



## **Incident Summary**

Uniformed Police Officers A and B were on patrol in a marked black and white vehicle. Officer A was the driver, and Officer B the passenger.

Accompanying Officers A and B was Los Angeles County Deputy Probation Officer Witness A, who sat behind Officer A.

Officers A and B were driving on surface streets when they observed a vehicle, turn in front of them. The vehicle did not have a turn signal activated, in violation of California vehicle Code (CVC) Section 22107. According to Officer B, the alley in which the vehicle had exited from was known as a gang members' hangout and an area known for stolen vehicles.

Officers A and B observed the front passenger, Subject 1, was not wearing his seat belt, in violation of 27315(e) CVC. Officers A and B then observed Subject 1 place his seatbelt on as the vehicle came to a stop at an intersection. Officer B queried the vehicle's license plate in their police vehicle's Mobile Digital Computer (MDC) and received information that the vehicle had not been reported stolen.

The driver, Subject 2, negotiated a left turn into the number one lane of traffic, followed by Officers A and B. Officer B directed Officer A to conduct a traffic stop of the vehicle for the observed violations. Officer A activated the vehicle's emergency equipment forward facing red light; therefore, activating the Digital In-Car Video System (DICVS).

Officer B broadcast to Communication Division (CD) the officers would be conducting a traffic stop on the vehicle. As Officers A and B attempted to stop the vehicle, Subject 2 activated the right turn signal and pulled toward the east curb, as if she were going to stop her vehicle. Subject 2 then pulled away from the curb and continued driving in the number two lane of traffic, pulling into a gas station.

Simultaneously, uniformed Police Officers C and D, in a marked black and white vehicle, had finished conducting a traffic stop in the area when they observed the attempted traffic stop. In an effort to assist, Officer C followed behind Officers A and B.

The Subject's vehicle continued through the gas station and exited via the driveway. Officers A, B, C, and D followed the vehicle through the gas station and back onto the street. Officer A activated the police vehicle's siren, using a short burst, to get Subject 2 to pull to the curb. Subject 2 continued driving and failing to stop.

Officer B broadcast a request for an additional unit. Officers C and D informed Communications Division (CD) that they had arrived at the location (Code-Six) with Officers A and B.

Uniformed Police Officers E and F were in the vicinity driving an unmarked police vehicle, equipped with a forward facing red light and siren, when they heard Officer B's request for an additional unit.

The Subject's vehicle continued accelerating. Officer A continued activating the police vehicle's siren in short bursts while the forward facing red light remained activated to encourage Subject 2 to pull over. Officer E activated his police vehicle's emergency lights and followed behind Officers A, B, C, and D as the third unit in the line of police vehicles.

Subject 2 continued driving along surface streets and failed to stop for multiple posted stop signs. Officer B continued to broadcast their location while following Subject 2, as Officer A continued to activate short bursts of the police vehicle's siren in an effort to have Subject 2 pull over. Subject 2 continued making additional vehicle code violations to evade the officers.

As the pursuit continued, Officer B broadcast a request for back-up and an Air Unit. Officer B activated his BWV upon going into pursuit of Subject 2.

**Note:** Officer A stated that he pressed the button on his BWV but was unaware that it did not activate until the termination of the pursuit.

Officer C activated his police vehicle's emergency equipment; therefore, activating the DICVS.

Officer B continued to broadcast the Subject 2's vehicle location. Officer B also broadcast that Subject 1 kept looking back and reaching down underneath the seat. Officer B was concerned that Subject 1 was reaching for a gun.

**Note:** According to Officer A, he observed Subject 1 dip his shoulder two to three times, lowering himself, then returning to his original position.

According to Officer C, he observed Subject 1 moving forward, then left and right, but uncertain as to what he was doing.

According to Witness A, he observed Subject 1 bent at the waist, leaning forward, appearing to reach down.

Due to his belief that Subject 1 may be in possession of a gun, Officer B, while seated in the front passenger seat, unholstered his service pistol with his finger along the frame on a couple occasions. Officer B also removed his seatbelt in preparation to exit.

As Subject 2 continued, Subject 1 opened the right front passenger door on several occasions, and it appeared that he might exit the vehicle during the pursuit.

Subject 2 then drove the vehicle into a cul-de-sac. As Subject 2 approached the end of the cul-de-sac, the vehicle slowed, and Subject 1 hastily exited via the front passenger door. Subject 1 ran up a steep driveway toward a residential property. As Subject 1 ran up the driveway, Subject 2 stopped the vehicle and remained seated with both hands on the steering wheel. Officer A stopped his police vehicle behind the Subject's vehicle.

According to Officer C, Officer A suddenly stopped his vehicle causing him to steer his vehicle to the right in an effort to avoid a collision. However, Officer C was unable to avoid the collision, as the front left bumper of his vehicle collided with the rear right bumper of the primary unit vehicle.

At the termination of the pursuit, Witness B observed Subject 1 exit the vehicle and run up the driveway. As Subject 1 neared the top of the driveway, he reached a group of residents identified as Witnesses B, C, D, E, and F.

According to Witness C, as Subject 1 ran up the driveway, she pushed Subject 1 and told him he was not coming up his driveway, to which Subject 1 did not verbally respond. However, according to Witness C, Subject 1 had a look of rage. Witness C then pushed Subject 1 a second time and wrestled with him as Subject 1 reached for his waistband area, appearing to attempt to withdraw something.

According to Witness D, he punched Subject 1's left cheek, causing Subject 1 to stumble. According to Witness E, he observed Subject 1 run up the driveway with both of his hands in his front waistband area, causing him to believe that Subject 1 possessed a gun. While Subject 1 was being held by the group, Witness D threw a brick at Subject 1, which missed him.

**Note:** Some of the actions of the witnesses were obtained from the DICVS of Officer A and Officer D's BWV.

Officer D observed Subject 1 run up the driveway toward the witnesses holding onto his waist area. Officer D believed that the witnesses may be taken as hostages or involved in a possible active shooter situation. Officer D believed he needed to assist; therefore, he decided to pursue Subject 1.

As Officer D ran past Officer B, he advised Officer B that he was going to pursue Subject 1. As Officer D ran past the vehicle, he slowed slightly and unholstered his service pistol due to his belief that the situation may escalate to the use of deadly force if Subject 1 used a weapon on the witnesses or against the officers. Officer D ran approximately half way up the driveway with his service pistol in his right hand. As Officer D approached closer to Subject 1 and the civilians, he holstered his service pistol.

At this same time, Officer E stopped his police vehicle to the left and behind Officers C and D's police vehicle. Officer E observed Subject 1 exit the vehicle and run up the

driveway. Officer E was also concerned that Subject 1 was armed and running toward witnesses and followed Officer D.

At this same time, Officer C, who stood next to Officers A and B's police vehicle, observed Officer D run past the vehicle, looking inside as he ran up the driveway in pursuit of Subject 1. Due to his concern for Officer D, Officer C holstered his service pistol, waited until Officer A lowered his service pistol to a low-ready position, then ran between the rear of the vehicle and the front of Officers A and B's police vehicle, up the driveway behind Officers D and E.

Just as Officer D arrived at the group's location, Witness D punched Subject 1 a second time, while Witnesses B and C continued to pull on Subject 1.

The force of Witness D's second punch, along with Witness C pulling Subject 1, caused Subject 1, Witnesses C and D, and Officer D to fall onto the embankment of the driveway. As Officers C and E arrived, they directed the witnesses to step aside, which they did.

At the bottom of the driveway, at the Subject's vehicle, Officer A exited and stood behind the open driver door of his police vehicle. Officer A unholstered his service pistol and held it off target, with his finger along the frame, focused on Subject 2.

Officer B unholstered his service pistol, held it in his right hand and pointed it at Subject 2 as he repositioned himself near the passenger front quarter panel of his police vehicle for cover. Officer A directed Subject 2 to put her hands up.

Officer F observed Officers C, D, and E pursue Subject 1 up the driveway and knew that Officers A and B were covering Subject 2 in the vehicle. Officer F began to run past the Subject's vehicle, on the passenger side of the vehicle, toward the driveway. As Officer F passed the vehicle, he looked inside and observed Subject 2 to be the only occupant.

The Probation Officer, Witness A, exited and unholstered his service pistol and held it in two hands. As Officer B positioned himself near the passenger side and Officer A positioned himself near the rear of the vehicle, while Witness A moved near the left rear bumper of the vehicle, pointing his pistol at Subject 2.

As Subject 2 exited the vehicle, Witness A moved to his left, away from the vehicle, while Officer A repositioned himself toward the left rear bumper. As Officer A held onto his service pistol with his right hand, he used his left hand to direct Subject 2 down onto the ground. As Subject 2 exited, Officer B repositioned himself to the rear of the vehicle, then near the driver's side to the right of Officer A.

Upon reaching Subject 1, at the top of the driveway, Officer D took ahold of him, and the momentum from Witness C pulling on Subject 1, along with Witness D striking Subject 1, caused Officer D, Witness C, and Subject 1 to fall onto the embankment. As they fell, Officer E arrived at the group's location, immediately followed by Officer C.

Officer C observed Subject 1 and the witnesses engaged in a physical altercation, then observed Officer D grab onto Subject 1 and wrestle him down onto an elevated embankment approximately 12" high, between the driveway and a chain-linked fence.

Officer D directed Subject 1 to get on the ground and observed Subject 1's right hand, but could not see his left hand. Officer D remained on the right side of Subject 1 as Officers C and E arrived.

Officer E directed the Witnesses to get back as he grabbed onto Subject 1's right wrist and forearm using both hands and attempted to bring Subject 1's right arm behind his back. According to Officer E, Subject 1 resisted by turning his shoulders side to side and moving his right arm front to back while his left arm was fully extended and left hand was near his head.

Officer C arrived at the embankment as Subject 1 lay on his left side and Officer D lay on top of Subject 1 with his left arm wrapped around Subject 1's shoulders. Officer C positioned himself to the left of Subject 1 as Officer E was positioned to the right of Subject 1.

At this time, Officer F arrived, observed Officer E on Subject 1's right side, Officer C on Subject 1's left side, and Officer D toward the back of Subject 1.

According to Officer D, as he and Officer E struggled to control Subject 1's right arm, Subject 1 attempted to stand as he pushed up and got onto his knees. Officer D directed Subject 1 to show his hands; however, Subject 1 failed to comply.

As Officer C went to the left side of Subject 1, he heard Officer D direct him to grab Subject 1's left arm. According to Officer C, Subject 1 appeared to be lying on his left arm on the ground. Officer C reached around Subject 1's left shoulder, under his chest, and grabbed onto Subject 1's left forearm. As Officer C pulled Subject 1's forearm, he looked over Subject 1's shoulder and observed Subject 1 holding onto the upper slide portion of a dark, small caliber handgun with his left hand and the barrel pointed in the direction of Officer D. Officer C yelled out, "Gun, gun!" Officer C believed that if Subject 1 placed his finger on the trigger, he would shoot Officer D.

Simultaneously, as Officer E attempted to control Subject 1's right arm, he observed a small caliber blue steel handgun, with brown grips, in Subject 1's left hand, with his palm faced upward. It appeared to Officer E that Subject 1 was attempting to acquire a grip on the pistol. Officer E yelled out, "Gun" or "He's got a gun." During the struggle, and possibly due to Officer C's body position, Officer E lost sight of the handgun and continued his efforts to gain control of Subject 1's right arm.

After hearing Officer C's statement regarding the gun, Officer D stated that he feared for his life and that his objective was to keep Subject 1 down, to not allow him to manipulate his arms and fire his handgun. Officer F heard the officer's statements

directing Subject 1 to stop resisting; however, he continued to move his elbows around and tried to get leverage with his feet to push officers off him. Officer F then heard his fellow officer's statement of, "gun," and reached down to pull Subject 1's right foot from underneath him so that he would not have any leverage.

As Officer C struggled to maintain control of Subject 1's left forearm, the handgun fell into a narrow water channel between the embankment and the chain-link fence. Subject 1 then made a sudden movement with his left arm that caused Officer C to lose his grip. At this time, Subject 1 used his left hand and picked up the handgun. An unknown officer can be heard on the BWV telling Subject 1, "Let it go, dude." Officer C believed that he could not take control of the handgun and that Subject 1 intended on firing the handgun at either Officer D or himself. Therefore, Officer C stood up and used his left hand to push Subject 1's upper left back area to hold Subject 1 down.

Officer C unholstered his service pistol and held it in a close contact shooting position. Officer C pointed his service pistol at Subject 1's left side rib area and fired one round in a downward trajectory. According to Officer C, Subject 1 grunted; however, he continued to maintain possession of the handgun. Officer C then fired a second-round targeting Subject 1's left ribs area, slightly to the left of the first round, at which time Subject 1 released the handgun. Regarding his decision to shoot, Officer C stated that he strongly believed Subject 1 was going to pick up that gun and use it against him or his partner.

Meanwhile, after Subject 2 exited the vehicle, at the direction of officers, she proned herself on the ground and was handcuffed by Officer A. Officer A then conducted a search of Subject 2 for weapons, rolled her to a sitting position, and stood her up.

As Officer A handcuffed Subject 2, Officer B holstered his service pistol and broadcast a help call with shots fired. Officer B then broadcast that the incident had been resolved (Code Four) and requested a Rescue Ambulance (RA).

After the gunshots, Officer E looked to his left and observed Officer C holding his service pistol and pointing it at Subject 1's back. Subject 1 then rolled to his right off the embankment and fell onto his back on the driveway. Officers E and F unholstered their service pistols, at which point Subject 1 was taken into custody. Officer D recovered Subject 1's loaded handgun.

Los Angeles City Fire Department Firefighter/Paramedics responded to the scene and transported Subject 1 to hospital, where he failed to respond to medical treatment and was pronounced dead.

### **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). 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, made the following findings:

#### **A. Tactics**

The BOPC found Officers A, B, C, D, E, and F's tactics to warrant a Tactical Debrief.

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

The BOPC found Officers A, B, C, D, E, and F's drawing and exhibiting of a firearm to be in policy.

#### **C. Non-Lethal Use of Force**

The BOPC found Officers C, D, E, and F's non-lethal use of force to be in policy.

#### **E. Lethal Use of Force**

The BOPC found Officer C's lethal use of force to be in policy.

### **Basis for Findings**

#### **Detention**

- Officers A and B observed Subject 1 sitting in the passenger seat of a vehicle without a seatbelt on in violation of California vehicle Code (CVC), Section 27315(e). When the officers attempted to conduct a traffic stop on the vehicle, the driver failed to stop and then proceeded to commit several additional vehicle code violations, resulting in the initiation of a vehicle pursuit. The officers' actions were appropriate and within Department policies and procedures.

#### **A. Tactics**

##### **Tactical De-Escalation**

- In this case, the officers were faced with a rapidly unfolding tactical situation when Subject 1 exited the vehicle at the termination of the pursuit. While grabbing his waistband he ran up to a group of four citizens that were standing in the driveway of their residence. Prior to the officers reaching Subject 1, he became involved in a struggle with the citizens.

As the officers reached Subject 1, they ordered the citizens to step back and then attempted to take him into custody. Subject 1 immediately resisted the officers' efforts to take him into custody and engaged in a struggle with the officers. During the struggle Subject 1 dropped a handgun on the ground. As the officers continued to struggle with Subject 1, they ordered him to show his hands. Subject 1 then picked up the handgun off the ground. An officer attempted to immediately de-escalate the situation by ordering him to let go of the gun. However, Subject 1 failed to comply, resulting in an OIS.

- In its analysis of this incident, the BOPC identified the following tactical considerations:

### **1. Pursuing Possibly Armed Suspects**

Officers C, D, E, and F went in foot pursuit of Subject 1, whom they believed was possibly armed with a weapon.

Generally, officers are discouraged from pursuing armed suspects on foot. Nonetheless, officers must be afforded a level of discretion regarding the appropriateness of their decision to engage in a foot pursuit of an armed suspect.

It is the BOPC's expectation that officers are decisive in their actions during a rapidly unfolding, life-threatening situation, while taking into consideration that police work is inherently dangerous.

In this case, the officers were attempting to minimize the threat to the public and safeguard the lives of the citizens at the top of the driveway while dealing with a non-compliant and possibly armed suspect.

The BOPC determined that Officers C, D, E, and F's actions were reasonable, and their decision to pursue Subject 1 was in the best interest of the public's safety and not a substantial deviation from approved Department tactical training.

### **2. Running Past an Unsearched vehicle**

Officers C, D, E, and F ran past an unsearched vehicle, which was still occupied with Subject 1 in the driver's seat.

Officers, when faced with an ongoing tactical situation, must remain alert to improve their overall safety, by their ability to recognize an unsafe situation and then work collectively to ensure a successful resolution.

In this case, as the officers exited their vehicles, they observed that Officers A and B were covering the Subject's vehicle and that Subject 1 was fighting with the citizens at the top of the driveway. As they passed the vehicle, the officers

looked into the vehicle for additional suspects or threats and observed that Subject 2 was the only occupant in the vehicle and her hands were visible.

Although the officers' decision to run past the vehicle potentially placed them at a tactical disadvantage, they maintained their situational awareness and believed Subject 1 posed a greater risk to themselves and the community.

Based upon the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined that Officers C, D, E, and F's actions were a substantial deviation, with justification, from approved Department tactical training.

### 3. Utilizing Cover

The utilization of cover enables officers to confront an armed suspect while simultaneously minimizing their exposure. As a result, the overall effectiveness of a tactical incident can be enhanced while also increasing an officer's tactical options.

In this case, Officers A and B observed the Subject's vehicle move forward after the officers ran by. Fearing for the safety of the officers who engaged in the foot pursuit, and to avoid a crossfire situation, they left their positions of cover, tactically approached the passenger side of the vehicle, and gave Subject 2 commands to stop the car and exit the vehicle. Subject 2 complied and was taken into custody without incident.

The BOPC determined that Officers A and B's actions were reasonable and their decision to reposition themselves in the event they needed to take immediate action was not a substantial deviation from approved Department tactical training.

- The BOPC also considered the following:
  1. **Vehicle Pursuit Procedures** – The investigation revealed that Officers E and F did not ensure that Communications Division (CD) was notified they were the third unit in the pursuit. According to Officer F, he broadcast that they were third in the pursuit, but CD didn't respond. He then switched over to a different radio frequency and keyed the microphone, but he was prevented from issuing a broadcast. The officers are reminded of Department's requirement to notify CD when they are involved in a vehicle pursuit.
  2. **Occupying a Moving vehicle with a Service Pistol Drawn** – The investigation revealed that during the vehicle pursuit, Officer B drew his service pistol while seated in his police vehicle. Officer B is reminded there is always a heightened concern for an unintentional discharge when seated in a moving vehicle with a drawn service pistol.

3. **Situational Awareness** – The investigation revealed that Officer B incorrectly broadcast the location of the termination of the vehicle pursuit. Officer B is reminded of the importance of maintaining constant awareness and broadcasting the correct location to ensure responding units arrive in a timely manner.
  4. **Simultaneous Commands (Conflicting)** – The investigation revealed that Officers A and B gave simultaneous, conflicting commands to Subject 2 during the incident. The officers are reminded that simultaneous commands can sometimes lead to confusion and non-compliance.
  5. **Running with a Service Pistol Drawn** – The investigation revealed that Officer D pursued Subject 1 with his service pistol drawn. Officer D is reminded that there is a heightened concern for an unintentional discharge when running with a drawn service pistol.
  6. **Preservation of Evidence** – The investigation revealed that Officer D picked up Subject 1's handgun without gloves and placed it in the trunk of his police vehicle. Officer D is reminded that it is preferable to leave evidence undisturbed until Force Investigation Division investigators can properly document and preserve the scene.
  7. **Required Equipment** – The investigation revealed that Officers C, D, and E did not have their Hobble Restraint Device on their person at the time of the incident. Officers E and F also did not have batons on their person at the time of the incident. The officers are reminded to have all their required equipment on their person while performing field patrol duties.
- The evaluation of tactics requires that consideration be given to the fact that officers are forced to make split-second decisions under very stressful and dynamic circumstances. Tactics are conceptual and intended to be flexible and incident specific, which requires that each incident be looked at objectively and the tactics be evaluated based on the totality of the circumstances.

In conclusion, the BOPC determined that Officers A, B, C, D, E, and F's tactics warranted a Tactical Debrief.

#### **A. Drawing/Exhibiting**

- According to Officer B, during the pursuit, Subject 2 slowed down and Subject 1 opened his door as if he was going to exit the vehicle. Believing Subject 1 was possibly armed and was going to jump out or turn around and shoot at them, Officer B drew his service pistol.

At the termination of the vehicle pursuit, Officers A, B, and C drew their service pistols because they were conducting a felony vehicle stop on a possible stolen vehicle and believed Subject 1 was possibly armed.

According to Officer D, as Subject 1 continued to run up the driveway, he observed Subject 1 grabbing his waistband and drew his service pistol because he believed Subject 1 was possibly armed.

Upon reaching the top of the driveway, Officers C, D, E, and F engaged in a physical struggle with Subject 1, who had armed himself with a handgun.

According to Officer C, he completely lost control of Subject 1's left hand and observed him reach down with his left hand and pick up the gun. He then placed his left hand on the upper left side of Subject 1's body and used his body weight to hold him [Subject 1] down as he drew his service pistol to a close contact position.

According to Officer E, he did not believe that he drew his service pistol at any time during the incident.

**Note:** A review of Officer C's BWV revealed that Officer E drew his service pistol immediately after the OIS and momentarily covered Subject 1 before re-holstering.

According to Officer F, as the officers were attempting to control Subject 1's arms, he reached down and grabbed Subject 1's right leg to prevent him from getting any leverage. While doing so, he heard two gunshots. He was unsure where the gunshots came from, so he drew his service pistol and covered Subject 1.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined that an officer with similar training and experience as Officers A, B, C, D, E, and F, while faced with similar circumstances, would reasonably believe that there was a substantial risk that the situation may escalate to the point where deadly force may be justified.

In conclusion, the BOPC found Officers A, B, C, D, E, and F's drawing and exhibiting of a firearm to be in policy.

## **B. Non-Lethal Use of Force**

- **Officer C** – Firm Grip, Physical Force and Body weight

According to Officer C, he reached under Subject 1's body with his left hand, grabbed his left forearm, and pulled it away from his body.

According to Officer C, he observed Subject 1 reach down with his left hand and pick up the gun. Officer C placed his left hand on the upper left side of Subject 1's body and used body weight to hold him down.

- **Officer D** – Firm Grip, Takedown and Body weight

According to Officer D, he grabbed Subject 1, and they simultaneously fell to the ground. Subject 1 landed face down, leaning on his left side, with Officer D on his back.

- **Officer E**– Firm Grip, Physical Force and Body weight

According to Officer E, after the OIS, he did not see a weapon, so he grabbed Subject 1's right arm and placed it behind his back. Subject 1 was still fighting so he placed his right knee on Subject 1's right shoulder area to hold him down and keep him from moving.

- **Officer F** – Firm Grip, Physical Force and Body weight

According to Officer F, he reached down and grabbed Subject 1's right leg so he did not have any leverage.

According to Officer F, after the OIS, he assumed a position on the left side of Subject 1, with his right knee in the small of his back and his left knee on the driveway. Subject 1 ignored Officer F's commands to put his hand behind his back, so Officer F grabbed Subject 1's left arm and utilized his body weight to get it out from under Subject 1's body. Officer F placed Subject 1's arm behind his back and assisted in handcuffing.

Based upon the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined, that an officer with similar training and experience as Officers C, D, E, and F, while faced with similar circumstances, would believe that this same application of non-lethal force would be reasonable to overcome Subject 1's resistance.

In conclusion, the BOPC found Officers C, D, E, and F's non-lethal use of force to be objectively reasonable and in policy.

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

- **Officer C** – (pistol, one round)

According to Officer C, he observed Subject 1 reach down with his left hand and pick up the gun. Believing that Subject 1 was about to shoot him or his partner, Officer C fired two rounds at Subject 1 to stop the deadly threat.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, the BOPC determined that an officer with similar training and experience as Officer C, would reasonably believe that Subject 1's actions presented an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury, and the use of lethal force would be objectively reasonable to stop the threat.

In conclusion, the BOPC found Officer C's lethal use of force to be objectively reasonable and in policy.