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

NON-TACTICAL UNINTENTIONAL DISCHARGE – 040-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duty-On () Off (X) Uniform-Yes () No (X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside City</td>
<td>8/17/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer(s) Involved in Use of Force**

Officer A

**Length of Service**

1 years, 2 months

**Reason for Police Contact**

Officer A was off-duty in his/her residence when he/she had a Non-Tactical Unintentional Discharge with his/her firearm.

**Subject**

Deceased () Wounded () Non-Hit ()

Not applicable.

**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 (FID) investigation (including all of the transcribed statements of witnesses, pertinent Subject 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 BOPC of Police; and the report and recommendations of the Inspector General. The Department Command staff presented the matter to the BOPC and made itself available for any inquiries by the BOPC.

The following incident was adjudicated by the BOPC on June 23, 2020.
Incident Summary

Officer A was off-duty and inside the living room of his/her home. Witness A, who also lived in Officer A’s residence, was also in the living room. She was seated on the floor in front of the mirror on one side of the living room, approximately seven feet north of Officer A.

Officer A brought his/her back-up service revolver home with the intention to clean it.

Officer A was standing between the couch and kitchen counter. Prior to retrieving his/her cleaning equipment, Officer A decided to practice dry fire exercises with the revolver. Officer A retrieved the revolver from his/her backpack on the floor of his/her bedroom and removed the revolver from its holster.

With the muzzle of the revolver pointed toward the ground, Officer A held the revolver with his/her right hand and used his/her right thumb to push the cylinder release button, disengaging the cylinder from the revolver. Once the cylinder disengaged, Officer A placed his/her left hand under the open cylinder and used his/her left index finger to depress the ejector rod, releasing the live rounds into his/her left hand. Officer A did not count the live rounds and placed them on top of the kitchen counter directly behind him/her. Officer A then closed the cylinder.

Officer A held his/her revolver with two hands in a standing shooting position. He/she raised his/her revolver and pointed it in the direction of the vertical blinds covering a sliding glass doors, which led to an exterior patio. Officer A placed his/her finger on the trigger and pressed it to dry fire the revolver. Officer A conducted two dry fire presses of the trigger.

According to Officer A, he/she normally conducted dry trigger press exercises approximately three times per week, on his/her days off. However, Officer A stated that he/she usually practices with his/her semi-automatic service pistol, and this was the first time that he/she practiced with his/her revolver.

Witness A stated that Officer A would normally conduct dry trigger press exercises with his/her empty duty pistol for a period of five to ten minutes in the living room on his/her days off.

According to Officer A, believing his/her revolver was still unloaded, he/she placed his/her finger on the trigger and pressed it a third time, which caused the revolver to discharge a single round. No one was injured by the discharge.

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 of a firearm by any involved officer(s); and the Use of Force by any involved officer(s). Based on the BOPC’s review of the instant case, the BOPC made the following findings:

A. Tactics

The BOPC found Officers A’s tactics to warrant a finding of Tactical Debrief.

B. Drawing and Exhibiting

Does not apply.

C. Unintentional Discharge

The BOPC found Officer A’s non-tactical unintentional discharge to be negligent, warranting a finding of Administrative Disapproval.

- During its review of the incident, the BOPC considered the following:
- Firearms Manipulations – Four Basic Firearms Safety Rules.
- Officer A – (revolver, one round)

According to Officer A, his/her intent was to conduct a few dry fire presses prior to cleaning his/her revolver to maintain his/her accuracy. Officer A had not cleaned his/her revolver since he had graduated from the police academy, and he/she had observed some lint on his/her revolver because he/she kept the revolver in his/her pants pocket when working. Standing in front of the kitchen counter, Officer A removed the revolver from the holster and placed the holster down on the counter. Officer A disengaged the cylinder from the revolver and believed he/she had ejected all five live rounds. Officer A did a quick visual check of the cylinder and could see light through the cylinder. Officer A did not count the live rounds and placed the live rounds on top of the kitchen counter directly behind him/her, by his/her holster. Officer A closed the cylinder and pointed the gun towards the east with two hands in a standing shooting position. His/her revolver was pointed in the direction of the window. Officer A then pressed the trigger twice without consequence. Officer A then pressed the revolver’s trigger a third time, causing a round to discharge.

The BOPC determined that Officer A’s actions violated the Department’s Basic Firearm Safety Rules and found Officer A’s Unintentional Discharge to be Negligent.