



Summary of Investigation

SiRT File # 2025-0044

Referral from

New Glasgow Regional Police

April 27, 2025

Erin E. Nauss
Director
October 31, 2025

SiRT MANDATE

The Serious Incident Response Team (“SiRT”) has a mandate to investigate all matters that involve death, serious injury, sexual assault, intimate partner violence or other matters determined to be of a public interest to be investigated that may have arisen from the actions of any police officer in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. This mandate encompasses incidents that occur on or off-duty, to avoid the real or perceived bias of police investigating police.

At the conclusion of every investigation, the SiRT Director must determine if criminal charges should result from the actions of the police officer. If no charges are warranted the Director will issue a public summary of the investigation which outlines the reasons for that decision, which must include the information set out by regulation. Public summaries are drafted with the goal of adequate information to allow the public to understand the Director’s rationale and conclusions.

Mandate invoked: This investigation was authorized under Section 26I of *Police Act* due to the serious injuries of the Affected Party.

Timeline & Delays: SiRT commenced its investigation on April 27, 2025. The investigation concluded on October 6, 2025. There was some delay due awaiting receipt of the collision analyst report.

Terminology: This summary uses the following language in accordance with regulations made under the *Police Act* and to protect the privacy of those involved:

- “**Affected Party/AP**” means the person who died or was seriously injured in relation to a serious incident.
- “**Civilian Witness/CW**” means any non-police individual who is a witness to or has material information relating to a serious incident.
- “**Witness Officer/WO**” means any police officer who is a witness to or has material information relating to a serious incident.
- “**Subject Officer/SO**” means a police officer who is the subject of an investigation, or whose actions may have resulted in a serious incident.

Evidence: The decision summarized in this report is based on evidence collected and analyzed during the investigation, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Police Incident Reports
2. Affected Party Statement
3. Civilian Witness Statements (2)
4. Police Radio Transmission
5. Medical Records of the Affected Party
6. Police vehicle GPS data
7. In-car camera video
8. Civilian video
9. Body-worn camera footage
10. Collision Analyst Report

INVESTIGATION SUMMARY

Introduction

On April 27, 2025, at approximately 12:24pm, a New Glasgow Regional Police officer (the Subject Officer (SO) activated his lights and sirens and attempted a traffic stop of a grey truck on Temperance Street that matched the description of a stolen vehicle. The driver of the truck did not stop and accelerated through a stop sign, nearly causing a collision. The SO turned off his emergency equipment, and the truck continued to travel north at a high rate of speed and collided with a taxi that was traveling east on MacLean Street. The driver of the truck, the Affected Party (AP), fled the scene on foot. The SO arrested him a short distance away. After arrest, the AP was taken to hospital and was diagnosed with a broken collarbone. No one in the taxi was injured.

Police Incident Reports & Radio Transmission

Police incident reports show that the New Glasgow Regional Police had responded to a complaint at a local business on April 19, 2025, where an adult male smashed a truck window and left the property in the truck. Police determined from the license plate that the truck was stolen by the adult male.

On April 27, 2025, the SO received information that the AP was driving the stolen truck while his license was suspended. At approximately 12:20pm, he located the truck on Granville Street in New Glasgow and noted it was occupied by a male driver and female passenger. Police incident reports indicate the SO requested that a "flight from police" file be generated. Radio transmissions record the SO advising police dispatch a couple of seconds later that the truck was involved in a collision

with a taxi, and the driver was fleeing on foot. The SO caught up with the driver, the AP, and took him into custody. EHS was contacted, and they transported the AP to hospital.

Subject Officer

Subject officers are not required by law to provide their notes or reports, or to provide an interview to SiRT. In the present case, the SO declined to provide his notes or reports and did not consent to an interview.

Affected Party

The AP provided a statement to SiRT on April 27, 2025. He stated that he was just driving around and the police started following him with their lights activated, so he panicked, sped up and drove off, and got “t-boned”. He stated that he ran away from police, was cuffed, and waited for an ambulance. He recalled police following him with lights on for a few blocks, and that when police turned the lights off, they continued to follow him.

The AP consented to the release of his medical records to SiRT, which confirm he had lacerations on his head and a fractured left collar bone.

At the hospital the AP was found to be in possession of a significant quantity of illegal drugs.

Civilian Witnesses

The female passenger of the AP’s truck, Civilian Witness #1 (CW1), provided a statement to SiRT on April 27, 2025. She explained that someone she knew picked her up after she asked for a cigarette. CW1 stated that they were driving when all of a sudden, police lights came on behind them and the AP started panicking. The AP started flying through stop signs, and she told him she wanted to get out of the vehicle. CW1 stated she could see a cab slowly come toward them, and all she remembers is the AP hitting the cab.

CW1 stated that the police pursued them through one to two stop signs, and then the police “kind of backed off a little bit”. She stated that there was nothing in her mind that police did wrong in the situation.

SiRT interviewed the taxi driver involved in the collision on April 27, 2025, Civilian Witness #2 (CW2). He was driving two passengers, one of whom was a young person. His direction of traffic did not have a stop sign. The other direction has stop signs. CW2 stated that as he drove his vehicle uphill, another vehicle (the AP’s vehicle) went through a stop sign and hit the front passenger side

of his taxi. He stated that the police vehicle was a fair distance back from the AP's truck, and he did not see it until after the collision. He stated he did not hear sirens, but the police vehicle had its lights on. He observed the AP run away from the scene.

Video Evidence

SiRT obtained video of the collision captured by a camera at a residence. Three seconds into the video footage, the AP's truck drives through a stop sign and directly into the front of a taxi, causing the collision. The truck spins and collides with a telephone pole. At nine seconds, two occupants emerge from the truck (later identified as the AP and CW1). Eighteen seconds into the video footage, a marked police vehicle with lights and sirens activated drives by.

In-car camera footage from the SO's police vehicle was obtained by SiRT as part of the investigation. The following is a synopsis of the relevant footage:

12:24:33 – Police vehicle is following the grey truck at a speed of approximately 38km/h.

12:24:45 - Truck stops abruptly at a red light and turns right at the intersection.

12:24:56 - SO activates his lights and sirens to initiate a traffic stop.

12:25:05 - Truck begins to speed away from the police vehicle.

12:25:10 - Truck runs a stop sign at a high rate of speed, nearly colliding with another vehicle and almost goes airborne through the intersection.

Police vehicle turns off its lights and sirens.

12:25:17 - Police vehicle slows to a stop at the stop sign, then continues down the street, maintaining a visual of the truck.

12:25:24 - The truck runs another stop sign and collides with a taxi that was travelling perpendicular.

12:25:35 - The police vehicle drives towards the collision and lights and sirens are reactivated. An individual can be observed running across the street in the distance.

12:25:41 - As the police vehicle is driving past the collision, the siren is deactivated.

12:25:57 - The police vehicle is stopped and you can hear the SO yelling, "Stop [AP], Stop. Stop. You're under arrest. Get down, get down on the ground. Get down on your stomach. Get on your stomach now. Get down, you're under arrest. Get on your stomach. Don't move, do not move."

12:27:08 - Backup unit arrives to assist.

12:28:59 - Backup unit departs.

12:35:53 - Ambulance arrives on scene.

12:39:59 - Police vehicle

is moved off of the street, into a parking lot.

12:47:49 - Lights are deactivated on the police vehicle.

13:27:39 - Another police vehicle arrives and an officer moves the SO's vehicle to another location, where the vehicle stayed for the remainder of the video, unoccupied.

Body-Worn Camera (BWC) Footage

SiRT obtained the SO's body-worn camera footage, which is consistent with the footage from the in-car camera and other evidence. It also captures the SO's interaction with the AP once he was located and arrested. The BWC footage does not show any physical force being used on the AP. Due to the pain the AP was in, the SO agreed to move the handcuffs to the front of the AP.

Collision Analyst Report

SiRT does not have its own specialized services and has a policy that when those services are required, they are engaged from a police service that is separate from the agency that employs the Subject Officer. In this case, a collision analyst from the RCMP attended the scene and conducted an analysis. He found that there were no mechanical defects with either of the vehicles involved in the collision, and although there was insufficient evidence to determine the pre-impact speed of the truck, it was consistent with a high rate of speed. The taxi was travelling 44km/h at the time of impact. The collision analyst is of the opinion that the cause of the collision was the AP failing to stop at the stop sign and driving straight into the intersection and into the taxi.



Photo of taxi after collision



Photo of truck after collision

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

Criminal Code:

Dangerous operation

320.13 (1) Everyone commits an offence who operates a conveyance in a manner that, having regard to all of the circumstances, is dangerous to the public.

Operation causing bodily harm

(2) Everyone commits an offence who operates a conveyance in a manner that, having regard to all of the circumstances, is dangerous to the public and, as a result, causes bodily harm to another person.

Nova Scotia Motor Vehicle Act:

Duty to drive carefully

100 (1) Every person driving or operating a motor vehicle on a highway or any place ordinarily accessible to the public shall drive or operate the same in a careful and prudent manner having regard to all the circumstances.

(2) Any person who fails to comply with this Section shall be guilty of an offence.

Careful and prudent speed

101 A person operating or driving a vehicle on a highway shall operate or drive the same at a careful and prudent rate of speed not greater than is reasonable and proper, having due regard to the traffic, surface and width of the highway and of all other conditions at the time existing, and a person shall not operate or drive a vehicle upon a highway at such a speed or in such a manner as to endanger the life, limb or property of any person.

Exemption of police or emergency vehicle

109 (1) The speed limitations as set forth in this Act shall not apply to vehicles when operated with due regard to safety under the direction of the police in the chase or apprehension of violators of the law or of persons charged with or suspected of any such violation, nor to fire departments or fire patrol vehicles when travelling in response to a fire alarm, nor to public or private ambulances when travelling in emergencies and the drivers thereof sound audible signal by bell, siren or exhaust whistle.

(2) This Section shall not relieve the driver of any such vehicle from the duty to drive with due regard for the safety of all persons using the highway, nor shall it protect the driver of any such vehicle from the consequences of a reckless disregard of the safety of others. R.S., c. 293, s. 109; revision corrected.

LEGAL ISSUES & ANALYSIS

I must now assess the evidence to determine whether there are reasonable and probable grounds to believe a criminal offence has been committed. Reasonable and probable grounds is a standard lower than a balance of probabilities or beyond a reasonable doubt, and more than reasonable suspicion.

Based on the evidence reviewed as part of this investigation, it is clear the SO was in lawful execution of his duties and had reasonable grounds to stop the vehicle operated by the SO. The vehicle was confirmed to be stolen, and the AP was operating it while his license was suspended. The AP failed to stop for police, and fled at a high rate of speed, driving dangerously and almost causing a collision. As a result, the SO deactivated his lights and sirens and terminated the attempted traffic stop, in accordance with New Glasgow Regional Police policy. The AP continued to travel at a high rate of speed and through a stop sign, causing a collision with another vehicle. Based on the evidence, it appears the collision resulted in the AP's injuries.

I am satisfied that the SO conducted himself with due care and regard for public safety, as required by the criminal law, throughout his brief engagement with the truck driven by the AP. The evidence indicates that the SO had his emergency lights and sirens activated, alerting nearby traffic of his presence. He then turned the emergency equipment off and terminated engagement. I cannot conclude he was operating his vehicle in a manner that was dangerous to the public.

The *Motor Vehicle Act* sets out offences related to speed and imprudent driving. However, it contains an exemption for police vehicles when operated with due regard to safety during a chase or when apprehending those in violation of the law. I am satisfied the SO had due regard for safety and did not conduct himself in a manner that was reckless or imprudent.

CONCLUSION

I have determined that there are no reasonable grounds to lay a charge against the SO.