

approached the door to the storage area. Officer B told whoever was inside the storage area to come out, but no one responded, so Officer B opened the door and saw a Rottweiler, which ran towards the open door. Officer B attempted to close the door, but the dog's head got caught between the door and the frame. Officer B then released the door to seek cover inside the residence. The dog ran out the door toward Officer A as he was attempting to find cover. The dog was less than a foot away and was barking, growling, and snarling its teeth at Officer A. Officer A drew his pistol and fired one round at the dog, striking it in the left paw. The dog then ran away.

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 weapon 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 and B's tactics to warrant a tactical debrief

B. Drawing/Exhibiting/Holstering

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

C. Use of Force

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

Basis for Findings

A. Tactics

In its analysis of this incident, the BOPC identified the following tactical considerations:

The Warrant Service Tactical Plan Report states that there was a large Rottweiler dog on the premises. The Warrant Service Tactical Plan Report also states that a fire extinguisher was deployed for this incident. It would have been prudent for either Officer A or B to have had the fire extinguisher readily available when they searched the storage area, knowing that there was a dog on the premises. In this instance, although there were identified areas for improvement, the tactical considerations did not

individually or collectively unjustifiably and substantially deviate from approved Department tactical training.

B. Drawing/Exhibiting/Holstering

In this situation, a dog unexpectedly charged toward Officer A while growling and baring its teeth, resulting in Officer A drawing his service pistol. It was reasonable for Officer A to believe that the attacking dog presented a threat of serious bodily injury and that the situation had escalated to the point that lethal force may become necessary to defend himself. The BOPC found Officer A's drawing and exhibiting to be in policy.

C. Use of Force

In this incident, the charging dog presented a threat of serious bodily injury to Officer A. After realizing that there was no available cover or avenue of escape from the dog, the situation escalated to the point that lethal force was necessary. The BOPC found Officer A's use of lethal force to be in policy.