

SIRT

Serious Incident Response Team

Investigation Summary:

Incident Type: Officer-Involved Shooting (Fatal)

SIRT File No.: 2025-20

Incident Date: July 18, 2025

Agency Involved: RPS

Civilian Executive Director: Greg Gudelot

Date of Report: August 14, 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Timeline	2
The Investigation	2
Summary	4
Analysis	5
Decision.....	8

Introduction

On Friday, July 18, 2025, at approximately 10:30 a.m., the Saskatchewan Serious Incident Response Team (SIRT) received a notification from the Regina Police Service (RPS) regarding an officer-involved shooting that had just taken place in Regina. SIRT's Civilian Executive Director accepted the notification as within SIRT's mandate and directed an investigation by SIRT.

On the morning of July 18, 2025, plainclothes members of the RPS Major Crimes Unit were engaged in a homicide investigation. At approximately 10:08 a.m., members observed a 29-year-old male on a bicycle, subsequently referred to as the affected person, who was wanted in connection with the investigation. The members requested other RPS units attend the area to assist with locating the affected person again after contact had been lost. At approximately 10:12 a.m., the affected person was located by plainclothes members of RPS in the alley between Garnet Street and Athol Street north of 8th Avenue. Two plainclothes members of RPS exited separate unmarked police vehicles and a confrontation took place between the affected person and police. During that confrontation, police issued verbal commands to the affected person. One plainclothes member of RPS, subsequently referred to as the Subject Officer, discharged a single round from a service pistol, striking the affected person.

RPS immediately called EMS to attend the scene as additional police resources arrived and assessed the affected person's injuries. EMS arrived at the scene at approximately 10:17 a.m., and assumed responsibility for the affected person's care, pronouncing him deceased at approximately 10:19 a.m.

Timeline

SIRT was notified of the incident on July 18, 2025, at approximately 10:30 a.m. A SIRT team consisting of the Civilian Executive Director and four SIRT investigators was immediately deployed to Regina to begin the investigation. On May 19, 2026, 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, and documentary evidence was seized. Numerous physical exhibits were seized during the scene examination, with several of those exhibits subsequently submitted for testing.

Audio recordings seized during the investigation captured RPS radio communications during the incident, and in particular, contained a recording consistent with the identification of police upon arrival at the incident scene, and the confirmation that the firearm believed to be possessed by the affected person remained outstanding in advance of the incident. Video footage related to the incident was obtained both from a neighborhood canvas and from the involved RPS vehicles but was determined to be of little value to the investigation. The two RPS vehicles present during the actual incident were both unmarked vehicles operated

by the RPS Major Crimes Unit, which were not equipped with in-car digital video (ICDV) systems. ICDV video was obtained from RPS marked vehicles during the investigation, but this footage captured only events that occurred following the incident itself. A neighborhood canvas for civilian video footage yielded only a single video of limited relevance, capturing an individual believed to be the affected person operating a bicycle in advance of the incident.

A significant volume of documentary evidence was obtained by SIRT investigators during the course of the investigation. The documents were related both to the incident itself and the ongoing homicide investigation which brought RPS members into contact with the affected person during the incident. These documents included dispatch logs, briefing reports, emails, and various documents related to the affected person's background. Of particular significance were documents related to information received reporting the possession of a black Glock handgun by the affected person. Additional documentary evidence recorded the arrest of the affected person in the days leading up to the incident, during which several rounds of live ammunition were seized, but with the previously reported handgun still outstanding. Documents related to the affected person's background confirmed the existence of a court order imposing a prohibition on the possession of both firearms and ammunition, and the existence of an officer safety flag on his profile.

A total of 16 members of RPS were designated as witness officers during the course of SIRT's investigation, with those directly involved interviewed during the investigation and those with peripheral involvement providing notes or reports relevant to their involvement. One Witness Officer, a member of the RPS Major Crimes Unit, was present in the alley at the time of the incident and was interviewed in relation to his actions and observations. Two civilian witnesses were identified during SIRT's investigation, including one present in the alley at the time of the incident. EMS staff who arrived following the incident provided written accounts of their involvement following the incident.

While under no legal obligation to do so, the Subject Officer voluntarily provided a statement during the investigation by participating in a recorded interview. Evidence obtained directly from a Subject Officer, when voluntarily provided, is often invaluable 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 a knife possessed by the affected person during the incident, and a black Glock replica handgun recovered from the affected person's bag following the incident.

The knife and replica firearm recovered from the incident scene were both submitted for DNA testing, with laboratory results confirming the presence of the affected person's DNA on both exhibits. Attempted function testing of the replica firearm recovered following the incident confirmed the exhibit to be a non-functional replica of a Glock 19 handgun. The RPS-issued firearm fired during the incident and seized during the investigation was tested and confirmed to be in proper working condition, passed all function testing and inspection, and was confirmed as a firearm within the meaning of the *Criminal Code*.

An autopsy examination was conducted following the incident, which determined the affected person's cause of death to be a single gunshot wound to the torso, entering through the left shoulder and not exiting the

body. Toxicology results noted the presence of multiple drugs in the affected person's body at the time of his death, including methamphetamine and cocaine.

Summary

On July 13, 2025, the RPS Major Crimes Unit was called out to investigate a homicide following the discovery of the body of an adult male in Regina's North Central neighbourhood. As the investigation progressed over the following days, police identified several suspects in the case and proceeded with interviews and arrests. One suspect, later identified as the affected person in this matter, was identified by police, along with information that he was in possession of a black Glock handgun, which he carried in a bag or backpack.

On July 16, 2025, the affected person was arrested for his role in the homicide and was interviewed the following day. Despite being prohibited by a court order from possessing both firearms and ammunition, when the affected person was arrested, he was found to be in possession of two live rounds of ammunition, but the black Glock handgun he was reported to carry was not recovered. Following the affected person's interview on July 17, 2025, he was released from custody to allow the investigation to continue. Later that night, police were able to gather further evidence that implicated the affected person in the homicide, and the decision was made that the affected person would be re-arrested and charged with murder.

On the morning of July 18, 2025, members of the RPS Major Crimes Unit were working in the North Central area of Regina, attempting to locate witnesses and suspects in relation to the homicide. The specific focus of the operation was not the arrest of the affected person but based on the additional evidence and decision from the previous night, the instruction was given that should the affected person be located, he was to be re-arrested and charged with murder. RPS members conducting surveillance observed the affected person riding a bike in the area, and in part due to the information regarding the affected person's possession of a handgun, assistance from uniformed patrol officers was sought. Surveillance contact with the affected person was broken briefly until one member of the RPS Major Crimes Unit, later designated as the Subject Officer in SIRT's investigation, observed the affected person leaving the backyard of a residence on the 1300 block of Athol Street and heading towards the back alley on his bike.

The Subject Officer advised the other officers over the police radio that he had located the affected person, then exited his unmarked police vehicle with his service pistol drawn, but pointed downward, stating that he was concerned that the affected person could be in possession of the Glock handgun as described in the information received. The Subject Officer, who was dressed in plain clothes, but displaying his police badge on a lanyard around his neck, began conversing with the affected person. While the Subject Officer could not recall if he verbally identified himself as the police, he stated that the affected person understood that he was a police officer based on comments he made referring to his arrest the previous day. A civilian witness, who had been conversing with the affected person immediately prior to the arrival of the Subject Officer also identified the Subject Officer as a police officer and confirmed that the Subject Officer gave the affected person verbal commands and told him to get on the ground. The Subject Officer, who was at that point the only police officer in the back alley, stated that he told the affected person he was being arrested again today and to get off his bike.

The affected person stepped off his bicycle and let it fall to the ground. The Subject Officer stated that as the affected person stepped off the bicycle, he noticed that the affected person was holding a silver-colored knife in his left hand. Concerned that he was too close to the affected person, the Subject Officer raised his service pistol and ordered the affected person to drop the knife. After repeated verbal commands, the affected person dropped the knife and the Subject Officer then ordered him to lie down on the ground. The Subject Officer indicated that the affected person was again non-responsive to these commands and instead removed his backpack and placed it on the ground. After removing his backpack, the affected person turned and slightly bladed his body towards the Subject Officer and placed his hand inside his pocket. At this point, a second member of the RPS Major Crimes Unit, subsequently designated as a Witness Officer in SIRT's investigation, arrived in the alley. The affected person's placement of his hand inside his pocket, as described by the Subject Officer, was witnessed both by the Witness Officer and by the civilian witness present in the alley who had been speaking with the affected person prior to the incident. The action was described as the affected person moving his hand inside his pocket as if searching for something. The Subject Officer issued repeated verbal commands for the affected person to remove his hand from his pocket. The affected person, without notice, rapidly pulled his hand from his pocket in an upward direction, holding a black object. The Subject Officer stated that he believed the object to be a black Glock handgun, which at that point in the encounter was still unaccounted for, and in response, discharged a single round from his service pistol, striking the affected person in the shoulder and causing him to fall to the ground.

When the affected person fell to the ground, the object pulled from his pocket also fell to the ground and was revealed to be a black cellphone. Other RPS units arrived in the alley rapidly following the shooting, and RPS members immediately contacted EMS and attended to the affected person, placing him in handcuffs and assessing his condition. EMS arrived at the scene at approximately 10:17 a.m. and assumed responsibility for the affected person's care. Following their assessment, the affected person was pronounced deceased at approximately 10:19 a.m.

Although it was not directly involved in the incident, a search of the affected person's backpack yielded a bag that contained a black replica Glock handgun.

Analysis

As previously noted, while SIRT's investigation yielded significant evidence from a variety of different sources, including audio, documentary, and witness evidence, no video evidence of the shooting itself was available, despite video canvas efforts and the seizure of other police video footage. In cases such as this, evidence provided by witnesses and evidence provided directly by a Subject Officer take on additional significance.

In law, a Subject Officer has the same rights pursuant to the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* as any other Canadian citizen, including the right to remain silent. A decision by a Subject Officer to rely upon this right and decline to provide evidence cannot be considered against the officer or used to draw a negative inference. Doing so, however, may leave a significant evidentiary gap, particularly as regards the issues of what the officer may have intended, perceived and believed, and any explanation of why an officer acted the way they did.

As a SIRT investigation is a *Criminal Code* investigation, all evidence gathering during the course of the investigation must be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence and meet the standards of trial admissibility. Accordingly, when a Subject Officer does provide evidence, it is provided voluntarily and unconditionally with the knowledge that any evidence provided can be used for or against them.

Evidence from a Subject Officer, when voluntarily provided, can often prove instrumental to an understanding of the event. Such information becomes even more critical in cases where only limited witness or video evidence of the incident is available. That said, evidence directly from a Subject Officer is not automatically accepted without challenge, and as with any witness evidence, a Subject Officer's statement is carefully scrutinized 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.

At the time of the incident, the Subject Officer was on duty, and while wearing plainclothes rather than a uniform, was identifiable as a police officer at the time of the incident. Based on the totality of the evidence, including the conversation with the affected person regarding his prior arrest in relation to the homicide, the knowledge of the affected person that he was dealing with police during the incident is not in serious dispute. Similarly, the Subject Officer's lawful authority to arrest the affected person in relation to the ongoing homicide investigation is well established. Documentary evidence obtained from the homicide investigation confirms that following the receipt of additional evidence the prior night, members of the RPS Major Crimes Unit had been instructed that the affected person, if encountered, was to be arrested and charged with murder. When considering all of the evidence, the Subject Officer was lawfully placed in his dealings with the affected person and his attempt to place him under arrest.

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.

In this case, it is beyond dispute that the object the affected person withdrew from his pocket during the incident was not the handgun that had been the subject of previous report, but rather a cellphone. As previously noted, however, in addition to an actual threat of death or grievous bodily harm, the law allows for actions in response to a reasonably perceived threat of death or grievous bodily harm. In order to satisfy the legal requirements for the use of force, the police officer must subjectively believe in the existence of a threat of death or grievous bodily harm, and that belief, in all of the circumstances, must be objectively reasonable.

In this case, the subjective belief of the Subject Officer can be determined on the basis of the evidence obtained directly from the Subject Officer during his voluntary statement. In that statement the Subject Officer described fearing for his life and taking action in response to that fear. When assessing the totality of the evidence gathered during the course of SIRT's investigation, there is no evidence to contradict the subjective element of the Subject Officer's belief that he faced a threat that was capable of inflicting death or grievous bodily harm on himself or another.

The more relevant analysis in this case is the objective reasonableness of the Subject Officer's belief. In conducting this analysis, it is important to note that the assessment must consider what the officer would have known or may have reasonably believed at the time the force was used, not what might have been determined after the fact. Furthermore, during a rapidly occurring incident, an officer is not expected to measure the force used with exactitude and detached reflection cannot be demanded in exigent circumstances. It is the reasonable belief of the police officer in light of all the circumstances that must be considered, which based on the applicable legal standard, includes some allowance for the exigencies of the incident and for the possible reasonable miscalculation of the degree of force necessary during a rapidly unfolding occurrence.

When assessing force used, particularly in a case such as this when information obtained after the fact sheds light on the actual level of threat present during the incident, it is particularly important to avoid the lens of hindsight. The issue is not whether the Subject Officer was correct in his belief that the affected person might have been reaching for a firearm. The issue is whether the Subject Officer believed that the affected person was doing so, and whether that belief was objectively reasonable.

In this case, the evidence established that shortly prior to the incident police had received information that the affected person was in possession of a black Glock handgun. This information was compounded by the recovery of several rounds of live ammunition during the affected person's arrest several days prior to the incident, but not the recovery of the firearm itself. The genuine belief by police, including the Subject Officer, that the affected person remained in possession of a firearm is well documented by several pieces of evidence gathered during the investigation. These include an officer safety email distributed prior to the incident advising of the affected person's possession of a handgun, as well as the radio transmission preceding the incident attempting to obtain the assistance of uniformed members due to the believed presence of a handgun. Such evidence impacts both on the subjectively held belief on the part of the Subject Officer as to the threat posed by the affected person when he rapidly withdrew an object from his pocket, and on the objective reasonableness of that belief.

During the incident, the affected person demonstrated inconsistent levels of compliance with the verbal commands issued to him by police. While he eventually dropped the knife that he was holding at the outset of the incident, this was only following repeated commands for him to do so. The affected person, despite repeated commands to get on the ground, confirmed by both police and civilian evidence, remained non-compliant with those commands during the course of the incident. While the affected person did ultimately remove his hand from his pocket during the incident, it is difficult to describe the manner in which this occurred as being demonstrably compliant with the commands given. In the circumstances of this incident, the affected person's non-compliance or inconsistent compliance with verbal commands, in conjunction with the information regarding his possession of a firearm, would serve to reasonably elevate the perception of risk on the part of the Subject Officer.

While in general, the underlying offense for which an individual is subject to arrest does not determine the level of force which may be permitted, the facts associated with that offense may, in certain circumstances impact upon the officer's perception of risk. In this case, both the seriousness and the violence of the homicide for which the affected person was subject to arrest could also serve to reasonably elevate the perception of risk by an officer during that arrest.

In the circumstances of this incident, faced with significant pre-existing information regarding the possession of a firearm by the affected person, the officer was required to make a split-second decision. A police officer does not have to wait to be fired upon to respond. If an officer reasonably believes that a person presents an imminent risk of grievous bodily harm or death, he or she is authorized to use lethal force in response to that perceived threat. Both subjectively and objectively, the threat, as perceived by the Subject Officer, was immediate and serious, precluding the ability to investigate further or to rely upon a lesser degree of force. As such, the Subject Officer's response to this reasonably perceived lethal threat was both proportionate and necessary.

In this case, following the application of the facts established by the evidence to the standard established by law, the force employed by the Subject Officer falls within the range that is protected by law, and accordingly, provides no grounds to believe that the Subject Officer 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)

August 14, 2026

Date of Report