

# ***SIRT***

*Serious Incident Response Team*

## **Investigation Summary:**

Incident Type: Officer-Involved Shooting (Fatal)

SIRT File No.: 2023-25

Incident Date: November 1, 2023

Agency Involved: Estevan Police Service

Civilian Executive Director: Greg Gudelot

Date of Report: October 2, 2025

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	2
Timeline .....	2
The Investigation .....	2
Summary .....	3
Analysis .....	5
Decision.....	6

## Introduction

On Wednesday, November 1, 2023, the Saskatchewan Serious Incident Response Team (SIRT) received a notification from the Estevan Police Service (EPS) regarding an officer-involved shooting that had taken place within the EPS headquarters at approximately 9:32 a.m.

Earlier that morning, EPS received a call for service and discovered a woman who had sustained serious injuries within a residence in Estevan. Despite first aid and medical treatment being provided, the woman was pronounced deceased and her 19-year-old son, subsequently referred to as the affected person, was arrested.

The affected person was taken to EPS headquarters to be processed in conjunction with his arrest. During the process of photographing the affected person, a confrontation took place and the affected person gained control of an EPS issued firearm. During the incident, one member of EPS was shot, sustaining a serious injury. A second EPS member discharged their service pistol, striking the affected person.

EPS members provided first aid until EMS arrived. EMS attended the scene and provided care to both the officer and the affected person before both individuals were transported to hospital, first in Estevan and then to Regina. The affected person was subsequently pronounced deceased at approximately 3:50 p.m.

## Timeline

SIRT was notified of the incident on November 1, 2023, at approximately 9:45 a.m. A SIRT team consisting of the Civilian Executive Director and five SIRT investigators was immediately deployed to Estevan to begin the investigation. On July 10, 2025, the completed investigation was submitted to the Civilian Executive Director for review.

## The Investigation

SIRT's investigation was comprehensive and thorough, conducted using current investigative protocols, and in accordance with the principles of Major Case Management (MCM). During the course of the investigation, all relevant police and civilian witnesses were interviewed, a scene examination was conducted of the incident location, and all relevant audio, video, documentary, and physical evidence was seized.

Video footage related to the incident was obtained from the various EPS vehicles involved in the initial arrest and transport of the affected person as well as from the EPS headquarters. While there is extensive video coverage within the EPS detention area, and footage was available from a significant number of cameras and angles, due to the various uses of the room where the majority of the incident occurred, no video footage directly capturing the incident itself was available for the investigation. That said, footage from other cameras assisted the investigation, capturing events such as the affected person's attempt to exit the room in question, and flashes consistent with gunshots, which assisted in developing a timeline of the incident.

Eleven police officers were designated as Witness Officers and were interviewed or provided notes during the course of SIRT's investigation. This included the police officer (later referred to as WO1), who was shot during

the incident, and was interviewed by SIRT investigators as a direct witness to the incident. Additional Witness Officers provided evidence regarding the arrest and transport of the affected person prior to the incident, the EPS response immediately following the incident, and the provision of first aid to both the affected person and WO1 after the incident.

Two civilian witnesses were identified and interviewed during the course of the incident, including a civilian detention guard and a detainee present within the EPS detention area at the time the incident occurred.

While under no legal obligation to do so, the Subject Officer voluntarily provided a statement to SIRT investigators as well as providing access to his police notes for use in the investigation. In addition to the statement and notes, the Subject Officer participated in a video recorded reenactment of the incident with SIRT investigators. Evidence directly from a Subject Officer, when voluntarily provided, is often invaluable in cases such as this, particularly when only limited video footage is available, as it can assist both with the factual determination of what occurred, and provide evidence of the subjective beliefs and perceptions of the Subject Officer.

Several physical exhibits were seized during the course of SIRT's investigation, with some submitted for further analysis as the investigation proceeded. These exhibits included the handgun possessed by the Subject Officer, as well as the handgun initially possessed by WO1 at the commencement of the incident. Function testing confirmed that both firearms were in proper working condition and passed all function testing and inspection. Following the incident, a spent shell casing remained inside the firearm initially possessed by WO1, having failed to fully eject following the final shot fired from that pistol. The pistol initially possessed by WO1 was submitted for laboratory testing during the course of the investigation, and testing confirmed the presence of the affected person's DNA on several parts of the pistol, including its grip and trigger. The results of this testing provided independent corroboration of the affected person's possession of WO1's pistol during the incident, as described by the relevant police witnesses.

Following the death of the affected person at the early stages of SIRT's investigation, an autopsy examination was conducted, which determined that the affected person had sustained two close range gunshot wounds to the right side of his rear torso, entering, but not exiting, the affected person's body causing extensive internal injury. Toxicology results noted the presence of methamphetamine and cocaine in the affected person's blood, at levels consistent with intoxication but not overdose. The determination of the forensic pathologist was that the cause of the affected person's death was multiple gunshot wounds to the torso.

## **Summary**

On November 1, 2023, at approximately 6:43 a.m., EPS received a call from EMS requesting assistance with a call at a residential address in Estevan where EMS had been dispatched to a report of an injured person. Upon arrival, members of EPS observed that an adult female, later identified as the mother of the affected person, had been stabbed. The affected person, the only other person in the residence, was observed to be covered in blood and was placed under arrest in relation to the stabbing. Based on the observations of the responding EPS members that the female's injuries were likely fatal, it was determined that the matter would be treated as a homicide. Despite medical intervention, the affected person's mother passed away in hospital a short time later.

Following his arrest, the affected person was placed in the rear of an EPS patrol vehicle and was transported to the EPS headquarters for processing and detention, arriving at approximately 7:14 a.m. On the morning of the incident, EPS did not have a Forensic Identification Section (FIS) member on duty, and as two separate locations required FIS processing, two members were called out to assist. One member of the Weyburn Police Service (WPS) FIS was requested to attend to the hospital and document the injuries to the affected person's mother, while an EPS FIS member, later designated as Witness Officer 1 (WO1), attended to EPS headquarters to process and document the affected person, who as previously noted, was covered in blood.

At approximately 7:18 a.m., the affected person was placed in an observation room within the EPS detention area and was provided with privacy to contact legal counsel. Once contact with counsel was complete, the affected person remained in the observation room awaiting processing. As this room was used for various purposes within the detention facility, including contact with legal counsel, it was not equipped with video monitoring so as to preserve the right of an accused to speak privately with counsel. Responsibility for guarding the affected person was transferred from the arresting officer to another member of EPS, later designated as the Subject Officer (SO) in this investigation.

WO1 entered the observation room at approximately 9:25 a.m. to begin processing the affected person. The affected person was seated in a chair next to a table near the door of the observation room. WO1 was clad in a modified uniform consisting of tactical pants and a short-sleeved golf shirt bearing the EPS insignia. WO1's service pistol was worn in a paddle-style holster attached to his belt on his right hip. The SO remained in the room and stood near the open doorway as WO1 introduced himself to the affected person and explained that he would begin processing him. After introducing himself, WO1 left the room to retrieve his camera, and after taking several initial pictures of the affected person, excused himself once again to retrieve evidence bags for the affected person's clothing. WO1 left the room again to obtain replacement clothing for the affected person, returning with the clothing in a large paper bag. While WO1 was outside of the room, the SO remained, guarding the affected person.

Once WO1 had re-entered the room, he began to process the affected person as the SO remained standing in the open doorway of the room. WO1 asked the affected person to remove his hoodie, and the affected person stood and attempted to remove the hoodie, appearing to struggle to locate the zipper due to a tear on the clothing. WO1 moved forward to assist the affected person, but the affected person pushed his hand away. Both WO1 and the SO noted that they interpreted this gesture not as an act of aggression, but as simply rejecting WO1's assistance. The affected person eventually succeeded in removing his hoodie, but instead of placing the clothing in the evidence bag that had been provided, tossed it on the table to his right. WO1 reached across with his left hand to retrieve the item from the table, and in doing so, slightly exposed his holstered pistol to the affected person.

At approximately 9:31 a.m., the affected person reached forward and grabbed WO1's pistol with both hands. WO1 attempted to defend his pistol, but the holster detached from the belt and WO1 shouted to the SO words to the effect of "he has my gun". The SO quickly entered the room from the doorway and WO1, the SO, and the affected person struggled for control of the pistol, which was still contained within the detached holster. The affected person succeeded in removing the pistol from the holster and WO1 stated words to the effect of "he has it". The affected person fired a single shot from WO1's pistol, striking WO1 in the abdomen,

and partially emerged from the observation room into the detention area hallway, before being pulled back inside as the struggle for control of the pistol continued.

The SO succeeded in pushing the affected person, still holding WO1's pistol against the rear wall of the observation room. WO1, who had sustained a gunshot wound, fell to the ground at this point, but was able to rise to his feet and continue the attempts to regain control of his pistol. The affected person, pushed against the wall by the SO, held the pistol in his right arm, extended forward and at an upward angle estimated at 45-degrees. WO1 grabbed the slide of his pistol as the affected person succeeded in firing another shot, striking the rear wall of the observation room. Following the shot, as the affected person still retained control of the gun and began to lower it from its raised angle, the SO drew his service pistol and fired two shots from the hip in close succession, striking the affected person in the torso.

The affected person fell to the ground, and WO1 sat down in the observation room chair. The SO applied one handcuff to the affected person, who stated words to the effect of "just finish me", and radioed for assistance, stating "shots fired, officer down", as well as requesting an ambulance.

Four members of EPS, who had been receiving a briefing on the ongoing homicide investigation, rushed to the detention area. Upon arrival, one of the responding members completed handcuffing the affected person, and first aid was provided to both the affected person and WO1 until the arrival of EMS.

EMS arrived and assumed responsibility for the care of the affected person and WO1, who were both transported to hospital in Estevan, before being transferred to hospital in Regina for further treatment. At approximately 3:50 p.m. on November 1, 2023, the affected person passed away during surgery at Regina General Hospital. WO1 was treated and released from hospital after several days.

## **Analysis**

While SIRT's investigation into this matter was successful in gathering a significant volume of evidence from a number of different sources, the location of the incident, contained primarily within an observation room which for reasons that were both clearly articulated and legally reasonable, was not subject to video recording, left SIRT's investigation without direct video footage of the incident. Accordingly, while there existed significant audio, video, and documentary evidence depicting many aspects of the events prior to and following the incident, the primary direct evidence regarding how the incident itself unfolded was provided by the SO and WO1, who were present inside the observation room with the affected person.

In situations such as this, it is important to recognize that SIRT's investigation does not automatically accept this evidence without challenge, and that the evidence provided by the directly-involved police officers is scrutinized to the same degree as any other evidence gathered during the course of the investigation, and steps are taken to determine whether that evidence is consistent with, corroborated by, or contradicted by any other available eyewitness, or physical or forensic evidence. In this case, significant corroboration of the direct versions obtained from the SO and WO1 is provided by the results of the forensic examination, the results of the DNA analysis of WO1's pistol, and, unfortunately, the serious injury sustained by WO1 during the incident.

The narrative of the incident, as obtained from the numerous sources of evidence gathered during the course of SIRT's investigation, depicts a situation where the SO had an undeniably reasonable fear of death or grievous bodily harm, for both himself and WO1. In this case, that fear was not merely a reasonably apprehended theoretical or potential risk, but an ongoing and pressing reality based on the injury sustained by WO1, the subsequent discharge of an additional shot by the affected person, and the continuing attempt by the affected person to bring WO1's pistol to bear.

At the time of the incident, the affected person had been lawfully arrested in connection with an ongoing homicide investigation and was lawfully subject to the attendant detention and processing that followed that arrest. Accordingly, the SO was lawfully placed in all of his dealings with the affected person that occurred within the EPS detention facility.

Under S. 25 of the *Criminal Code*, a police officer is authorized to use as much force as necessary in the lawful execution of their duties. This can include force that is intended or likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm, when the officer reasonably believes that such force is necessary to defend themselves or someone under their protection from death or grievous bodily harm. Further, under S. 34 of the *Criminal Code* any person, including a police officer, is entitled to the use of reasonable force in defence of themselves or another. Factors in assessing the reasonableness of force used can include the use or threatened use of a weapon, the imminence of the threat, other options available, and the nature of the force or threat of force itself.

As previously outlined, the events inside the observation room, comprising an ongoing situation where risk of death remained real and grievous bodily harm had already occurred, amply satisfy the criteria required under both S.25 and S.34 of the *Criminal Code* to legally protect the force employed by the SO to address that ongoing risk, and to practically preclude the ability to rely on a lesser degree of force during the incident.

In this case, following the application of the facts established by the evidence to the standard established by law, the force employed by the SO falls within the range that is protected by law, and accordingly, provides no grounds to believe that the SO committed any *Criminal Code* offence during the course of this incident. As a result, no charges will be laid.

## Decision

There being no grounds to believe an offence was committed by the Subject Officer, SIRT's involvement with this matter is concluded without referral to the Attorney General for Saskatchewan in accordance with S.91.08(10)(a) of *The Police Act, 1990*.

Original Signed

---

Greg Gudelot  
Civilian Executive Director  
Serious Incident Response Team (SIRT)

October 2, 2025

---

Date of Report