

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

**OFFICER-INVOLVED ANIMAL SHOOTING – 062-10**

<b>Division</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Duty-On (X) Off( )</b>	<b>Uniform-Yes(X) No( )</b>
Southeast	07/26/10		

<b>Officer(s) Involved in Use of Force</b>	<b>Length of Service</b>
Officer A	17 years, 3 months

**Reason for Police Contact**  
Officers were conducting a search when an officer-involved animal shooting occurred.

<b>Subject(s)</b>	<b>Deceased ( )</b>	<b>Wounded (X)</b>	<b>Non-Hit ( )</b>
Pit Bull dog.			

**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 and addenda items); the 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 Inspector General. The Los Angeles Police Department Command Staff presented the matter to the Chief and made itself available for any inquiries by the Commission.

Because state law prohibits divulging the identity of police officers in public reports, the masculine pronouns (he, his, and him) will be used in this report in situations where the referent could in actuality be either male or female.

The following incident was adjudicated by the BOPC on August 2, 2011.

## **Incident Summary**

Officer A, along with other officers, was executing a search warrant at a location. Upon their arrival, Officer A and his partner, Officer B, were assigned to monitor the rear of the residence during service of the warrant. Due to the fact that officers were serving a search warrant, Officer A unholstered his pistol. The officers pried open the front pedestrian gate at the residence and Officers A and B walked into the front yard, toward the driveway.

Officer A walked down the driveway and then saw a large Pit Bull dog walk from the rear yard of the residence onto the driveway. According to Officer A, the dog was barking, showing its teeth, and began to run toward him in an aggressive manner as if it wanted to bite him. Officer A walked backwards approximately four feet and the dog continued to run toward him. The dog came within two feet of Officer A. Officer A, fearing the dog was going to attack and bite him, fired one round from his pistol at the dog in a downward direction. According to Officer A, the round struck the dog fell onto the ground.

## **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/Holstering of a revolver by any involved officer(s); and the Use of Force by any involved officer(s). All incidents are evaluated to identify areas where involved officers can benefit from a tactical debriefing to improve their response to future tactical situations. This is an effort to ensure that all officers benefit from the critical analysis that is applied to each incident as it is reviewed by various levels within the Department and by the BOPC. Based on the BOPC's review of the instant case, the BOPC unanimously made the following findings.

### **A. Tactics**

The BOPC found Officer A's tactics to warrant a tactical debrief.

### **B. Drawing/Exhibiting**

The BOPC found Officers A's drawing/exhibition of a firearm to be in policy.

### **C. Use of Force**

The BOPC found Officers A's use of force to be in policy.

## **Basis for Findings**

### **A. Tactics**

In this instance, no specific areas of improvement were noted nor did the actions of the officers individually nor collectively unjustifiably and substantially deviated from approved Department tactical training.

In conclusion, the BOPC found Officer A's tactics to warrant a tactical debrief.

### **B. Drawing/Exhibiting**

In this situation, Officer A was in the process of assisting other personnel with the service of a search warrant. After arriving at the target location, Officer A drew his service pistol.

The service of search warrants presents involved officers with a set of circumstances in which individuals inside of the location to be searched may have unrestricted access to a variety of weapons including firearms. As a result, it is a common practice for officers serving search warrants to draw or exhibit weapons due to the increased potential for contact with an armed suspect that could quickly escalate to a point where deadly force may be necessary. It was reasonable for Officer A to draw his service pistol during this incident.

In conclusion, the BOPC found Officer A's drawing/exhibiting to be in policy.

### **C. Use of Force**

In this instance, Officer A observed a large Pit Bull breed dog charging toward him. Fearing serious bodily injury, Officer A fired one round at the Pit Bull. The Pit Bull stopped charging, turned and collapsed.

It was reasonable for Officer A to believe that the Pit Bull breed dog presented an immediate threat of serious bodily injury or death; therefore, the use of lethal force was justified.

In conclusion, the BOPC found Officer A's use of lethal force to be in policy.