

**ABRIDGED SUMMARY OF CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE INCIDENT AND
FINDINGS BY THE LOS ANGELES BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS**

LAW ENFORCEMENT-RELATED INJURY 002-20

Division Date Duty-On (X) Off () Uniform-Yes (X) No ()

North Hollywood 1/5/2020

Officer(s) Involved in Use of Force Length of Service

Officer A	12 years, 9 months
Officer B	6 months
Officer E	11 years, 11 months
Officer F	3 years, 9 months
Officer H	1 year, 4 months
Officer I	3 years, 10 months
Officer K	5 years
Officer L	1 year, 1 month

Reason for Police Contact

Officers contacted the Subject, who was at his parents' home in violation of a restraining order. Officers attempted to take him in to custody and a struggle ensued, resulting in a law enforcement-related injury (LERI).

Subject(s) Deceased () Wounded (X) Non-Hit (X)

Subject: Male, 38 years of age.

Board of Police Commissioners' Review

This is a brief summary designed only to enumerate salient points regarding this Categorical Use of Force incident and does not reflect the entirety of the extensive investigation by the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) or the deliberations by the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC). In evaluating this matter, the BOPC considered the following: the complete Force Investigation Division investigation (including all of the transcribed statements of witnesses, pertinent subject criminal history, and addenda items); the relevant Training Evaluation and Management System materials of the involved officers; the Use of Force Review Board recommendations; the report and recommendations of the Chief of Police; and the report and recommendations of the Office of the Inspector General. The Department Command staff presented the matter to the BOPC and made itself available for any inquiries by the BOPC.

The following incident was adjudicated by the BOPC on November 17, 2020.

Incident Summary

Between the late afternoon hours of Saturday January 4, 2020 and the early morning hours of Sunday, January 5, 2020, LAPD officers responded to a total of three calls for service involving the Subject. Two of the calls had been placed by a neighbor (Witness A) of the Subject's parents (Witnesses B and C), and one call had been placed by the Subject's father (Witness B). Witness B placed the first call and reported that the Subject was behaving erratically and was under the influence of drugs. Witness B also reported that the Subject had a mental health disorder. The Subject was gone by the time the officers arrived. The Subject had a valid restraining order against him, with one of the conditions being that he stay away from his parents' home.

Witness A called the second time when the Subject began throwing debris into his yard. Once again, the Subject fled before he could be contacted by officers.

At 0329 hours, Witness A called 911, again reporting that the Subject had returned and was yelling in the street near their residence. Witness A relayed that the Subject had thrown rocks at their house earlier and believed the Subject was on drugs.

Officers A and B responded to the call and arrived at 0346 hours. Approximately one minute later, Officers C and D arrived. Both units placed themselves at the scene via their Mobile Digital Computers. Officer A observed the Subject inside of the gated courtyard of Witnesses B and C's residence, yelling and pacing back and forth at the front porch. Officer A was aware that the Subject's parents lived at the location and that they had a restraining order against him.

Additionally, Officer A advised the other officers that he/she recognized the Subject from a prior restraining order violation arrest at the same location.

Officer A directed the Subject to walk out of the courtyard to speak with him/her. The Subject did not comply, and instead ran north to a block wall that separated the property of his parents from Witness A's property. The Subject ran west, on top of the wall, into the backyard of his parents' residence.

Moments later, Witness B appeared at the front door and alerted the officers that the Subject was inside the residence.

Upon reaching the front door of the residence, the officers were alerted to the Subject's presence inside by Witness B. Simultaneously, Witness B opened the door wider, stepped back, and extended his right hand/arm, apparently inviting the officers to enter. He then pointed toward the Subject.

Witness B stated he was in bed when he heard someone jump his fence and open the back door of his residence. Witness B observed the Subject inside the house, in violation of the restraining order.

As the officers moved toward the front door, Officer A broadcast a request for a supervisor and asked that one of the officers at scene obtain a beanbag shotgun. Officer D heard the request and retrieved a beanbag shotgun from his/her police vehicle, while Officers A, B, and C approached the front door.

While standing at the front door, Officer A asked Witness B where Witness C was located; he indicated she was inside the residence. As this was occurring, the Subject was kneeling in the dining room and saying, "Please, I don't want to go to jail."

As the officers entered the residence, the Subject stood up and walked into the kitchen area.

Officer A and Officer B followed behind the Subject. As they continued to illuminate him with their flashlights, Officer A told the Subject to "relax" and that he/she needed to see the Subject's hands. The Subject raised his hands, walked behind the kitchen island, and shouted, "I'm so sorry ... I don't want my life to be over ... Please don't kill me." Officer A then requested a backup. As a result, Sergeant A and Officers E, F, G, and H responded.

Approximately one minute later, the Subject moved into the dining room as Witness C emerged from the hallway and hugged him. According to Witness C, she did this in an attempt to calm him down. The Subject hugged Witness C while repeatedly shouting, "They're gonna kill all of us."

From Officer A's position, he/she could see Witness C interacting with the Subject and did not believe she was in any danger.

Officer A observed Witness C attempting to calm the Subject by speaking to him and by rubbing his back in a comforting manner. Officer A believed Witness C's actions could be meaningful in de-escalating the situation.

Upon Sergeant A's arrival, he/she was given a quick briefing by Officers C and D while he/she stood just outside the front door. Officer C told Sergeant A that the Subject was "just flipping out." Officer C also told Sergeant A that the Subject "snatched mom and doesn't want to let her go." Officer C added that there was a restraining order against the Subject and that no officers had physically touched him thus far. Officer D told Sergeant A that he/she possessed a beanbag shotgun, and Sergeant A confirmed with Officer D that he/she would be less-lethal. Sergeant A then instructed Officer C to brief additional officers as they arrived.

Officer A advised Sergeant A there were no known weapons involved and that, according to Witness B, the Subject was in violation of a restraining order. According to Sergeant A, he/she positioned him/herself in the middle of the dining room behind the officers and continued assessing the situation. Soon after, Officer A approached

Witness C and grasped the back of her clothing while asking her to step away from the Subject; Witness C complied.

At approximately 0355 hours, Officers I, J, K, and L arrived and positioned themselves near the front door. According to Officer K, the Subject was sweating and irate. He/she believed the Subject's apparent thought patterns were consistent with someone who was mentally ill or under the influence of methamphetamine.

According to Officer A, while interacting with the Subject, he/she called him by his first name, reminding him that they knew each other from a prior incident and assured him they were not there to hurt him. Officer A also maintained his/her distance from the Subject and kept his/her hands away from his/her police equipment to avoid causing the Subject fear.

Officer A told the Subject he/she was going to be fair with him and directed the Subject to turn around and place his hands behind his back. According to Officer A, he/she intended to get the Subject out of the residence so that he would have less access to potential weapons. Officer A communicated his/her plan to Sergeant A. According to Sergeant A, he/she agreed with this plan, because it would make for a less cluttered environment.

While Officer A continued communicating with the Subject, Officer D moved farther into the residence with the beanbag shotgun. Simultaneously, Officer K moved from the front door of the residence to the dining room and positioned him/herself near Officer A on the Subject's right side. The Subject refused to step outside and continued yelling at the officers in a rapid and agitated manner, while emphatically moving his hands and arms.

Despite repeated attempts by Officer A to calm the Subject over the span of approximately nine minutes, he remained uncooperative and defiant. Officer K believed the Subject might respond to a different voice and tried to talk with him. However, as Officer K began to speak, the Subject faced him/her and yelled, "No, you are not in charge!" Officer K directed the Subject to turn around and explained that if he did not comply, he would be handcuffed and more than likely end up on the ground. The Subject continued to yell at Officer K and was emphatic that the officers needed to leave his residence. Based on the Subject's demeanor, Officer K did not believe that further attempts to communicate with the Subject would be effective.

Officer K recognized that they were in a confined area and that the Subject was wearing baggy clothing and had not been searched for weapons. At that point, Officer K decided to grab the Subject to prevent him from potentially reaching into his pockets for a weapon.

Officer K stepped toward the Subject and placed his/her left hand on the Subject's right elbow while also grabbing the back of the Subject's right hand. Officer K then applied a wrist lock and guided the Subject's right hand to his lower back. Simultaneously, Officer

B assisted Officer K by placing his/her right hand on the Subject's right tricep and his/her left hand on the Subject's right wrist.

As Officers B and K attempted to control the Subject's right arm, Officer I placed his/her left hand on the Subject's left arm while he/she simultaneously placed his/her right hand on the Subject's left wrist. According to Officer I, he/she intended to place the Subject's left arm behind his back for handcuffing.

The Subject became rigid and began walking forward, causing Officer I to lose his/her grip of the Subject's left arm. Officer L then assisted by grabbing the Subject's left arm.

The Subject continued moving forward toward a leather couch. In an effort to slow the Subject's momentum, Officer A stated that he/she placed his/her right hand on the right side of the Subject's chest and his/her left hand on the Subject's right arm. The Subject continued moving forward, causing Officer A to fall on his/her right knee near the couch.

Officers B, K, and L were still holding onto the Subject's arms as he fell forward onto the couch. As the Subject's upper body came to rest on the seat cushions, his knees and lower body remained on the floor. While Officer E used both hands to hold the Subject's right ankle, Officer I placed his/her right knee on the back of the Subject's right thigh and applied bodyweight. According to the officers, they observed the Subject moving his legs and both applied bodyweight in an effort to control them.

According to Officer L, the Subject attempted to stand. To prevent him from doing so, Officer L applied pressure to the Subject's left shoulder with his/her left hand while maintaining control of the Subject's left wrist with his/her right hand. Simultaneously, Officer A applied pressure to the back of the Subject's right shoulder with his/her right forearm. Officer L then advised the other officers that he/she had control of the Subject's left arm, so they could focus their efforts on the Subject's right arm and take him into custody as quickly as possible.

The Subject was still lying on the couch when Officer K applied a wrist lock to his right hand and maintained it behind his back for handcuffing. According to Officer K, he/she performed the wrist lock by placing his/her hand on top of the Subject's right hand and by flexing it toward the Subject's inner forearm. Officer K was not certain that he/she would be able to maintain control of the wrist lock based upon the Subject's size and transitioned to a two-handed grip around the Subject's right forearm.

As the Subject was being taken into custody, Sergeant A stood near the couch and monitored the officers. Sergeant A ordered the Subject to give the officers his hands and directed the officers to handcuff the Subject.

Officer B attempted to place a handcuff on the Subject's right wrist, however the cuff got caught on the Subject's right jacket sleeve. Officer I observed Officer B struggling to handcuff the Subject and assisted by applying a wrist lock to the Subject's right hand. While the wrist lock was maintained, Officers B and I moved the Subject's jacket sleeve

upward, which allowed Officer B to then fasten the handcuff around the Subject's right wrist.

Once the Subject's right hand was cuffed and being held by Officer I, Officer K transitioned to assist Officer L with securing the Subject's left wrist. Officer K placed two hands around the Subject's left wrist and moved it from his stomach area to behind his back. Officer K then used his/her right hand to grip the Subject's left hand and used his/her other hand to slide the Subject's left sleeve past his wrist. Officer J utilized a second pair of handcuffs to secure the Subject's left wrist and then joined the two sets of handcuffs.

After the handcuffs were applied, the Subject remained in a face down position and was still attempting to kick his legs. In an effort to prevent that from continuing, Officer F grabbed the Subject's right calf; Officer E placed both of his/her knees on the Subject's left ankle; Officer H placed his/her left shin on the Subject's left hamstring while also placing both of his/her hands on the back of the Subject's legs. Sergeant A then directed the officers to apply a Hobble Restraint Device (HRD) to the Subject's legs. Officer F released his/her grip on the Subject's right leg as he/she and Officer H retrieved their respective HRDs. Officer E then removed his/her knees from the Subject's left ankle and used his/her hands to bring the Subject's ankles together.

As Officer H maintained his/her bodyweight on the Subject's left hamstring, he/she and Officer F placed a HRD around the Subject's crossed ankles and a second HRD above his knees. Approximately 10 seconds after the HRD were secured, Officers A, I, and L moved the Subject into a seated position, with his legs extended in front of him.

After the Subject was placed in the seated position, Officer I positioned his/her right knee behind the Subject's back. According to Officer I, he/she did this to support the Subject so that he would not bump his head and or injure himself. Similarly, Officer L crouched behind the Subject and placed his/her left hand on the back of the Subject's neck while holding his right wrist with his/her right hand. According to Officer L, he/she placed his/her hand on the back of the Subject's neck without applying any force. Officer L did this in an effort to stabilize the Subject and prevent him from falling backward.

Officer D requested a Rescue Ambulance (RA) believing the Subject was possibly under the influence of a narcotic. Prior to the arrival of the RA, the Subject was rolled into a recumbent position on his right side. Officer H repositioned him/herself behind the Subject and placed his/her hands on his left arm, while Officer L placed his/her left arm on the Subject's left wrist.

Officer E maintained control of the lower hobble and placed his/her left shin across the Subject's lower legs. Officer F maintained control of the upper hobble and placed his/her left knee on the Subject's left thigh.

Officer F indicated he/she was aware the Subject was lying on his right side, however repositioning the Subject to his left side was not feasible due to his large size and the small confines of the room.

At approximately 0410 hours, Officer K rolled the Subject into a prone position so Officer F could double lock the handcuffs that conjoined the handcuffs on the Subject's wrists. The Subject remained in this general position for approximately 40 seconds before he was returned to his right side.

Paramedics then arrived and the Subject was transported to the hospital.

At approximately 0353 hours, Sergeant B responded to the scene and initiated a Non-Categorical Use of Force Investigation. During his/her investigation, Sergeant B obtained digital photographs and conducted brief interviews of the Subject's parents. Force Investigation Division (FID) ultimately assumed the investigative responsibility prior to Sergeant B completing the Non-Categorical Use of Force Report.

At 0435 hours, the Subject arrived at the hospital. At the request of hospital staff, Officers I and J removed the Subject's handcuffs from the gurney to allow for his transfer to a hospital bed. The Subject was moved to the hospital bed and the officers fastened the handcuffs to the bed rails, while hospital staff members prepared to place the Subject in soft restraints.

As medical staff took over, Officer B observed a staff member take control of the Subject's right arm. The Subject appeared to resist the staff member and attempted to stand up. Officer B then observed the staff member place his left arm on the Subject's right shoulder and forcefully push him down onto the bed. Medical staff members ultimately fastened each of the Subject's ankles to the bottom of the bed, his left arm to the left side of the bed and his right arm to the top of the bed. Neither officer was involved in the application of the restraints.

The Emergency Department physician stated he conducted a head to toe assessment of the Subject and physically palpated the Subject's body for injuries. No fractures or dislocations were detected.

According to the medical records, at 1730 hours, approximately 13 hours after arriving at the hospital, the Subject complained of pain to his right wrist, which was still secured with a soft restraint. A series of X-rays were completed and at 2134 hours, it was determined that the Subject had a posterior dislocation of his right elbow. At approximately 2300 hours, Emergency Department personnel performed a right elbow relocation.

At 2330 hours, the Subject was admitted to the hospital for a right elbow dislocation, rhabdomyolysis, transaminitis, and amphetamine abuse.

BWV and DICVS Policy Compliance

SERIAL	NAME	TIMELY BWV ACTIVATION	FULL 2-MINUTE BUFFER	BWV RECORDING OF ENTIRE INCIDENT	TIMELY DICVS ACTIVATION	DICVS RECORDING OF ENTIRE INCIDENT
39555	Officer M	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	N/A
38964	Officer A	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	N/A
41945	Officer K	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	N/A
41531	Officer G	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	N/A
42457	Officer F	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	N/A

Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners' Findings

The BOPC reviews each Categorical Use of Force incident based upon the totality of the circumstances, namely all of the facts, evidence, statements and all other pertinent material relating to the particular incident. In every case, the BOPC makes specific findings in three areas: Tactics of the involved officer(s); Drawing/Exhibiting of a firearm by any involved officer(s); and the Use of Force by any involved officer(s). Based on the BOPC's review of the instant case, the BOPC made the following findings:

A. Tactics

The BOPC found Sergeant A and Officers A, B, E, F, H, I, K and L's, tactics to warrant a Tactical Debrief.

B. Non-Lethal Use of Force

The BOPC found Officers A, B, E, F, H, I, K and L's non-lethal use of force to be In Policy.

Basis for Findings

In making its decision in this matter, the Commission is mindful that every "use of force by members of law enforcement is a matter of critical concern both to the public and the law enforcement community. It is recognized that some individuals will not comply with the law or submit to control unless compelled to do so by the use of force; therefore, law enforcement officers are sometimes called upon to use force in the performance of their duties. It is also recognized that members of law enforcement derive their authority from the public and therefore must be ever mindful that they are not only the guardians, but also the servants of the public. The Department's guiding principle when using force shall be reverence for human life. Officers shall attempt to control an incident by using time, distance, communications, and available resources in an effort to de-escalate the situation, whenever it is safe and reasonable to do so. When warranted, Department personnel may use objectively reasonable force to carry out their duties. Officers who use unreasonable force degrade the confidence of the community we serve, expose the Department and fellow officers to physical hazards, violate the

constitutional rights of individuals upon whom unreasonable force is used, and subject the Department and themselves to potential civil and criminal liability. Conversely, officers who fail to use force when warranted may endanger themselves, the community and fellow officers.” (Special Order No. 1, 2020, Policy on the Use of Force - Revised.)

The Commission is cognizant of the legal framework that exists in evaluating use of force cases, including the United States Supreme Court decision in Graham v. Connor, 490 U.S. 386 (1989), stating that:

“The reasonableness of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight. The calculus of reasonableness must embody allowance for the fact that police officers are often forced to make split-second judgments – in circumstances that are tense, uncertain and rapidly evolving – about the amount of force that is necessary in a particular situation.”

The Commission is further mindful that it must evaluate the actions in this case in accordance with existing Department policies. Relevant to our review are Department policies that relate to the use of force:

Use of Force – General. It is the policy of the Department that personnel may use only that force which is “objectively reasonable” to:

- Defend themselves;
- Defend others;
- Effect an arrest or detention;
- Prevent escape; or,
- Overcome resistance.

Use of Force – Deadly. It is the policy of the Department that deadly force shall be used only when necessary in defense of human life. Specifically, deadly force shall only be used to:

- Defend against an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or another person; or,
- Apprehend a fleeing person for any felony that threatened or resulted in death or serious bodily injury, if the officer reasonably believes that the person will cause death or serious bodily injury to another unless immediately apprehended. Where feasible, a peace officer shall, prior to the use of force, make reasonable efforts to identify themselves as a peace officer and to warn that deadly force may be used, unless the officer has objectively reasonable grounds to believe the person is aware of those facts.

An officer shall not use deadly force against a person based on the danger that person poses to themselves, if an objectively reasonable officer would believe the person does

not pose an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or another person.

Factors Used to Determine Whether Deadly Force was Necessary. The Department examines the necessity of deadly force by evaluating each situation in light of the particular circumstances of each case, and whether other resources and techniques were reasonably safe and feasible to an objectively reasonable officer.

The Department shall also consider the totality of the circumstances, including the officer's tactics and decisions leading up the use of deadly force. (Special Order No. 1, 2020, Policy on the Use of Force - Revised.)

An officer's decision to draw or exhibit a firearm should be based on the tactical situation and the officer's reasonable belief that there is a substantial risk that the situation may escalate to the point where deadly force may be justified. (Los Angeles Police Department Manual.)

Tactical de-escalation involves the use of techniques to reduce the intensity of an encounter with a subject and enable an officer to have additional options to gain voluntary compliance or mitigate the need to use a higher level of force while maintaining control of the situation. Tactical de-escalation does not require that an officer compromise his/her safety or increase the risk of physical harm to the public. De-escalation techniques should only be used when it is safe and prudent to do so. (Tactical De-Escalation Techniques, October 2016.)

Tactical De-Escalation

- Tactical de-escalation does not require that an officer compromise his or her safety or increase the risk of physical harm to the public. De-escalation techniques should only be used when it is safe and prudent to do so.

Planning – Officer A discussed tactical concepts with Officer B on the day of the incident, which included contact and cover, pedestrian stops, dealing with mentally ill community members, and tactical de-escalation. After receiving a radio call while at the station, Officer A began formulating his/her response and asked Officers C and D, who were also at the station, to respond as an additional unit. While on their way to the location of the radio call, Officers A and B discussed the type of situation they were entering, so they could then determine what actions would be necessary. Prior to entering Witness B's residence, Officer A requested a supervisor and requested Officer D to retrieve a less-lethal force option. Upon entering the residence, Officer A observed that the Subject had retreated into the area of the kitchen. Officer A planned to contain the Subject in the kitchen by having Officer B stand in front of the north kitchen entry while Officer A maintained the south entrance. After the non-lethal use of force had occurred, Officer A discussed a plan with Sergeant A to have the Subject medically examined due to the Subject's erratic behavior and reported narcotics use.

While responding to the radio call, Officers K and L discussed contact and cover roles, as well as roles of lethal and less-lethal force options, traffic stops, pedestrian stops, and the fluidity of those situations. Prior to the non-lethal use of force, Officer K nodded to Officers A and I to indicate that he/she was ready to make contact with the Subject as part of his/her tactical plan. During the non-lethal use of force, Officer K verbalized his/her plans to move from one side of the Subject to the other while assisting with the application of handcuffs. Prior to the non-lethal use of force, Officer I observed Officer K's head nod and nodded in return as acknowledgement in a non-verbal agreement to make contact with the Subject.

Officer F and his/her partner, Officer G, had worked as partners and previously discussed their respective roles including contact, cover, lethal force, less-lethal force options, and physical takedowns. After the Subject was handcuffed, Officer F discussed a plan with Officers H and L to double-lock the Subject's handcuffs. Once he/she determined it was too difficult to do so from his/her positioning, Officer F communicated his/her plan to place the Subject onto his stomach while he/she double-locked the handcuffs.

Officers E and H, while enroute to the radio call, discussed cover, contact, less-lethal force options, lethal force, and traffic stops. Officer E stated that prior to each radio call, he/she and Officer H discussed their respective roles. Officer E's plan was to de-escalate the situation. During the non-lethal use of force, Officer E planned on controlling the Subject's legs if it was necessary. Officer E did so and maintained control of the Subject's legs until the Subject was taken into custody.

Sergeant A entered the residence after officers were communicating with the Subject in an attempt to de-escalate the situation. Sergeant A verified Officer D was the designated beanbag shotgun officer. During the non-lethal use of force, Sergeant A observed Officer F double-locking the Subject's handcuffs while the Subject was in the prone position. Sergeant A directed Officer F to return the Subject to a recovery position after Officer F had completed double-locking the handcuffs. Officer F confirmed he/she understood Sergeant A's plan and followed through with it by placing the Subject into the recovery position after double-locking the handcuffs.

Assessment – Officer A assessed the Subject's behavior when he/she arrived at the location of the radio call. The Subject's behavior was more erratic than his behavior had been during Officer A's previous contact with him. Officer A had arrested the Subject for a restraining order violation months prior. Officer A believed the Subject was possibly under the influence of narcotics and directed Officer B not to shine his/her flashlight directly at the Subject, to prevent it from further heightening the Subject's agitated state. Officer A determined a less-lethal force option should be deployed during the incident and in addition, requested a supervisor and a back-up. While in the residence, the Subject's mother, Witness C, walked up to the Subject and hugged him. Initially, Officer A believed Witness C's

presence would de-escalate the Subject's behavior. However, Officer A closely assessed the interaction throughout their contact and determined Witness C's presence was not serving to de-escalate the situation involving the Subject. As a result, Officer A approached Witness C while asking Witness C to step away from the Subject and Witness C complied.

Officers I and J immediately assessed the Subject's behavior and that he/she exhibited signs of being under the influence of methamphetamines. Officers I and J also observed the Subject was not responding to attempts at de-escalation by Officer A. After the non-lethal use of force began, Officer J assessed the number of officers involved and decided not to engage unless it became necessary.

Officer F entered the residence and observed the Subject's parents, Witnesses B and C, near officers who were engaged in the non-lethal use of force. Officer F walked over to Witnesses B and C and maintained a position between the Subject and his parents to ensure the Subject's parents did not engage with the involved officers. Officer G observed numerous officers involved in the non-lethal use of force and determined there were sufficient officers engaged. Officer G made the decision to only engage in the use of force if it was necessary.

Officers E entered the location as the non-lethal use of force was occurring and assessed the Subject and the engagement of the officers with him. Officer E observed the Subject kicking forward and moving towards the couch as the officers attempted to take the Subject into custody. Officer E took hold of the Subject's legs to assist until the other officers were able to control the Subject's arms.

Officer A assessed that a less-lethal force option may be needed during the incident, and Officer D deployed the beanbag shotgun. Officer D assessed that he/she was too close to the Subject and re-deployed to gain some distance within the residence.

The BOPC noted Officer K's specific assessment of the Subject leading up to the non-lethal application of force and his/her decision to make physical contact. The BOPC noted the specific articulation by Officer K with regard to his/her experience and understanding of the Department's Training Bulletin on excited delirium when dealing with persons exhibiting signs of excited delirium. Officer K discussed in his/her interview the signs and symptoms and his/her knowledge of the considerations an officer should contemplate when dealing with such individuals.

Sergeant A assessed the incident while inside of the residence and determined that some roles, such as less-lethal and contact officer, had already been assumed by officers within the residence. Sergeant A directed Officer C to remain at the front of the residence to brief the incoming resources who were responding to Officer A's back-up request. Officer A had established his/her role as the communications officer with the Subject and Sergeant A noted the officers were not referring to the Subject by his name. Sergeant A obtained the Subject's name as he/she believed it could assist the officers in de-escalating the Subject. During the non-lethal use of

force, Sergeant A continued to assess and believed there were sufficient officers engaged with the Subject. Sergeant A advised the involved officers to only use bodyweight to control the Subject. Sergeant A continued to monitor the officers' activities and the Subject's condition as they struggled to take the Subject into custody. As Officer F attempted to double-lock the Subject's handcuffs, Sergeant A assessed the Subject's prone position. Sergeant A told Officer F to return the Subject to a lateral recumbent position once Officer F had completed double-locking the handcuffs.

Time – Officers A and B observed the Subject in the front yard of his parent's residence. Officers A and B remained outside on the street monitoring the Subject's movements. Through verbalization, Officer A attempted to have the Subject walk out of the yard to the street where the officers were waiting. After the Subject entered his parent's residence through the back door in the backyard, Witness B opened the front door to allow the officers to enter. As Officer B walked towards the front door, Officer A advised Officer B to wait for the additional officers. Officer A also attempted to de-escalate the situation for approximately 13 minutes prior to the non-lethal use of force.

Officers E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L did not engage with the Subject when they initially arrived. After determining the Subject was not responding to Officer A's attempts at de-escalation, Officers I and K positioned themselves on either side of the Subject but did not engage with the Subject. Officers I and K waited as Officer A continued verbalizing with the Subject. Officer F used his/her time, upon entry into the residence, to assess and eventually determined his/her priority was to keep the Subject's parents away from the officers who were engaged with the Subject.

While the Subject's attention was diverted to the officers who were handcuffing him, Officers F and H utilized that time to apply two HRDs to the Subject's legs, which assisted in de-escalating the incident and preventing the Subject from kicking and injuring the officers. After the Subject was taken into custody, Officer G utilized his/her time in the residence to gather information about the Subject from Witnesses B and C.

Sergeant A stated that time was available to the officers as he/she heard additional resources responding to the back-up request. Sergeant A allowed the primary officers to continue with their attempts at verbal de-escalation.

Redeployment and/or Containment – Officers A and B slowly entered the residence. After entering, they observed the Subject slowly backing into the kitchen. Officer A and Officer B redeployed to either side of the kitchen in an attempt to contain the Subject as they tried to de-escalate the situation. Later during the incident, Officer B ensured the hallway was contained up to the point that Witness C exited the hallway and walked over to the Subject. Officer A advised Officer D to move further back and away from the Subject since Officer D was standing nearby while holding the beanbag shotgun.

Officer J entered the residence but observed that there were sufficient officers inside of the residence. Officer J redeployed outside of the residence until he/she was needed inside to provide an extra set of handcuffs.

Sergeant A observed the Subject attempting to move away from Officers I and K by trying to lunge towards the couch in the living room. Sergeant A re-deployed away from the Subject's path, avoiding becoming into contact with the Subject and maintaining his/her role as IC.

Other Resources – Officers A and B, prior to leaving the station, requested Officers C and D to assist them by becoming their additional unit and responding to the radio call with them. Upon arrival, Officer A believed, based on the Subject's behavior, that he/she needed to have a supervisor and an additional back-up unit. Officer A requested a back-up unit and a supervisor. Officer A also ensured a less-lethal force option was available as a resource in case it was needed.

Due to the Subject's non-compliance with Officer K's commands, Officer K utilized eye contact with Officer I as a non-verbal cue to have an additional officer assist him/her in making physical contact with the Subject. Likewise, Officer I recognized his/her responsibility to be in close proximity to render aid to Officer K if necessary.

Officer G utilized Department resources to verify that the restraining order was valid against the Subject.

Sergeant A ensured that other resources were available to the officers at scene. He/she also notified his/her Watch Commander of the incident.

Sergeant C responded to the back-up request; however, he/she remained outside of the residence during the incident. The BOPC noted that Sergeant C had the opportunity to assist Sergeant A with delegating assignments, preventing officers from stacking in the doorway, directing other resources to interview Witness A who had called 9-1-1, or contacted and obtained information from MEU. Sergeant C could have also assisted in the removal of Witnesses B and C from the residence to prevent them from interceding.

Lines of Communication – Officers A and B communicated their plan to each other when they were enroute to the call. Officer A established an open line of communication with Witness B by asking him/her questions about the Subject when he/she approached Witness B. Officer A asked about the restraining order, if the Subject's behavior was unusual, asked if there were other people in the residence, and where Witness C was located.

Officers A and B engaged in extensive communication with the Subject and attempted to use different techniques. Officer A advised the Subject that they knew each other, in an attempt to build rapport. When his/her verbalization and Witness C's attempts at calming the Subject appeared ineffective, Officer A communicated

with Witness C and asked Witness C to step away from the Subject. Continued attempts to gain the Subject's compliance were ineffective; therefore, Officer K took over communications and utilized firm, direct instructions with potential consequences should the Subject refuse to comply. Officer B continued to ensure the Subject that they were not going to hurt him because the Subject repeatedly stated that the officers were going to kill him. Officer A also communicated with Sergeant A as to the nature of the call and what was occurring.

Officer K was cognizant in the importance of utilizing a single point of contact and one line of communication until that contact was no longer effective.

Officer K and L discussed their plan with each other on the way to the radio call. Upon his/her arrival, Officer K communicated with officers at scene to ensure there was a less-lethal option and utilized non-verbal cues with Officer I to indicate that he/she was going to make physical contact with the Subject.

Officers F, H, and L communicated with each other when they were double-locking the Subject's handcuffs and re-positioning the Subject.

Officer K communicated with other officers as he/she moved around the Subject to assist with the left handcuff.

Officers E, F, H, and L communicated amongst each other with regard to applying and securing the HRD and the re-positioning of the Subject for purposes of double-locking the handcuffs before proceeding.

Sergeant A verified that Officer D was the designated less-lethal officer. He/she also directed Officer C to remain outside the residence and brief incoming officers who were responding to the back-up request. Sergeant A re-deployed to gain some distance from the Subject so he/she would not become physically involved in the use of force. Sergeant A directed the officers to only utilize bodyweight and to handcuff the Subject as they attempted to take him into custody. Sergeant A verbalized with Officers F and L to place the Subject into a recovery position upon completing the adjustment of the handcuffs. Sergeant A notified Lieutenant A that a use of force had occurred, believing it was a NCUOF incident at that time.

- During its review of this incident, the BOPC noted the following tactical considerations:

- **Tactical Planning/Communication**

Officers A, B, E, F, H, I, K, L, and Sergeant A had limited discussions in the development of a plan to detain the Subject, who was believed to be under the influence of narcotics or suffering from a mental illness.

In this case, Officers A, B, E, F, H, I, K, and L discussed tactical concepts and roles with their respective partners during their shift.

After receiving a radio call while at the station, Officer A began formulating his/her response and asked Officers C and D to respond as an additional unit. While on their way, Officers A and B discussed the need to first determine the type of situation they had, so they could then determine their actions.

When Officers A and B arrived at the radio call location, Officer A advised the officers that he/she had arrested the Subject months prior for a restraining order violation at this same residence. The community member who placed the 9-1-1 call, Witness A, stepped outside to meet with the officers. For Witness A's safety, Officer A ordered Witness A back into his residence and told him to lock his doors. However, no further information was gathered from Witness A, either in person or through Communications Division.

Officer A observed the Subject jump onto a wall and into his parent's backyard and directed officers to keep visual contact with the Subject. Shortly after, Officer A observed Witness B open the front door and state, "He's in here," while motioning with his hand for the officers to enter. Prior to entering the residence, Officer A requested a supervisor and asked Officer D to retrieve a less-lethal force option, but no plan was discussed amongst the officers. In addition, none of the officers attempted to gather further information about the incident or ask Witness B about reason for wanting police presence inside his home.

Upon entering the residence, Officer A observed that the Subject had retreated into the kitchen, and Officer A accordingly requested a back-up unit. Officer A planned to contain the Subject in the kitchen by having Officer B stand in front of the north kitchen entry while Officer A maintained the south entrance. Officer A assumed the role of contact officer throughout the incident until the contact officer role was transitioned to Officer K. However, there was no specific plan discussed among the other officers who were present.

Officer K stated that he/she made eye contact with Officer I as a non-verbal cue to initiate physical contact with the Subject, but there was no verbal plan or discussion of roles among the officers who were present and became involved in the non-lethal use of force. Officer K did verbalize his/her plans to move from one side of the Subject to the other while assisting with the application of handcuffs.

During the non-lethal use of force, Officer E planned on controlling the Subject's legs if it was necessary but did not verbalize his/her intent to the other officers. Officer E did so and maintained control of the Subject's legs until the Subject was taken into custody.

After the Subject was handcuffed, Officer F discussed a plan with Officers E, H, and L to double-lock the Subject's handcuffs. Once he/she determined it was too difficult to accomplish from his/her positioning, Officer F communicated his/her plan to place the Subject onto his stomach while he/she double-locked the handcuffs.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined that while there were areas for improvement, Officers A, B, E, F, H, I, K, and L's tactical planning and communication during this incident did not substantially deviate from approved Department tactical training. They worked as a team and coordinated their various responses.

Sergeant A entered the residence after the officers were communicating with the Subject in an attempt to de-escalate the situation. Sergeant A verified that Officer D was the designated beanbag shotgun officer and directed Officer C to remain outside the residence to brief additional officers. Sergeant A did not designate an arrest team or a designated cover officer to take the Subject into custody.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined that Sergeant A's tactical planning and overall communication during this incident did not substantially deviate from approved Department tactical training.

- **Situational Awareness-Tactical**

The officers were unable to locate a light source within the confines of a dark space. While a hallway light was later located inside the residence, the officers relied on their flashlights prior to and during the application of non-lethal use of force.

Officers H, I, J, K, and L arrived at the radio call and observed the Subject as they were standing in front of the residence's front door. The Subject, who was unsearched at the time and wearing bulky clothing, was directly in the path of the front door. In addition, Officer C guided Witness C near the kitchen island where a large knife was laying on a cutting board. In this case, there were no indications that Witness C was potentially violent.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined that while identified as an area for improvement in this case, the officers' actions were not a substantial deviation from approved Department tactical training, but there were areas identified for improvement.

- **Situational Awareness-Involvement of Family Member**

Officer B observed Witness C emerge from the hallway and move towards the Subject. Officer B ordered Witness C to stop, but Witness C continued towards

the Subject and wrapped her arms around the Subject in an embrace. Witness C advised the officers she could calm the Subject and spoke to him in another language. The officers at the scene did not know what Witness C's intentions were or if the Subject had weapons in his possession, as the Subject had not yet been searched.

In this case, Officer A stated the Subject was hugging Witness C, considered that Witness C may be able to de-escalate the Subject as she was rubbing the Subject's back in an attempt to soothe him. Officer A continued verbalizing with the Subject as Witness C attempted to calm him. The Subject was contained by the officers within the living/dining room area and the officers were assessing Witness C's effect on the Subject. Officer A observed that Witness C's contact with the Subject was not de-escalating the situation and Officer A pulled Witness C away from the Subject.

During the BOPC, FID investigators indicated that Witness B had the restraining order against the Subject and Witness C acted as the "peacekeeper" in their family. Witnesses B and C believed they had been granted a special waiver from the court to allow the Subject to visit during the Christmas holiday.

Officer C utilized the Mobile Digital Computer which confirmed that Witness B had a valid restraining order prohibiting the Subject from being in the residence.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined that while identified as an area for improvement, Sergeant A's and the officers' actions were not a substantial deviation from approved Department tactical training.

- **Hobble Restraint Device**

Officers F and H applied a HRD around the Subject's crossed ankles and a second HRD above the Subject's knees. The Subject was initially placed into a right lateral recumbent position. The Subject was returned to a prone position after the application of the two HRDs in order for Officer F to double-lock the handcuffs as he/she held onto the HRD strap. The Subject remained in this position for approximately 40 seconds before he was returned to his right side.

In this case, approximately 10 seconds after the HRDs were secured, Officers A, I, and L moved the Subject into an upright seated position, with his legs extended in front of him. Officer I used his/her right knee to support the Subject in the upright position so the Subject's movements would not cause the Subject injury. Officer L placed his/her left hand onto the back of the Subject's neck to brace and stabilize the Subject as the Subject was in a seated position. Officer F stated he/she noticed the handcuffs were not double-locked and he/she was afraid the handcuffs would poke or hurt the Subject. Officer K rolled the Subject into a prone position so Officer F could double-lock the handcuffs on the Subject's wrists.

Officer F finished double-locking the handcuffs while maintaining a hold on the HRD and upon completion, the Subject was rolled into a right lateral recumbent position. Officer H re-positioned him/herself behind the Subject and placed his/her hands on the Subject's left arm, while Officer L placed his/her left arm on the Subject's left wrist. Officer E maintained control of the lower hobble strap and placed his/her left shin across the Subject's lower legs. Officer F maintained control of the upper hobble strap and placed his/her left knee on the Subject's left thigh.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined that while identified as an area for improvement, Sergeant A's and the officers' actions were reasonable in this case.

- The BOPC also considered the following:
 - **Simultaneous Non-Conflicting Statements** – Officers B, C, and D gave non-conflicting, simultaneous commands to the Subject as Officer A was attempting to establish rapport with the Subject.
 - **Less-Lethal Force Options (Taser)** – Officer A requested a Taser to be used on the Subject when he was resisting the officers. Officer K responded verbally by stating “No Taser.” According to Officer K, he/she did not want the Taser utilized based on his/her belief that the officers who were in physical contact with the Subject would each be subject to the effects of the Taser if it were used on the Subject in a drive stun mode.
 - **Handcuffing Arrestees/Detainees** – Upon the initial handcuffing of the Subject, the handcuffs were not double-locked, causing Officer F to re-position the Subject into a prone position. Officers were reminded to double-lock handcuffs as soon as practical, to avoid potential injury to the suspect if the ratchets unintentionally tighten further.
 - **Body Worn Video Activation** – The FID investigation revealed that Officers F, G, and K did not have a full two-minute pre-activation buffer at the time of the incident. An analysis determined that Officers F, G, and K each had one prior BWV deviation involving a late activation or early termination.

The FID investigation revealed that Sergeant B and Officer A did not have a full two-minute pre-activation buffer at the time of the incident. An analysis determined that Sergeant B and Officer A had no prior BWV deviations.

A random inspection of BWVs associated to Sergeant B and Officers F, G, and K from August 17, 2020 through September 16, 2020, for compliance with BWV policy specific to a full two-minute pre-activation buffer indicated that they were all in compliance.

A random inspection of BWVs associated to Officer A, who has been assigned to a non-field assignment since February 16, 2020, was conducted. The period selected for the random inspection of a full two-minute pre-activation buffer was February 1, 2020 through September 16, 2020. The results of the inspection indicated that Officer A had two deviations between February 5, 2020 through February 14, 2020.

- **Required Equipment** – The FID investigation revealed that Officer E did not have a Hobble Restraint Device on his/her person at the time of the incident. Officer A was not in possession of his/her baton or other impact device.
- **Code Three Response** – Officer J responded in his/her police vehicle to Officer A's back-up request and activated his/her emergency lighting equipment, but only utilized the police vehicle's siren intermittently while responding.
- **Non-Categorical Use of Force Protocols** – Sergeants A, B, and C allowed Officer I and Officer B to accompany LAFD personnel in the RA with the Subject. Officers I and Officer B had been involved in the use of force in which Officer B had sustained a minor injury.

Neither Sergeants A, B, nor C accompanied the officers with the transport of the Subject to the hospital to ensure supervision of the custody of the Subject.

Sergeant C utilized Sergeant B's personal cellular phone to take photographs of the Subject for the initial use of force investigation, which was a NCUOF investigation at the time.

Sergeant B was assigned to complete the NCUOF investigation. Sergeant B arrived at the location and interviewed both Witnesses B and C together. While at scene, Sergeant B utilized his/her personal cellular phone to take photographs for the NCUOF investigation. Sergeant B did not respond to the hospital to interview the Subject.

Sergeant B had not yet completed this investigation when he/she was notified of the case status change from a NCUOF to a Categorical Use of Force.

Command and Control

- Sergeant A heard Officer A's request for a supervisor and recognized the location as the same residence he/she had responded to previously during his/her shift. Sergeant A directed Officer C to brief the arriving officers who were responding to the back-up request. Sergeant A observed Officer D holding a beanbag shotgun and verified with Officer D that he/she would be responsible for deploying it if needed. Sergeant A noticed that Officer A was not using the Subject's name and obtained it in an effort to help the officers build a rapport and de-escalate the incident. Sergeant A assessed the scene, monitored the officers' efforts, and

gathered background and behavior information from the Subject's parents. Sergeant A assessed his/her containment and determined there were enough officers at scene to assist in detaining the Subject. Sergeant A monitored the officers' utilization of force to ensure the officers were using an appropriate level and directed the officers to handcuff the Subject. Sergeant A observed the Subject trying to stand up, so he/she directed the officers to place a HRD onto the Subject's legs and place him into a recovery position. Sergeant A ordered Officer F to move the HRD away from the Subject's handcuffs to avoid any appearance that the HRD was connected to them.

Sergeant C responded to the radio call and arrived approximately thirty seconds after Sergeant A. Sergeant C spoke with responding units as he/she maintained his/her position in the location's driveway but did not make contact with Sergeant A. Upon Officers F and G's arrival, Sergeant C directed them to remain outside of the residence due to numerous officers already inside of the residence. Once Sergeant C overheard the sounds caused by the non-lethal use of force, he/she directed Officers F and G to go into the residence, again without contacting Sergeant A. Sergeant C remained near the front yard and front door area of the property during the non-lethal use of force. Sergeant C assisted Sergeant B, who was handling the incident as a NCUOF, by taking photographs of the Subject as the Subject was on the gurney in the back of the RA.

Sergeant C, who was standing outside the residence, did provide some assistance by monitoring officers and by directing officers into the residence.

Lieutenant A was notified by Sergeant A of the NCUOF incident. Lieutenant A was notified by officers, who were monitoring the Subject, that the Subject was admitted into the hospital for care. Lieutenant A contacted FID for advisement and FID's Assessment Team responded for further investigation. FID's Assessment Team determined that the NCUOF would be re-classified as a LERI. Lieutenant A notified the Department Operation Center (DOC) of the re-classification of this incident to a LERI.

These topics were to be discussed at the Tactical Debrief.

- In conducting an objective assessment of this case, the BOPC determined that Sergeant A's, as well as Officers A, B, E, F, H, I, K, and L's tactics did not substantially deviate from approved Department tactical training.

The BOPC determined that although Sergeant C did not receive a tactics finding in this case, Sergeant C would also benefit from attending the Tactical Debrief

Officers C, D, G, and J were not involved in the application of force; however, they were part of the response and engagement of the Subject and would also benefit from attending the Tactical Debrief of the incident.

The BOPC found Sergeant A and Officers A, B, E, F, H, I, K and L's, tactics to warrant a Tactical Debrief.

B. Non-Lethal Use of Force

- **Officer A** – (Firm Grip, Bodyweight)

According to Officer A, the Subject stepped forward towards the couch in the living room once officers attempted to take him into custody. The Subject moved in a forward motion to which Officer A responded by using his/her left hand to apply a firm grip to the Subject's right arm and simultaneously placed his/her right hand at the Subject's right collar bone. However, because the Subject's momentum continued to move him forward, Officer A stepped to his/her right, momentarily lost his/her grip, and fell onto his/her knee. As the Subject attempted to get up, Officer A stood up slightly and used his/her right forearm to apply bodyweight across the Subject's right shoulder blade.

- **Officer B** – (Firm Grip)

According to Officer B, he/she observed Officer K grab the Subject's hand. Officer B approached the Subject on his left side and used his/her right hand to apply a firm grip to the Subject's right triceps, then used his/her left hand to apply a firm grip to the Subject's right wrist.

Officer B recalled the Subject began pulling away and moving forward which caused Officer B to also fall forward. Officer B released his/her grip, obtained a pair of handcuffs, and placed a handcuff onto the Subject's right wrist.

- **Officer E** – (Firm Grip, Bodyweight)

According to Officer E, as the Subject moved forward onto the couch in the living room, the Subject was kicking his legs forward. Once the Subject fell onto the couch, Officer E believed he/she used both of his/her arms and legs to wrap them around the Subject's legs and applied bodyweight. Officer E's arms were wrapped around the Subject's upper knees. Once officers had taken control of the Subject's upper body, Officer E slid down and grabbed both of the Subject's ankles, utilizing a firm grip. Officer E used both of his/her knees to apply bodyweight to the Subject's left ankle. Once officers prepared to apply the HRD to the Subject, Officer E removed his/her knees from the Subject's ankles and transitioned to holding the Subject's ankles with both of his/her hands, utilizing a firm grip.

According to Officer E, he/she assisted with placing the HRD over the Subject's legs and over the Subject's knees. Officer E realized an officer holding an HRD at the Subject's ankle was bleeding and therefore, took over control of that HRD. While doing this, Officer E used his/her left shin to apply bodyweight across the Subject's lower legs.

- **Officer F – (Firm Grip, Bodyweight)**

According to Officer F, he/she entered the residence and assessed the situation. Officer F determined the Subject's parents needed to be reminded not to get involved. Officer F walked over to the Subject's parents to ensure they maintained their distance. However, Officer F observed that the officers were struggling with the Subject's legs. Officer F utilized both hands to apply a firm grip and bodyweight to the Subject's right leg, around his calf area.

According to Officer F, he/she had difficulty crossing the Subject's ankles due to his weight. Because of this, a second HRD was utilized. Officer F placed the HRD above the Subject's knees as a controlling device and maintained possession of the HRD strap. The Subject rolled himself onto his right side. Officer F utilized his/her knees to apply bodyweight onto the Subject's thigh to control his movements. However, Officer F stated he/she did not put all his/her weight on the Subject.

- **Officer H – (Firm Grip, Bodyweight)**

According to Officer H, he/she observed that the Subject had already been placed in handcuffs. The Subject began to flail and kick his legs. Officer H utilized his/her hands to apply bodyweight onto the Subject's legs in order to prevent him from kicking them. Officer H applied bodyweight for approximately five to ten seconds. Officer H did not recall which hand was placed on each of the Subject's legs. Officer H utilized his/her hands to apply bodyweight onto the Subject's left bicep area and left shoulder simultaneously. Officer H observed that the Subject was continuing to kick his legs up and flail around. Officer H assisted in the application of both HRDs.

- **Officer I – (Firm Grip, Bodyweight)**

According to Officer I, he/she observed the Subject's agitated state and felt like the Subject was going to snap and strike somebody. When the Subject turned towards Officer K, Officer I approached the Subject, on his right side to be close enough to render assistance to Officer K. Officer I realized Officer K's attempts to de-escalate were not working. Officer I believed he/she and Officer K had to take action to prevent themselves from getting injured or allowing the Subject to arm himself with a weapon. Officer I approached the Subject and used his/her left hand to apply a firm grip to the Subject's upper left arm as Officer I used his/her right hand to apply a firm grip on the Subject's right wrist. The Subject immediately tensed up, swung both arms forward, and began walking forward. When the Subject walked forward, Officer I lost his/her grip on the Subject's left arm.

According to Officer I, as the Subject was on the ground, he/she attempted to control the Subject's legs. Officer I used his/her right knee to apply body weight onto the Subject's right thigh. The Subject continued to actively and violently resist the officers.

Officer I recalled that as Officer B was attempting to place handcuffs onto the Subject's right wrist, Officer I observed Officer B struggling to apply the handcuff. Officer I assisted Officer B and used his/her right hand to apply a wrist lock to the Subject's right wrist.

- **Officer K – (Firm Grip, Wrist Lock)**

According to Officer K, he/she observed that the Subject was not responding to Officer A's commands. Officer K positioned him/herself to the right of the Subject, to keep the Subject's path to the front door clear, in the event the Subject complied and walked outside as Officer A had asked him to do. Officer K believed the Subject might respond to him/her and tried to give the Subject verbal commands. Officer K warned the Subject that a use of force might occur, and the Subject may end up on the ground. The Subject continued to act aggressively by tensing his fists and standing in a fighting pose and faced Officer K. Officer K realized the Subject had not been searched and was in baggy clothing in which he could have had a weapon. Officer K did not want the Subject to reach into his clothing and possibly produce a weapon. Therefore, Officer K approached the Subject to take him into custody.

According to Officer K, he/she used his/her left hand to apply a firm grip to the Subject's right elbow. Officer K then used his/her right hand to apply a wrist lock to the back of the Subject's right hand. The Subject began pulling away and attempted to flee, causing the Subject to fall forward. The Subject's upper body fell onto the living room couch while his lower body was partially on the ground in front of the couch. Officer K maintained control of his right arm as the Subject fell. Officer K then guided the Subject's right arm behind his back in order to take him into custody.

According to Officer K, after guiding the Subject's right hand behind his back, he/she transitioned and used both hands to apply a firm grip above the Subject's right wrist.

Officer K recalled that as the Subject's right handcuff was applied, Officer K observed the Subject was still resisting the officers who were attempting to place a handcuff on the Subject's left arm, which was under the Subject's stomach. Officer K transitioned to the Subject's left side and used both of his/her hands to apply firm grips to the Subject's left forearm. Officer K guided the Subject's left arm behind his back. Officer K obtained a secondary pair of handcuffs. Officer K applied a firm grip to the Subject's left wrist as Officer J attached the second set of handcuffs to the Subject's left wrist with Officer K's left hand.

- **Officer L – (Firm Grip, Bodyweight)**

According to Officer L, he/she approached the Subject, reached out towards the Subject, and used his/her hand to apply a firm grip to the Subject's left arm to get the Subject's hands behind his back. Officer L observed that the Subject was resisting the officers' efforts to take him into custody.

According to Officer L, the Subject was attempting to stand up. Officer L used his/her left hand to apply body weight to the Subject's left shoulder. Officer L then used his/her right hand to apply a firm grip to the Subject's right hand.

According to Officer L, while the Subject was being secured with two HRDs, he/she placed his/her right hand on the Subject's left wrist area. Officer L placed his/her left hand on the Subject's back and left shoulder after the HRDs had been applied, and the Subject was placed in a seated position. Officer L stated he/she did this to prevent the Subject from falling backward.

According to Officer L, once the Subject was placed into a right-side recovery position, Officer L, placed his/her left arm onto the Subject's left wrist to prevent the Subject from moving around.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined that an officer with similar training and experience, in the same situation as Officers A, B, E, F, H, I, K, and L's, would believe that the same application of non-lethal force was objectively reasonable to overcome the Subject's resistance to being detained.

Therefore, the BOPC found Officers A, B, E, F, H, I, K, and L's non-lethal use of force to be In Policy.