

**Report to / Rapport au:**

**OTTAWA POLICE SERVICE BOARD  
LA COMMISSION DE SERVICE DE POLICE D'OTTAWA**

**24 February 2025 / 24 février 2025**

**Submitted by / Soumis par:**

**Chief of Police, Ottawa Police Service / Chef de police, Service de police d'Ottawa**

**Contact Person / Personne ressource:**

**Superintendent Robert Drummond, Executive Officer to the Chief of Police  
DrummondR@ottawapolice.ca**

**SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT 24-OPF-301**

**OBJET: RAPPORT SUR L'UNITÉ DES ENQUÊTES SPÉCIALES – ENQUÊTE  
24-OPF-301**

**REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

**That the Ottawa Police Service Board receive this report for information.**

**RECOMMANDATIONS DU RAPPORT**

**Que la Commission de service de police d'Ottawa prenne connaissance du présent rapport à titre d'information.**

**BACKGROUND**

This document outlines a police interaction that resulted in the Special Investigations Unit (SIU) invoking their mandate. The background of the incident, along with SIU findings and recommendations are provided. As required by legislation, the Professional Standards Unit (PSU) subsequently completed an investigation into the policy, services and conduct of the Ottawa Police Service (OPS) in relation to this incident.

**DISCUSSION**

On July 9, 2024, an OPS officer observed an OPP officer in a physical confrontation with the Complainant on Highway 417 in Ottawa. The OPS officer gave assistance and used a CEW to gain control of the Complainant who was combative, uncooperative, and appeared to be going through a psychotic episode. Once the Complainant was

subdued, he was conveyed to the Montfort Hospital by the OPP under the Mental Health Act and was subsequently involuntarily admitted to the psychiatric facility.

On July 10, 2024, Montfort Hospital staff called 911 reporting that the Complainant was in a state of psychosis and security was having difficulty controlling him. Furthermore, the Complainant was confined to an area away from staff but had access to other hospital patients. Uniformed officers arrived and met with hospital security personnel who informed of the Complainant's background. The Complainant had former military training, mixed martial arts training, was extremely violent and had been diagnosed with schizophrenia. Given the Complainant's recent history of violence and his current display of aggressive behavior, OPS patrol officers called the OPS Tactical Unit for assistance.

Once the Tactical Unit arrived, the plan was to speak with the Complainant and resolve the matter peacefully. As soon as a tactical officer opened the door to access the area, the Complainant rushed towards him. The officer was able to retreat and close the door. Another plan was devised, and a less than lethal weapon was to be used to distract the Complainant should he rush the officers again. The officer opened the door, and again, the Complainant rushed towards them. The Subject Official (SO) fired one round from his 40-millimeter launcher (foam-tipped projectile) but the round missed the Complainant. Other officers used a protective shield, grounded the Complainant, and applied the handcuffs. A sedative was used by medical staff to calm the Complainant as he continued to resist and make attempts to assault the officers. Once restrained, the Complainant was turned over to hospital staff. No injuries were sustained by the Complainant, staff members or the involved officers.

The 40-millimeter launcher is considered a firearm, thus, the OPS contacted the SIU and notified them. The SIU invoked its mandate and opened an investigation.

## **INVESTIGATIONS**

### **SIU Investigation:**

On November 7, 2024, the OPS received a letter from the Director of the SIU concerning the outcome of their investigation. In his letter, Director Martino stated the file has been closed and no further action contemplated. He was satisfied that there were no grounds in the evidence to proceed with criminal charges against the Subject Official who was involved in this incident. The SIU investigative report was also disclosed to the Chief.

The SIU collected evidence, including interviews with police and non-police witnesses, and video footage.

In his report, the SIU Director stated: “The Complainant was subject to arrest at the time the SO fired his less-lethal launcher. Given the violence he had exhibited to staff at the mental health unit, the tactical team were within their rights in seeking to arrest the Complainant to preserve the peace.”

The Director concluded with, “I am also satisfied that the force used by the SO in the course of the Complainant’s arrest, namely, the discharge of his less-lethal launcher, was legally justified. The tactical team had good reason to believe that the Complainant would physically resist his arrest given his volatile behaviour. In the circumstances, having tried and failed to engage the Complainant peaceably, they were entitled to resort to a measure of force to take him into custody. The deployment of the less-lethal launcher – which fired foam-tipped rounds – made sense. If it worked as designed, the impact of the round would temporarily throw the Complainant off-kilter, without causing serious injury, allowing the officers to safely approach to effect the arrest.”

#### **Professional Standards Unit Investigation:**

Pursuant to Section 8 of Ontario Regulation 90/24, Section 81 of the Community Safety and Police Act (CSPA), PSU initiated an investigation into this incident to review the policies and services provided by the OPS, and to determine if the conduct of the involved police officers was appropriate.

During the PSU investigations, it was noted that the involved officer, and the SO followed the policies, procedures, and their training when tending to the call for service and using force to affect an arrest.

PSU’s investigation confirmed what the SIU concluded, in that, the officers were in the lawful execution of their duty. Furthermore, the RO’s use of force was appropriate, given the Complainant’s continuous showing of aggressive and assaultive behavior. The use of the less-lethal launcher was a good choice, based on sound judgement demonstrated by the tactical command and executed by the officers. It brought the incident to an end without injuries or further damage to the hospital.

PSU further investigated the use of force and equipment and did not find any issues with any of the application of force or the use of the said equipment.

After further review of the incident, no issues were identified in relation to service delivery or corporate policy as well as the conduct of the attending officers.

**Conduct Findings** – No conduct issues identified.

**Service Findings** – No service issues identified.

**Policy Findings** – No policy issues identified.

**CONCLUSION**

PSU has completed its Section 81 investigation into this incident and no further action is required.