

Incident Summary

Officers assigned to the front desk are required by Department policy to conduct a six-point safety check of the Remington 870 shotgun, which is maintained at the front desk of every station, at the beginning of every watch. The six-point safety check involves the visual and physical inspection of the barrel, ejector, extractor, firing pin, safety and shell carrier.

According to Officer A, he was to conduct the safety check of the TASER and Remington 870 shotgun maintained at the front desk. Officer A dated and placed his name on the clipboard adjacent to the shotgun rack as the officer responsible for the inspection of the TASER and six-point safety check of the shotgun.

Officer A conducted the inspection of the TASER. Officer A then obtained the shotgun that was secured in a locked vertical shotgun rack located out of public view in a hallway north of the front desk. Officer A unlocked the shotgun rack and removed the shotgun that had the action in the closed position. According to Officer A, he conducted a chamber check of the shotgun at the front desk prior to walking outside the station to complete the six-point safety check.

Officer A walked out the northwest rear door of the station to complete the six-point safety check of the shotgun and stood east of a covered patio area, clear of the overhead roof. Officer A then held the shotgun with the barrel pointed in an upward and slightly westerly direction, performed a visual chamber inspection of the shotgun, and closed the action with the safety on. He pressed the trigger, confirming the safety properly worked. Officer A again visually inspected the chamber, disengaged the safety and pressed the trigger a second time, discharging one round that struck the overhead patio roof. Officer A opened the action and placed the shotgun on the ground and immediately reported the incident.

There were no injuries.

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 most cases, 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). In this incident, there was no Drawing/Exhibiting of a firearm, and no Use of Force by the officer involved. 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 will 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 made the following findings.

A. Tactics

The BOPC found Officer A's actions to warrant a Tactical Debrief.

B. Unintentional Discharge

The BOPC found Officer A's unintentional discharge to be negligent, warranting administrative disapproval.

Basis for Findings

A. Tactics

- Because Officer A was not involved in a tactical event at the time of this incident, there were no identified tactical concerns. However, Department guidelines require that personnel who are substantially involved in Categorical Use of Force incidents attend a Tactical Debrief.

Officer A's tactics were not a factor in this incident; therefore, they were not reviewed or evaluated. However, Officer A was directed to attend a Tactical Debrief that included discussions with designated topics, relevant to this incident.

In conclusion, the BOPC found Officer A's actions to warrant a Tactical Debrief.

B. Unintentional Discharge

- **Officer A** – (shotgun, one round)

In this instance, while attempting to conduct a safety check of the Remington 870 shotgun, Officer A failed to appropriately conduct the required chamber check to verify the condition of the shotgun prior to pressing the trigger. Officer A's actions caused the unintentional discharge (UD) of the firearm.

The BOPC evaluated the circumstances relevant to Officer A's unintentional discharge and determined that his actions were negligent in nature, warranting administrative disapproval.