

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

**NON-TACTICAL UNINTENTIONAL DISCHARGE – 016-18**

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

Central                      3/7/18

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

Officer A    22 years, 7 months

**Reason for Police Contact**

Officer A pressed the trigger of his/her pistol while answering the telephone with his/her service pistol still in his/her hand, causing an unintentional discharge.

**Suspect    Deceased ( ) Wounded ( ) Non-Hit ( )**

Does not apply.

**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 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 January 15, 2019.

## **Incident Summary**

Police Officers A and B were working in the Police Headquarters Facility Building.

According to Officer A, his/her hands were dry, and he/she applied lotion to them. Officer A was standing in the cubicle next to Officer B. Officer A was getting ready to go home for the day. Officer A removed his/her duty pistol from its holster and discovered it was oily.

Officer A was wiping off the excess oil when the telephone rang. Officer A quickly turned with the firearm pointing downward when his/her finger slipped onto the trigger. The firearm discharged, with the discharged bullet striking 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 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 A's tactics to warrant a Tactical Debrief.

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

Does Not Apply.

### **C. Unintentional Discharge**

The BOPC found Officer A's unintentional discharge to be negligent.

## **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 value 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 objectively use 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 legal and physical hazards, and violate the rights of individuals upon whom unreasonable force is used. Conversely, officers who fail to use force when warranted may endanger themselves, the community and fellow officers.” (Use of Force Policy, Los Angeles Police Department Manual.)

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), 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:

Law enforcement officers are authorized to use deadly force to:

- Protect themselves or others from what is reasonably believed to be an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury; or
- Prevent a crime where the subject’s actions place person(s) in imminent jeopardy of death or serious bodily injury; or
- Prevent the escape of a violent fleeing felon when there is probable cause to believe the escape will pose a significant threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or others if apprehension is delayed. In this circumstance, officers shall to the extent practical, avoid using deadly force that might subject innocent bystanders or hostages to possible death or injury.

The reasonableness of an Officer’s use of deadly force includes consideration of the officer’s tactical conduct and decisions leading up to the use of deadly force. (Use of Force Policy, Los Angeles Police Department Manual.)

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 Ad to use a higher level of force while maintaining control of the situation. 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. (Tactical De-Escalation Techniques, October 2016.)

### **A. Tactics**

- Officer A's tactics were not a factor in this incident. Therefore, they were not reviewed or evaluated. However, Department guidelines require personnel who are substantially involved in a Categorical Use of Force incident to attend a Tactical Debrief. Therefore, the BOPC determined that it would be appropriate to recommend a tactics finding.

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

- Firearms Manipulations – Four Basic Firearms Safety Rules/Weapon Inspections

### **B. Drawing and Exhibiting**

Does Not Apply

### **C. Unintentional Discharge**

- **Officer A** – (pistol, one round)

According to Officer A, he/she observed that the handle of his service pistol was oily. He/she then removed his/her service pistol from its holster and began to wipe the oil off with a cleaning wipe. As Officer A cleaned his/her service pistol, the office telephone rang, and Officer A turned around to answer it while still holding his/her service pistol in his/her right hand. While pointing the service pistol in a downward position, Officer A unintentionally placed his/her finger on the trigger, causing one round to be discharged from his/her service pistol into the concrete floor in front of him/her.

Upon reviewing the evidence, the BOPC determined that the Unintentional Discharge was the result of operator error after Officer A pressed the trigger of his/her pistol while answering the telephone with his/her service pistol still in his/her hand. Officer A's action violated the Department's Basic Firearm Safety Rules.

The BOPC found Officer A's unintentional discharge to be negligent.