



BOARD REPORT

To: Chair and Members
Brantford Police Services Board

From: Inspector Kevin Reeder

Date: June 2, 2026

Subject: Report on Section 81(1) Investigation (SIU)
(SIU# 26-OFD-024)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Board accepts this report as required under the *Community Safety and Policing Act*, and

THAT the Board directs the Chief of Police to post this report on the internet within 30 days of receiving the report.

BACKGROUND:

Section 81(1) of the *Community Safety and Policing Act* directs that if the SIU Director causes an incident to be investigated under Section 15 of the *Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019* involving a member of a police service, other than a Deputy Chief of Police, the Chief of Police of the police service shall investigate:

- (a) the member's conduct in relation to the incident;
- (b) the policing provided by the member in relation to the incident; and
- (c) the procedures established by the chief of police as they related to the incident.

The Chief of Police shall report the findings and any action taken or recommendations based on the findings of the Section 81(1) investigation to the Police Service Board.

Section 8(3) of Ontario Regulation 90/24 directs that a Chief of Police who is required to report on an investigation under Section 81(1) shall give the report to the Police Service Board. If no criminal charges are laid against a member of the police service, the report shall be given within 90 days after the SIU Director publishes a final report.

Section 8(5) of Ontario Regulation 90/24 directs that a Police Service Board shall publish the report on the internet no later than 30 days after receiving the report.

Summary of SIU Incident

In the early morning of January 16, 2026, BPS officers were dispatched to a residence in the area of Wayne Gretzky Parkway and Lynden Road, Brantford. One of the homeowners had called police to report a domestic disturbance between the couple residing in the basement apartment. The male had a knife and was threatening to kill the female.

Officers arrived on scene in the basement apartment at about 2:30 a.m. to find that the female was being held in a locked bedroom by the male. The female indicated through the door that the male was holding a knife to her neck and would kill her if police opened the door. Multiple officers responded and attempted to negotiate a peaceful resolution with the male. They assured the male that they were not there to hurt him and encouraged him to open the door and allow the female to leave. The male refused to open the bedroom door. He said he would not hurt the female if the officers did not enter the room.

Emergency Response Team (ERT) officers began arriving on scene and assumed charge of police operations outside the bedroom door at about 4:15 a.m. At a distance of several metres from the bedroom door, a trained negotiator, tried to engage the male in conversation but he was mostly unresponsive. At about 4:30 a.m., the bedroom door opened and the female appeared in the doorway's threshold. The male had left her side

momentarily and she had seized the opportunity to try to escape. Before she could exit through the door, however, the male grabbed her by the hair, pulled her back into the room, and locked the bedroom door.

The officers feared for her life and made entry to the bedroom. The door was forced open and three ERT officers entered the room. The male grabbed the female from behind and held the knife to the back of her neck and head. The ERT officers feared the female would be stabbed and killed. From a distance of no more than a metre or two, the three ERT officers fired their service firearms at the male. One officer fired a Glock service handgun while the other two fired their service C8 rifles. The male sustained multiple gunshot wounds to the upper body and was immediately incapacitated. The female was not struck but did suffer a cut to her arm from the knife.

The male was immediately provided emergency medical attention but could not be saved. He was pronounced deceased at 4:46 a.m.

Cause of Death

The pathologist at autopsy was of the preliminary view that the male's death was attributable to gunshot wounds of the neck and shoulder.

The Special Investigations Unit was called and initiated an investigation. The SIU Director concluded that there were no reasonable grounds to believe that the officers committed any criminal offences in connection with the male's death. The SIU determined the officers were lawfully placed in the residence and used reasonable force. The Director's report stated:

“Once inside the bedroom, I am satisfied that the officers who discharged their firearms did so to protect the female from a reasonably apprehended attack. Though the subject officials, as was their legal right, chose not to interview with the SIU to provide that evidence firsthand, their mindset is safely inferred from the circumstances. By the time they fired their weapons, the male had grabbed the female and given every indication of

stabbing her with the knife in his right hand.

I am also satisfied that the officers' resort to gunfire constituted reasonable force in defence of the female. The male was stabbing or was just about to stab the female when the subject officials fired their weapons. Her life was in danger at that moment and it is difficult to see what else the officers could have done in defence of her life. A physical engagement would have put the officers at risk of being injured by the knife while leaving time for the male to potentially inflict a grievous or mortal wound on the female. And less-lethal force did not have the immediate stopping power required of the moment. On this record, the evidence establishes that the subject officials comported themselves reasonably when they chose to meet a lethal threat with a resort to lethal force of their own.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed."

Findings of the Section 81 Investigation

The ensuing Section 81(1) investigation looked at the officers' conduct, the service provided and any deficiencies or violations of policy and procedure.

The investigator found no deficiencies with the policies and procedures or services provided by members of the Brantford Police Service.

Further, there was no evidence discovered that suggested members committed misconduct or unsatisfactory work performance.

As a result, no further action is recommended to be taken.