

SiRT

SERIOUS INCIDENT
RESPONSE TEAM

Summary of Investigation

SiRT File # 2025-0105

Referral from

RCMP

September 6, 2025

Erin E. Naus
Director
February 13, 2026

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.

If the Director is of the opinion that a person’s privacy interest in not having some or all of the information or evidence published outweighs the public interest in having the information or evidence published, regulations permit the Director to omit that information or evidence from this report and provide reasons for doing so. In the present case, since the Affected Party is a young person and this incident involves allegations of family violence, some information has been omitted.

Mandate invoked: This investigation was authorized under Section 26I of *Police Act* in the public interest, due to an allegation of family violence/assault.

Timeline & Delays: SiRT commenced its investigation on September 6, 2025. The investigation concluded on February 2, 2026.

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 Report
2. Affected Party Statements
3. Civilian Witness Statements (2)
4. Witness Officer Notes and Reports (4)
5. 911 call recording
6. Body Worn Camera Footage

INVESTIGATION SUMMARY

Introduction

On September 5, 2025, Shelburne RCMP received a 911 call from a teenaged male (the Affected Party/AP) alleging he had been assaulted by his stepfather, who was an off-duty RCMP officer (the Subject Officer/SO).

The AP’s mother (Civilian Witness #1/CW1) was contacted by a friend and was concerned that he was driving while intoxicated. She called him and asked him to return home. When he arrived at home, the AP and CW1 argued about him driving while intoxicated. CW1 tried to take the keys from the AP. The SO came outside and asked them to come inside to avoid creating a disturbance. The AP tripped and fell on the front steps. The SO took the AP’s hand and led him inside.

Once inside, CW1 took the AP’s keys. She also took his cell phone. The AP later exited the residence through a basement door and left the property on foot. After leaving, it appears the AP may have consumed additional alcohol. He used a friend’s phone to call 911, reporting that he had been assaulted by the SO. Responding officers transported the AP to the Shelburne RCMP detachment, where he provided a statement to police. He provided two subsequent statements to SiRT, where he changed his account of events and stated that he was not assaulted by the SO. Statements from CW1 confirm these later accounts. Based on the evidence collected during SiRT’s investigation, there is nothing to indicate that the AP was assaulted by the SO.

911 Call

SiRT obtained the 911 call recording from September 5, 2025. It recorded the AP stating that he lived with the SO and that he took him to the ground and dragged him into his house. The AP used multiple expletives throughout the call and stated that he wanted the cops there and that he was bleeding. During the call the AP stated that he was intoxicated.

Affected Party Statements

AP Statement #1

SiRT obtained the body worn camera footage from the RCMP officers who responded to the incident. There was nothing relevant in the footage other than statements they recorded. Witness Officer #1 (WO1), a member of the Shelburne RCMP, took a warned statement from the AP on September 5, 2025, which was recorded by body-worn camera. The AP stated that he received a call from his mom to come home, so he listened and went home. In this statement the AP said he let his mother search his car, and then the SO grabbed him, knocked him down, and dragged him across the yard and inside the house.

During the statement the AP stated that he was intoxicated and that he faintly recalled calling the police. WO1 asked the AP if he was injured. He stated he was not injured and he drank a lot more after he left the house.

AP Statement #2

SiRT took a statement from the AP on October 9, 2025. In this statement, the AP is clear that the SO did not assault him. The statement differs significantly from his statement on September 5, 2025.

AP Statement #3

The AP contacted SiRT and provided a third statement on November 5, 2025. This statement was similar to his second statement. He again stated that the SO did not push him, and that he tripped. He explained that his mother tried to take his keys so he wouldn't drive, and that the SO asked him to come inside. He stated that he did not recall the SO touching him in any way.

Civilian Witnesses

CW1 Statement #1

CW1, the AP's mother, was interviewed by WO1 on the night of September 5, 2025. She stated that she received a text from a friend that the AP was drinking and driving. She called him and told him to come home, and she could smell alcohol from him instantly. She asked for his keys.

CW1 stated that the SO came out, and she told him the AP was drinking and driving and had the keys to the vehicle. She stated the SO got in front of the AP and told him to go inside the house. She stated the AP tripped on the doorstep and fell down and was laying in the doorway. The SO gave his arm a little pull to get him up so they could go inside and shut the door.

CW1 stated she grabbed his keys and then his phone. The AP went downstairs to the basement, and then out the door and into the driveway and left on foot.

CW1 Statement #2

SiRT took a statement from CW1 on October 9, 2025, which was very similar to her earlier statement to SIRT. She received a text from a friend that the AP was drinking and driving. She called him and told him to come home, and she could smell alcohol. She asked for his keys. CW1 stated that the SO came out after about 15 minutes, and she asked him to help her. The SO told the AP to go inside the house, and to stop screaming in the yard and road. CW1 stated the SO guided the AP towards the house. She stated the AP tripped going up the stairs. They were able to grab the car keys, and she later took his phone.

Subject Officer ("SO")

Subject Officers are not required by law to consent to an interview with SiRT. The SO declined to provide a statement to SiRT related to this incident.

Witness Officers ("WOs")

WO1 received the initial call on September 5, 2025. His police occurrence report outlines his response. The report notes that he did not observe any blood or injuries to the AP. He took a statement from the AP and CW1.

Witness Officer #2 (WO2) heard the call for service, and patrolled the area to look for the AP. He observed CW1's vehicle and pulled over. The AP stated that "they" had taken his cell phone,

shoes, and car keys. He also stated that someone tackled him to the ground and took his things. WO2 had to leave to deal with another matter, and the file was turned over to WO1.

The notes and reports of two other witness officers who assisted with the file were reviewed as part of the investigation, but do not contain any relevant information for the purpose of this summary.

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 collected in the course of the investigation, there is nothing to support the allegation that the SO assaulted or harmed the AP. It is reasonable to assume the AP was intoxicated and does not have a reliable or consistent memory of events. His inconsistent statements and subsequent change in story align with this premise. He admitted to being intoxicated and acknowledged that he was not truthful in his first statement to police. The description of events provided by CW1 do not indicate any force or assaultive behaviour was used towards the AP by the SO. There is no evidence of any injury or requirement for medical attention.

CONCLUSION

After a careful review of the evidence, I have determined that there are no reasonable grounds to lay a charge against the SO.