

**Report to / Rapport au:**

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

**23 June 2025 / 23 juin 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-552**

**OBJET: RAPPORT SUR L'UNITÉ DES ENQUÊTES SPÉCIALES – ENQUÊTE  
24-OPF-552**

**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**

In the morning of December 24, 2024, OPS officers began arriving at a residence in the area of Baseline Road and Greenbank Road, Ottawa. Witness #1 had called police expressing concern about the Complainant. She indicated the Complainant was suicidal and had cut himself with a knife.

Patrol officers were the first to arrive. A number of them entered the residence and spoke to the Complainant. The Complainant was in possession of a knife and refused to cooperate with the officers, waving the knife in their direction. Removed from the home by one of the officers, Witness #1 told him that the Complainant was at risk of harming himself with the knife. She noted an earlier suicide attempt by the Complainant the month prior. The officer – WO #1 – re-entered the house and advised the other officers that there were grounds to apprehend the Complainant under the *Mental Health Act*. The Complainant remained belligerent, and the officers thought it best to remove themselves from the home and call in the Tactical Unit (TU).

TU officers, including the SO, began arriving on the scene at about 11:45 a.m. and set up an inner perimeter around the front door of the residence. Minutes later, the Complainant emerged onto his front step and threatened the officers before re-entering and closing the door. The TU decided that they would attempt to prevent the Complainant from re-entering the home by way of a 40 mm launcher (less lethal weapon able to fire sponge projectiles) in the event he exited again and continued to ignore police commands to surrender.

At about 11:48 a.m., the Complainant opened the door and stepped onto the front landing. He was not holding a knife. He berated the officers with insults and threats. From a position several meters east of the Complainant's location, the SO, armed with the 40 mm launcher, fired a sponge round from his weapon. The projectile struck the Complainant on the left leg, but he remained standing and continued to yell at the officers. The SO fired two additional shots, again striking the Complainant's left leg. This time, the Complainant lowered himself to the ground and placed his hands up. Officers moved in and took him into custody.

The Complainant was seen at the hospital but was not diagnosed with any serious injury. Given that the 40 mm launcher is categorized as a firearm, the SIU was called and invoked its mandate.

## **INVESTIGATIONS**

### **SIU Investigation:**

On April 23, 2025, the OPS received a letter from the Director of the SIU concerning the outcome of their investigation. In his letter, Director Martino stated that the file has been closed, and no further action is 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.

In his report, the SIU Director stated: “The evidence establishes that the Complainant, while of unsound mind, had cut himself and was at risk of doing himself and the officers harm at the time of the events in question. On this record, I am satisfied he was subject to lawful apprehension under section 17 of the *Mental Health Act*.

I am also satisfied that the SO comported himself within the limits of the criminal law when he fired his less-lethal firearm at the Complainant. By that point, over the course of about an hour during which the police attempted to negotiate a peaceful resolution to the standoff, it had become clear that the Complainant would not surrender into police custody.”

The Director added: “The officers could have embarked on a hands-on physical confrontation with the Complainant when he stepped out the front door, but, given he was possibly still in possession of a knife, that would have risked serious injury or even death. In the circumstances, the use of the 40 mm launcher would appear a warranted use of force. If it worked as designed, the impact with the Complainant of the less-lethal projectiles would open a window of opportunity during which he could be safely apprehended without the infliction of serious injury. In essence, that is what occurred.”

The Director concluded that he was satisfied with the SO’s actions, and there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case.

#### **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 officers and the SO followed the policies, procedures, and their training when tending to the Mental Health call.

PSU’s investigation confirmed what the SIU concluded, in that the officers were in the lawful execution of their duty. Furthermore, the SO, along with other members of his team, had formulated a sound plan to take the Complainant into custody with minimal force. The use of the 40 mm launcher would assist them in preventing further harm to the public, themselves, and the Complainant. There are no indications that the SO acted outside of their lawful authority. The SO and other officers worked diligently and according to their training, OPS policies and procedures to ensure the incident ended with no further injuries.

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.