

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

OFFICER-INVOLVED ANIMAL SHOOTING – 050-24

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

77 th	10/16/24		
------------------	----------	--	--

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

Officer B	5 years, 9 months
-----------	-------------------

Reason for Police Contact

Officer B and his/her partner responded to a call regarding a German Shepherd and Pit Bull who had attacked an individual. During their investigation, Officer B approached an Recreational Vehicle (RV) to contact the potential owner of the two dogs. Upon knocking on the RV, Officer B and his/her partner encountered the Pit Bull and a German Shepherd. The Pit Bull lunged toward Officer B, resulting in an Officer-Involved Shooting of an Animal (OIS-A).

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

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 (CUOF) 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 (FID) investigation (including all of the transcribed statements of witnesses, pertinent suspect criminal history, and addenda items); the relevant Training Evaluation and Management System materials of the involved officers; the Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB) recommendations, including any Minority Opinions; 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 September 23, 2025.

Incident Summary

On October 16, 2024, at approximately 1240 hours, Witness A was walking her dog near her residence. Witness A observed two dogs, a German Shepherd and a Pit Bull, attacking and biting a victim who was walking nearby. Fearing the dogs might also attack her and her dog, Witness A hurried home and called 911 to report the incident. In response, Communications Division (CD) contacted the South Los Angeles Animal Shelter and reported that two loose dogs were running around chasing community members.

Approximately one hour and 45 minutes later, Witness B observed an individual, later identified as the victim. According to Witness B, the victim was standing next to a white RV when the German Shepherd and Pit Bull, approached him, attacked, and bit him, causing the victim to fall to the ground. In response, Witness B called 911 to report the incident. Communications Division subsequently broadcast a radio call, which advised 77th Area units of the incident.

At 1431 hours, Officers A and B requested the radio call. While the officers were en route, CD broadcasted additional identifying information regarding the victim. The broadcast also indicated the victim attacked the dog three or four times with a machete. Communications Division then verified that the responding unit was equipped with a 40 millimeter Less Lethal Launcher (LLL) and requested a supervisor to respond as part of the Department's edged weapons protocol. 77th Patrol Division Sergeant A requested the call.

Officers A and B arrived at the location approximately one minute and 20 seconds after being assigned the call and drove south. According to Officer B, upon reaching a stop sign, he/she observed a Pit Bull and a German Shepherd sitting on the sidewalk next to a white RV, which was parked against the curb.

Officer A and Officer B drove through an intersection and Witness B flagged them down. Officer A stopped the police vehicle. Witness B approached the vehicle window and described the dog attack on the victim. Witness B explained that the victim had a stick, struck the two dogs, and he walked away. Then the victim approached the dogs with the machete and struck the dogs with it. As Witness B spoke with the officers, he noticed the victim on the sidewalk and pointed him out. Officer B asked the victim if he was okay. The victim responded in the affirmative and indicated he was bit on the side of his hand.

Officer B exited the vehicle, instructed the victim to come to him/her, and asked the victim if he needed an ambulance. The victim approached Officer B while carrying a stick in his left hand. The victim appeared out of breath and informed Officer B that he had fallen and been attacked by two dogs but declined an ambulance. The victim gestured in the direction of where the RV was parked, indicating that someone had taken the dogs in that direction. Officer B indicated he/she would contact the person in the RV about the dogs. Officer B also asked whether the victim needed further assistance. The victim answered in the negative.

Officers A and B re-entered their vehicle, began to drive, and then stopped to contact Witness B. Officer A then made a U-turn and continued driving. As they did so, Officer A told Officer B that he/she did not see a machete. As they approached the RV, Officer A slowed and ultimately stopped at a stop sign.

Officer A and Officer B then reported observing the dogs approximately 50 yards away, wagging their tails and appearing happy. Officer B added that the dogs were on the sidewalk next to a closed gate, with a male, Witness C, standing on the other side of the gate. The officers discussed whether animal control would respond since the dogs were not contained. Officer A made another U-turn and parked behind the RV to try to meet with the dogs' owner.

After exiting the vehicle, Officer B walked to the rear passenger side of the RV and knocked on the rear panel. Simultaneously, Officer A approached the front of the patrol vehicle and began to unholster his/her baton. As Officer A did this, he/she turned west to face the sidewalk, where the German Shepherd and a Pit Bull could be seen trotting toward Officer B. At that moment, Officer B noticed the dogs and gave verbal commands for the dogs to back up as he/she unholstered his/her pistol.

The dogs barked aggressively and advanced toward Officer B. Officer B pivoted to face the dogs and stepped into the street as he/she held a pistol in his/her right hand. Simultaneously, the Pit Bull lunged at Officer B with its jaws wide open. Using a one-handed grip, Officer B pointed the muzzle of his/her pistol downward at the Pit Bull and fired one round from an approximate distance of one foot. As Officer B stepped back, Officer B lost his/her balance and fell backward. The Pit Bull continued its forward momentum, landing inches from Officer B's legs before retreating to the sidewalk, and joining the German Shepherd. The dogs ultimately ran down the street.

Officer B stood up and moved to the corner of the closest intersection. The dogs could be seen approximately 110 feet west, running away along the sidewalk. Approximately 30 seconds after he/she fired, Officer B used his/her radio to indicate shots were fired and to request a supervisor. Officers A and B then discussed whether the dog had been struck, and Officer A advised Officer B that he/she did not hit the dog. Moments later, Officer B made an additional broadcast in which he/she described the type and location of the two dogs. He/she also asked that the Department of Animal Services be notified about the loose dogs.

Approximately six minutes after the OIS-A, Officer B received a phone call from 77th Street Patrol Division Assistant Watch Commander, Sergeant B. Officer B briefed Sergeant B that he/she had been involved in a dog shooting and needed additional units to secure the scene. Sergeant B advised Officer B that Sergeant A was en route.

According to Sergeant A, while en route to the call, he/she heard Officer B calmly broadcast a "shots fired" call and believed it was an information-only type of broadcast. Sergeant A arrived at scene approximately ten minutes after the animal shooting.

Upon arriving, Sergeant A was directed to Officer B, who was speaking with the victim and gathering information to complete a Field Interview (FI) card. Officer B informed Sergeant A that he/she had been involved in an animal shooting. Sergeant A then obtained a Public Safety Statement (PSS) from Officers A and B, admonished both of them, before Sergeant A separated and monitored them. Approximately 30 minutes after the animal shooting, Sergeant B then responded to the scene and declared him/herself the Incident Commander.

At approximately 1730 hours, Officers C and D from the Department of Animal Services responded to the scene to search for the loose dogs. A community member directed them to a residence and indicated that the dogs involved in the incident were at that location. The community member also mentioned the house was abandoned, boarded up, and occupied by squatters.

Upon arriving at the residence, Officers C and D attempted to contact the occupants but received no response. Although the officers could hear dogs barking inside, they were unable to see them. As a result, Officer C completed a Department of Animal Services Investigation Report.

The investigation determined that the property was an abandoned house occupied by squatters. Force Investigation Division investigators attempted to contact the property owner to obtain consent to enter the premises but were unable to reach them. Lacking consent from the property owner and having no legal standing or exigency to enter the residence to secure the dogs, 77th Street Patrol Division Commanding Officer Captain A determined that the appropriate course of action was to disengage and avoid the risk of another animal shooting.

On October 17, 2024, at 1430 hours, Officer C conducted a follow-up visit to the residence. Officer C located the Pit Bull and impounded him to the South Los Angeles Animal Shelter.

BWV and DICVS Policy Compliance

NAME	TIMELY BWV ACTIVATION	FULL 2-MINUTE BUFFER	BWV RECORDING OF ENTIRE INCIDENT	TIMELY DICVS ACTIVATION	DICVS RECORDING OF ENTIRE INCIDENT
Officer A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners' Findings

The BOPC reviews each Categorical Use of Force (CUOF) 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 Officer B's tactics to warrant a Tactical Debrief.

B. Drawing and Exhibiting

The BOPC found Officer B's drawing and exhibiting of a firearm to be In Policy.

C. Lethal Use of Force

The BOPC found Officer B's 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. The Los Angeles Police Department also recognizes 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, feasible, and reasonable to do so. As stated below, when warranted, Department personnel may use objectively reasonable force to carry out their duties. Officers may use deadly force only when they reasonably believe, based on the totality of circumstances, that such force is necessary in defense of human life. Officers who use unreasonable force degrade the confidence of the community we serve, expose the Department and fellow officers to physical hazards, violate the law and rights of individuals upon whom unreasonable force or unnecessary deadly 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. 23, 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 De-Escalation Techniques: It is the policy of this Department that, whenever practicable, officers shall use techniques and tools consistent with Department de-escalation training to reduce the intensity of any encounter with a suspect and enable an officer to have additional options to mitigate the need to use a higher level of force while maintaining control of the situation.

Verbal Warnings: Where feasible, a peace officer shall, prior to the use of any force, make reasonable efforts to identify themselves as a peace officer and to warn that force may be used, unless the officer has objectively reasonable grounds to believe that the person is already aware of those facts.

Proportionality: Officers may only use a level of force that they reasonably believe is proportional to the seriousness of the suspected offense or the reasonably perceived level of actual or threatened resistance.

Fair and Unbiased Policing: Officers shall carry out their duties, including use of force, in a manner that is fair and unbiased. Discriminatory conduct in the basis of race, religion, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, housing status, or disability while performing any law enforcement activity is prohibited.

Use of Force – Non-Deadly: 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.

Factors Used to Determine Objective Reasonableness: Pursuant to the opinion issued by the United States Supreme Court in *Graham v. Connor*, the Department examines the reasonableness of any particular force used: a) from the perspective of a reasonable Los Angeles Police Officer with similar training and experience, in the same situation; and b) based on the facts and circumstances of each particular case. Those factors may include, but are not limited to:

- The feasibility of using de-escalation tactics, crisis intervention or other alternatives to force;
- The seriousness of the crime or suspected offense;
- The level of threat or resistance presented by the suspect;
- Whether the suspect was posing an immediate threat to the officers or a danger to the community;
- The potential for injury to citizens, officers or suspects;
- The risk or apparent attempt by the suspect to escape;
- The conduct of the suspect being confronted (as reasonably perceived by the officer at the time);
- The amount of time and any changing circumstances during which the officer had to determine the type and amount of force that appeared to be reasonable;
- The availability of other resources;
- The training and experience of the officer;
- The proximity or access of weapons to the suspect;
- Officer versus suspect factors such as age, size, relative strength, skill level, injury/exhaustion and number of officers versus suspects;
- The environmental factors and/or other exigent circumstances; and,
- Whether a person is a member of a vulnerable population.

Drawing or Exhibiting Firearms: Unnecessarily or prematurely drawing or exhibiting a firearm limits an officer's alternatives in controlling a situation, creates unnecessary anxiety on the part of citizens, and may result in an unwarranted or accidental discharge of the firearm. Officers shall not draw or exhibit a firearm unless the circumstances surrounding the incident create a reasonable belief that it may be necessary to use the firearm. When an officer has determined that the use of deadly force is not necessary, the officer shall, as soon as practicable, secure or holster the firearm. Any drawing and exhibiting of a firearm shall conform with this policy on the use of firearms. Moreover, any intentional pointing of a firearm at a person by an officer shall be reported. Such reporting will be published in the Department's year-end use of force report.

Use of Force – Deadly: It is the policy of the Department that officers shall use deadly force upon another person only when the officer reasonably believes, based on the totality of circumstances, that such force is necessary for either of the following reasons:

- To defend against an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or another person; or,

- To 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.

In determining whether deadly force is necessary, officers shall evaluate each situation in light of the particular circumstances of each case and shall use other available resources and techniques if reasonably safe and feasible. Before discharging a firearm, officers shall consider their surroundings and potential risks to bystanders to the extent feasible under the circumstances.

Note: Because the application of deadly force is limited to the above scenarios, 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.

The Department's Evaluation of Deadly Force: The Department will analyze an officer's use of deadly force by evaluating the totality of the circumstances of each case consistent with the California Penal Code Section 835(a), as well as the factors articulated in *Graham v. Connor*.

Rendering Aid: After any use of force, officers shall immediately request a rescue ambulance for any person injured. In addition, officers shall promptly provide basic and emergency medical assistance to all members of the community, including victims, witnesses, subjects, suspects, persons in custody, suspects of a use of force and fellow officers:

- To the extent of the officer's training and experience in first aid/CPR/AED; and
- To the level of equipment available to the officer at the time assistance is needed.

Warning Shots: It is the policy of this Department that warning shots shall only be used in exceptional circumstances where it might reasonably be expected to avoid the need to use deadly force. Generally, warning shots shall be directed in a manner that minimizes the risk of injury to innocent persons, ricochet dangers and property damage.

Shooting at or From Moving Vehicles: It is the policy of this Department that firearms shall not be discharged at a moving vehicle unless a person in the vehicle is immediately threatening the officer or another person with deadly force by means other than the vehicle. The moving vehicle itself shall not presumptively constitute a threat that justifies an officer's use of deadly force. An officer threatened by an oncoming vehicle shall move out of its path instead of discharging a firearm at it or any of its occupants. Firearms shall not be discharged from a moving vehicle, except in exigent circumstances and consistent with this policy regarding the use of Deadly Force.

Note: It is understood that the policy regarding discharging a firearm at or from a moving vehicle may not cover every situation that may arise. In all

situations, officers are expected to act with intelligence and exercise sound judgement, attending to the spirit of this policy. Any deviations from the provisions of this policy shall be examined rigorously on a case by case basis. The involved officer must be able to clearly articulate the reasons for the use of deadly force. Factors that may be considered include whether the officer's life or the lives of others were in immediate peril and there was no reasonable or apparent means of escape.

Requirement to Report Potential Excessive Force: An officer who is present and observes another officer using force that the present and observing officer believes to be beyond that which is necessary, as determined by an objectively reasonable officer under the circumstances based upon the totality of information actually known to the officer, shall report such force to a superior officer.

Requirement to Intercede When Excessive Force is Observed: An officer shall intercede when present and observing another officer using force that is clearly beyond that which is necessary, as determined by an objectively reasonable officer under the circumstances, taking into account the possibility that other officers may have additional information regarding the threat posed by a suspect.

Definitions

Deadly Force: Deadly force is defined as any use of force that creates a substantial risk of causing death or serious bodily injury, including but not limited to, the discharge of a firearm.

Feasible: Feasible means reasonably capable of being done or carried out under the circumstances to successfully achieve the arrest or lawful objective without increasing risk to the officer or another person.

Imminent: Pursuant to California Penal Code 835a(e)(2), "[A] threat of death or serious bodily injury is "imminent" when, based on the totality of the circumstances, a reasonable officer in the same situation would believe that a person has the present ability, opportunity, and apparent intent to immediately cause death or serious bodily injury to a peace officer or another person. An imminent harm is not merely a fear of future harm, no matter how great the fear and no matter how great the likelihood of the harm, but is one that, from appearances, must be instantly confronted and addressed."

Necessary: In addition to California Penal Code 835(a), the Department shall evaluate whether deadly force was necessary by looking at: a) the totality of the circumstances from the perspective of a reasonable Los Angeles Police Officer with similar training and experience; b) the factors used to evaluate whether force is objectively reasonable; c) an evaluation of whether the officer exhausted the available and feasible alternatives to deadly force; and d) whether a warning was feasible and/or given.

Objectively Reasonable: The legal standard used to determine the lawfulness of a use of force is based on the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. See *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386 (1989). *Graham* states, in part, “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 test of reasonableness is not capable of precise definition or mechanical application.”

The force must be reasonable under the circumstances known to or reasonably believed by the officer at the time the force was used. Therefore, the Department examines all uses of force from an objective standard rather than a subjective standard.

Serious Bodily Injury: Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 243(f)(4) Serious Bodily Injury includes but is not limited to:

- Loss of consciousness;
- Concussion;
- Bone Fracture;
- Protracted loss or impairment of function of any bodily member or organ;
- A wound requiring extensive suturing; and,
- Serious disfigurement.

Totality of the Circumstances: All facts known to or reasonably perceived by the officer at the time, including the conduct of the officer and the suspect leading up to the use of force.

Vulnerable Population: Vulnerable populations include, but are not limited to, children, elderly persons, people who are pregnant, and people with physical, mental, and developmental disabilities.

Warning Shots: The intentional discharge of a firearm off target not intended to hit a person, to warn others that deadly force is imminent.

A. Tactics

Tactical De-Escalation Techniques:

Planning,

Assessment:

Time;

Redeployment and/or Containment;

Other Resources; and

Lines of Communication.

Planning, Assessment, Time, Redeployment and/or Containment

At the time of the incident, Officers A and B were not routine partners; however, they had worked with each other approximately two to three times previously. Officers A and B discussed various tactical scenarios but had not specifically discussed vicious animal encounters. According to Officer B, they discussed that he/she would be the contact officer and Officer A would be the cover officer.

Before and during their time at the scene of the radio call, Officers A and B discussed their plan to find the owner of the dogs and have the owner secure them. If that was not feasible, they planned to contact animal control before they approached the dogs. Before completing the final U-turn and approaching the RV, Officers A and B assessed the dogs' location and noted they were approximately 50 yards away from them and moving further away. The officers believed the dogs' distance allowed them the time to knock on the door of the RV. After knocking on the side of the RV, the dogs quickly ran back to the officers' location. As the dogs rounded the corner, they suddenly were close to Officer B, limiting the time available to him/her to react. Officer B redeployed away from the dogs, but the dogs continued to close the distance.

Other Resources – Approximately 30 seconds after the animal shooting, Officer B broadcast that shots had been fired over the police radio. Officer B requested a supervisor and Animal Control to respond.

Lines of Communication – Officers A and B communicated with several community members in the area. They obtained pertinent information and attempted to keep people away from the animals to ensure their safety. Prior to the OIS-A, Officer B gave commands to the dogs to back up, which the dogs ignored. After the OIS-A, Officer B requested additional resources to address the dogs and secure the scene.

During its review of the incident, the BOPC considered the following:

- **Dog Encounters**

As Officers A and B drove to the RV, they observed the dogs approximately 50 yards away and continuing to move away from them. This led the officers to believe they had sufficient time to safely knock on the RV and attempt to contact who they believed to be the owner of the dogs. The dogs unexpectedly and suddenly changed direction and returned to the RV before the Pit Bull lunged at Officer B.

The BOPC assessed the tactics used by Officer B. The BOPC noted at the time of the officer's response that the dogs were not actively attacking anyone, and their behavior did not appear aggressive to the officers. The BOPC opined based upon the information provided to the officers at the time, that attempting to contact the owner to have the dogs secured was a reasonable method to attempt to resolve the

situation. Additionally, the BOPC opined the distance and demeanor of the dogs at the time the officers decided to exit their vehicle and knock on the RV, caused them to reasonably believe they had the time to conduct that activity safely.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined that the tactics employed by Officer B were not a substantial deviation from Department-approved tactical training. This issue was to be discussed during the Tactical Debrief.

Command and Control

- After completing the “shots fired” broadcast, Officer B requested additional resources and a Sergeant. He/she directed Officer A to secure the crime scene with crime scene tape. Officer B began to obtain the victim’s information when Sergeant A arrived at scene. Sergeant A arrived approximately ten minutes after the animal shooting and was advised of the shooting. Sergeant A located Officers A and B, separated them, and completed separate Public Safety Statements (PSS) on both officers. Sergeant B responded to the scene and declared him/herself the incident commander over the police radio.

The BOPC determined that the overall command and control exercised by Officer B and Sergeants A and B were consistent with Department training and expectations of senior officers and supervisors during a critical incident.

Tactical Debrief

- In conducting an objective assessment of this case, the BOPC adopted the Chief’s findings that Officer B’s actions did not deviate from Department-approved tactical training.

Each tactical incident merits a comprehensive debriefing. In this incident, areas were identified where improvements could be made. A Tactical Debrief is the appropriate forum for the involved officer to discuss individual actions that took place during this incident. Therefore, Officer B was directed to attend a Tactical Debrief.

B. Drawing and Exhibiting

- **Officer B**

According to Officer B, he/she unholstered his/her service pistol when he/she heard dogs aggressively barking at him/her and when he/she saw the Pit Bull dog lunge in his/her direction. Officer B was in fear that he/she was going to be bit by the Pit Bull.

The BOPC evaluated Officer B’s drawing and exhibiting of his/her service pistol. The BOPC noted Officer B observed the Pit Bull barking aggressively and lunging toward him/her when he/she decided to unholster his/her service pistol. The BOPC

opined the unholstering of his/her service pistol due to the threat posed by the Pit Bull was objectively reasonable and consistent with Department policy.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined that an officer with similar training and experience as Officer B would reasonably believe there was a substantial risk the situation may escalate to the point where deadly force may be justified.

Therefore, the BOPC found Officer B's drawing and exhibiting to be In Policy.

C. Lethal Use of Force

Background – The investigation determined that at the time of the animal shooting, Officer B pointed his/her pistol downward in a westerly direction and fired at the Pit Bull from an approximate distance of one foot. The background consisted of the sidewalk verge and the curb of a street.

- **Officer B** – pistol, one round.

After knocking on the side of the RV, Officer B heard the dogs behind him/her. As Officer B turned around, the dogs barked at him/her and advanced toward him/her. Officer B faced the dogs and backed away from them. The Pit Bull lunged at Officer B with its jaws wide open. Using a one-handed grip, Officer B pointed the muzzle of his/her service pistol downward at the Pit Bull and fired one round from an approximate distance of one foot. As he/she stepped back, Officer B lost his/her balance and fell backward. The Pit Bull continued its forward momentum, landing inches from Officer B's legs before retreating to the sidewalk, and joining the German Shepherd. The dogs retreated down the street.

The BOPC assessed Officer B's use of deadly force. The BOPC noted due to the dogs' unexpected and sudden return to the area, the tactical options and tools available to the officers was limited. The BOPC also noted that Officer B quickly attempted to redeploy away from the dogs while using a commanding voice in attempt to deter the dogs. The BOPC opined when those attempts were ineffective and the Pit Bull lunged at Officer B with open jaws, that he/she was left with no alternative other than to the use of lethal force to prevent the dog from biting and causing serious bodily injury to him/her.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined that an officer with similar training and experience as Officer B, in the same situation, would reasonably believe the use of lethal force was objectively reasonable, proportional, and necessary.

Therefore, the BOPC found that Officer B's lethal use of force was In Policy.