcuffing and the AP was transported to cells. Upon arrival, he was found unresponsive in the rear of the police vehicle. He was transported to the hospital for medical attention. On December 12, 2025, the AP was declared deceased.

Because of the connection in time between the harm suffered by the AP and his interactions with police, 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 one civilian witness and one witness police officer;
- police Computer-Aided Dispatch (“CAD”) and Police Records Information Management Environment (“PRIME”) records;
- audio recordings of police radio transmissions;
- video recordings from the scene of the arrest and from SPS cells area;
- BC Emergency Health Services records; and
- postmortem and toxicology reports.

Based on initial evidence gathered in this case indicating that the AP had suffered a medical event that had not been caused by the actions of any police officer, no officer was designated as a Subject Officer. Evidence was obtained from a civilian witness, the designated Witness Officer, the PRIME reports of other involved officers and objective evidence such as video recordings and medical reports.

NARRATIVE

At 9:34 p.m. on December 6, 2025, several Surrey police officers responded to a residence after a call reporting a domestic disturbance at the address. Civilian Witness 1 (“CW1”), the civilian caller, later told IIO investigators about an altercation between family members that had escalated to screaming and possible physical assault. When the police arrived, CW1 said, he was outside the house. He said officers went into the house, and he heard “some kind of thump” as if the AP had “jumped off the bed” (CW1 also said, at

another point in his interview, that the AP was immediately standing in front of his bed when the police entered, but did not explain how he saw this from outside the house). CW1 said the officers took hold of the AP by the arms, one on each side, and CW1 heard the AP saying he had done nothing wrong.

CW1 said that, eventually, the officers brought the AP out of the house and took him to a police car. CW1 said that police did not use any other force against the AP, and did not strike him. Security camera video obtained by IIO investigators shows the AP was held between two officers as he walked to the police vehicle.

Witness Officer 1 (“WO1”) told the IIO that when he went into the residence, he saw the AP on a bed, apparently asleep. WO1 said he told the AP he was under arrest, but the AP did not respond. WO1 said another officer pulled the AP from the bed into a sitting position on the floor. WO1 said the AP was then picked up, and as he was now yelling belligerently, he was handcuffed before being walked out of the house and placed into the rear seat of a police vehicle.

WO1 said that by the time he had completed some formalities with the AP prior to transporting him, the AP had calmed down. On the way to the police station, WO1 said, he could hear the AP snoring in the back seat, but did not hear any other sounds through the “silent patrolman” partition that separated the front seats from the rear.

WO1 told investigators that at the station, when he went to the back door of his vehicle to bring the AP out and into the cells area, he found the AP had fallen down into the footwell in front of the rear seat, and saw that the AP’s face had a blue tinge. When he checked, WO1 found that the AP did not appear to be breathing. He immediately called for assistance, and the AP was pulled out of the vehicle and into the custody area where staff began administering cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR). This account of events was corroborated by video recordings from the police establishment.

The AP was subsequently transported to the hospital and placed in intensive care. On December 15, 2025, the IIO was advised by the BC Coroners Service that the AP had been declared deceased.

The AP’s Postmortem Examination Report stated the cause of death as “combined effects of atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease and acute or chronic ethanol use.” No injury of any sort, related to the incident or the arrest, was noted.

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 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 ("BCPS") for consideration of charges.

In this case, the AP's death was the result of medical conditions and alcohol consumption. The involved officers were acting in the lawful execution of their duty in arresting the AP after receiving evidence of a potential domestic assault. There is no evidence that any unjustified force was used against the AP by any officer, and no evidence that any officer was negligent in the course of police interactions with the AP.

Accordingly, as 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 the matter will not be referred to the BCPS for consideration of charges.

Jessica Berglund
Chief Civilian Director

September 16, 2026
Date of Release