

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

**OFFICER-INVOLVED ANIMAL SHOOTING – 045-11**

<b>Division</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Duty-On (X) Off ( )</b>	<b>Uniform-Yes ( ) No (X)</b>
Devonshire	05/17/11		

<b>Officer(s) Involved in Use of Force</b>	<b>Length of Service</b>
Officer A	8 years, 3 months

**Reason for Police Contact**

Officers were serving a search warrant when they encountered a viscous dog, resulting in an officer-involved animal shooting.

<b>Animal(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, 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 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 Commission and made itself available for any inquiries by the Commission

Because state law prohibits divulging the identity of police officers in public reports, for ease of reference, the masculine pronouns (he, his, and him) will be used in this report to refer to male or female employees.

The following incident was adjudicated by the BOPC on November 22, 2011.

## **Incident Summary**

Officers attended a briefing at the police station in preparation for the service of a search warrant for narcotics violations at a business. During the briefing, the officers were informed of the possible presence of a large Pit Bull dog at the location. Detective A was assigned to bring a fire extinguisher to control the dog in the event the officers were to encounter it.

The officers arrived at the location and knocked on the front metal security door of the building. The officers observed a large Pit Bull dog on the other side of the security door. Detective A approached the door and sprayed the dog through the door with the fire extinguisher, which caused the dog to back away from the door.

When no one responded to open the door, the officers breached the door and made entry. The Pit Bull began to approach the officers. Detective A sprayed the dog again with the fire extinguisher, which caused the dog to retreat into a room adjacent to the entry door. Detective A followed the dog into the room along with a group of officers. The dog retreated behind an L-shaped sales counter. Detective A attempted to corral the dog with the fire extinguisher, but then realized the fire extinguisher was beginning to lose pressure.

The dog began attempting to jump over the counter. On its third attempt, the dog managed to jump over the counter and charge, growling with its teeth exposed, toward Officer A, who was approximately four feet away. Officer A was in fear of great bodily injury to himself and the other officers, and he fired six rounds from his pistol at the Pit Bull until the dog fell to the floor.

The remaining officers finished their search and secured the location.

## **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 Detective A and Officer A's actions to warrant a tactical debrief.

## **B. Drawing/Exhibiting**

The BOPC found Detective A and 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 lethal force to be in policy.

## **Basis for Findings**

### **A. Tactics**

In this instance, the BOPC determined the tactics utilized did not unjustifiably and substantially deviate from approved Department tactical training.

In conclusion, the BOPC found Detective A and Officers A's actions to warrant a tactical debrief.

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

In this instance, the involved personnel were serving a search warrant for narcotics violations at a business. As the officers deployed around the business and prepared to enter the location, they drew and exhibited their respective weapons. Tactical practices dictate that search warrant operations are inherently dangerous. The occupants are often times familiar with the layout of the location and have a tactical advantage. As a result, officers draw their service pistols upon their approach and while establishing containment around the location with the understanding that there is a substantial risk that the situation may escalate to the point where deadly force may be justified.

In conclusion, the BOPC found Detective A and Officer A's drawing and exhibition of a firearm to be in policy.

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

Based on the dog's actions, an officer with similar training and experience as Officer A would reasonably believe that the charging dog represented an imminent threat of serious bodily injury. Therefore, the BOPC determined that Officer A's use of lethal force was objectively reasonable and consistent with Department guidelines.

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