

SIRT

Serious Incident Response Team

Investigation Summary:

Incident Type: Officer-Involved Shooting (Fatal)

SIRT File No.: 2024-11

Incident Date: June 20, 2024

Agency Involved: Saskatoon Police Service

Civilian Executive Director: Greg Gudelot

Date of Report: September 24, 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Timeline	2
The Investigation	2
Summary	4
Analysis	5
Decision.....	6

Introduction

On Thursday, June 20, 2024, at approximately 11:06 a.m., the Saskatchewan Serious Incident Response Team (SIRT) received a notification from the Saskatoon Police Service (SPS) regarding an officer-involved shooting in Saskatoon. SIRT's Civilian Executive Director accepted the notification as within SIRT's mandate and directed an investigation by SIRT.

On June 20, 2024, at approximately 10:35 a.m., SPS received a call reporting that a male had produced a shotgun and fired a single round in front of the caller at a location near the intersection of 20th St. West and Avenue V South in Saskatoon. The caller provided a description of the involved male and the group he was with and remained on the line with SPS providing updates as to the group's location. At approximately 10:42 a.m., the caller terminated the call, and approximately one minute later, two members of the SPS Tactical Support Unit (TSU) encountered a group resembling the caller's description near the intersection of 20th St. West and Avenue S South. Shortly after the TSU members arrived, a confrontation occurred between the two members of SPS and a 27-year-old male, subsequently referred to as the affected person, during which two members of SPS discharged their service pistols, striking the affected person.

EMS was contacted immediately and arrived at the location at approximately 10:50 a.m., where the affected person was pronounced deceased a short time later.

Timeline

SIRT was notified of the incident on June 20, 2024, at approximately 11:06 a.m. A SIRT team consisting of the Civilian Executive Director and five SIRT investigators was immediately deployed to begin the investigation. On June 30, 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, both during the scene examination and the autopsy examination.

Audio recordings seized during the investigation captured the original call for service received by SPS, and the subsequent police radio communications, both before and after the incident. Video footage related to the incident was obtained from several involved SPS vehicles, body-worn cameras from SPS members, from a taxi in the area at the time of the incident, and from a video canvass that was conducted in the area of the incident. While these various sources of video yielded footage that aided the investigation and assisted with confirming the timing and sequence of various events, no direct footage of the incident itself was available.

Four members of SPS were designated as Witness Officers within the meaning of *The Police Regulations* and were interviewed during the course of SIRT's investigation. These members arrived after the discharge of

firearms during the incident and were able to describe their observations upon arrival and the first aid provided to the affected person following the incident.

Six civilian witnesses were identified and interviewed during SIRT's investigation. This included witnesses present both during the incident itself and during the events prior to the affected person's contact with police. The civilian witness who placed the initial 911 call to police described the affected person, in the company of others, attending to an address near the incident scene, producing a shotgun from his backpack, and discharging a round into the ground before apologizing and indicating that he had the wrong person. A second witness who was present at that residence described a similar sequence of events, with the affected person discharging a round into the ground before departing that location. A third witness, present during the incident itself described previous contact with the affected person prior to the incident, and indicated that upon the arrival of police, the affected person produced a firearm and was shot by police. This witness described verbal commands by police and the barrel of the shotgun ultimately recovered but also acknowledged his own state of intoxication at the time of the incident. A fourth witness described the affected person producing a firearm during the incident that appeared to be homemade and pointing it at police prior to the discharge of rounds by police. The fifth witness indicated that he did not see the affected person point a gun at police during the incident and indicated that they had not seen the affected person get shot, believing that the incident under investigation involved the discharge of a Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW). Video evidence obtained during the investigation calls into question this witness's location at the time of the incident and whether they would have actually witnessed the incident itself. A final civilian witness interviewed during the investigation described hearing gunshots and observing people running but was unable to provide any detail regarding the shooting incident itself.

The two members of SPS TSU who discharged their service firearms during the incident were both designated as Subject Officers within the meaning of *The Police Regulations*. While under no legal obligation to do so, both Subject Officers voluntarily provided a statement during the investigation by participating in a recorded interview with SIRT investigators. Evidence 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 each Subject Officer. Both Subject Officers described their arrival at the incident scene and issuing verbal commands to the affected person. When the affected person failed to comply with those commands, reached for his waistband and produced what they perceived to be a firearm, both Subject Officers articulated a fear of death or grievous bodily harm, and discharging rounds from their service firearms in reaction to that threat.

Numerous physical exhibits were seized during the course of SIRT's investigation. These exhibits included components from a 12-gauge shotgun, an unfired 12-gauge shotgun shell, and a folding knife recovered from the immediate area near the affected person's body. An item believed to be a makeshift weapon, and a can of bear spray were among items recovered from the wagon pulled by the affected person's group. The SPS firearms discharged during the incident were seized and submitted for testing, which confirmed that both were in proper operating condition and were operable firearms within the meaning of the *Criminal Code*.

While, as noted above, evidence from two civilian witnesses suggested that the affected person had discharged a round from a shotgun during the events that led to the original call for service, and prior to contact with police, physical evidence of that discharge was inconclusive, and investigators were unable to

confirm whether the shotgun components recovered from the incident scene could be made to function as an improvised firearm.

An autopsy was conducted, which determined the affected person's cause of death to be multiple gunshot wounds. Toxicology results noted the presence of alcohol, cocaine, and methamphetamine in the affected person's blood, all falling within a range that could have caused or contributed to intoxication.

At the outset of the investigation, as required by S.91.12(1) of *The Police Act, 1990*, a Community Liaison was appointed to assist the investigation. The liaison was provided with regular updates on the investigation, and at the conclusion of the investigation, was provided with the opportunity to review the investigation in its entirety, and to make comments and recommendations as necessary.

Summary

On June 20, 2024, at approximately 10:35 a.m., SPS received a call for service near the intersection of Avenue V and 20th Street in Saskatoon. The caller stated that a male, subsequently identified as the affected person, had produced a sawed off 12-gauge shotgun and discharged a round into the ground in front of him. The caller indicated that the affected person had stated that he was going to shoot the caller but had realized that he was the wrong person. The caller indicated that the male had returned the shotgun to his backpack and provided physical descriptions of the affected person and those accompanying him.

The information from the call was transmitted to SPS units in the area, informing them of the discharge of the firearm and the description of the shooter. The information transmitted stated that a male, the affected person, had pulled a sawed off 12-gauge shotgun and shot the ground in front of complainant, and provided a description of a distinctive item of clothing worn by the affected person.

Multiple SPS units began to arrive in the area of the call to attempt to locate the male with the gun. At approximately 10:38 a.m., an unmarked SPS vehicle occupied by two members of TSU, both subsequently designated as Subject Officers in SIRT's investigation, was dispatched to the call and was already operating in the general area of the call.

At approximately 10:42 a.m., the Subject Officers observed the affected person's group walking northbound on the 200 block of Avenue S South, and identified the affected person based on the distinctive item of clothing described in the initial call, a black and white Louis Vuitton patterned hat. The Subject Officers passed the affected person's group and stopped their vehicle just past where the group was walking and exited the vehicle. Both Subject Officers shouted several verbal commands to the affected person, informing him that he was under arrest and to get on the ground. The affected person did not respond to the verbal commands, and one Subject Officer, believing that the affected person was about to run, drew his CEW. As the affected person reached for his waistband, both Subject Officers drew their service pistols, as the affected person remained non-compliant with verbal commands. As the affected person produced an object, which both Subject Officers indicated they recognized as the barrel of a shotgun, from his waistband and began to level it at them, both Subject Officers discharged several rounds from their service pistol, striking the affected person and causing him to immediately fall to the ground.

Immediately after the discharge of rounds, at approximately 10:43 a.m., one Subject Officer radioed SPS communications that shots had been fired, and that the suspect was down, with a firearm in his hand. The Subject Officers followed up this communication, confirming that the shots fired were theirs, described the sawed-off shotgun, and indicated that they were dealing with three other individuals at the scene as well.

Other SPS units immediately began to arrive at the incident scene, with two Witness Officers commencing first aid on the affected person and providing CPR. At approximately 10:44 a.m., a Witness Officer contacted EMS and requested an ambulance attend the scene. Witness Officers continued providing care to the affected person, alternating performing CPR until the arrival of EMS at approximately 10:50 a.m., when EMS personnel assumed responsibility for the affected person's care.

At approximately 10:52 a.m., EMS pronounced the affected person deceased at the incident scene.

Analysis

The completed investigation into this incident featured evidence from a variety of sources, sufficient to allow for an understanding of what occurred, and to enable an analysis of the lawfulness of police actions during the incident. While video evidence directly capturing the critical moments of the incident itself was not available, physical evidence, witness evidence from both police and civilian witnesses, and audio and video recordings capturing the events surrounding the incident were gathered and were sufficient to enable such an analysis. As stated above, this evidence also includes voluntary statements provided by both Subject Officers, who were interviewed during the course of SIRT's investigation.

In this case, following a comprehensive review of the evidence gathered during SIRT's investigation, the accounts provided by both Subject Officers are either consistent with or corroborated by numerous pieces of independently-gathered evidence. This includes both the physical evidence gathered during the scene examination, and civilian witness evidence provided by individuals who were present during the incident. The statements of the Subject Officers, wherein they described the affected person drawing what they perceived to be a functional firearm during the incident are consistent with the physical evidence gathered during the scene examination and are corroborated by the evidence of two civilian witnesses. Like the Subject Officers, the two civilian witnesses described the affected person's actions of producing a firearm during the incident and in advance of the discharge of rounds by police. While, as noted above, some of the civilian witness evidence available in this matter bears certain limitations, including the self-described state of intoxication on the part of one witness, the consistency of those accounts with both the physical evidence gathered and the voluntary statements provided by the Subject Officers serves to elevate the reliability those accounts.

Based on the available evidence, at the time of the incident, both Subject Officers were on duty, easily identifiable as being police officers, and, based on the information available to them from the original call for service and their own observations, were lawfully placed to arrest the affected person for his involvement in the earlier incident involving the reported discharge of a firearm.

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.

While the nature of the original call for service, involving the reported discharge of a firearm in a residential area during a confrontation with others, would itself have resulted in a heightened perception of risk on the part of the involved officers, the affected person's actions during the incident, namely disregarding repeated verbal commands by police and producing what would have been reasonably perceived as a firearm, are sufficient to give rise to a reasonably perceived risk of death or grievous bodily harm on the part of both Subject Officers. The ultimate functionality of the firearm components later recovered does not serve to impact this analysis, particularly when, as the incident unfolded, those components were identified by both the involved police officers and civilians present during the incident as being a firearm. Both subjectively and objectively, the threat presented by the affected person's actions was immediate and serious, precluding the ability to investigate further or to rely upon a lesser degree of force, and accordingly, the level of force employed by the Subject Officers in response to this reasonably perceived lethal threat was both proportionate and necessary.

With all factors, including the nature of the threat presented by the affected person's actions, taken into account, the force applied by the Subject Officers during the incident falls within the range protected by law, and provides no reasonable grounds to believe that an offence was committed by any police officer during the incident. As a result of the application of the facts established by the evidence to the standard established by law, no charges will be laid.

Decision

There being no grounds to believe an offence was committed by either 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)

September 24, 2026

Date of Report