

Use of Conducted Energy Weapons by the Sheriff Services in British Columbia, 2001–2007

This review of 127 reported incidents of conducted energy weapon (CEW) usage by sheriffs and sheriff deputies in British Columbia includes descriptions of subject characteristics and behaviours, incident type and location, mode of CEW deployment, use of other force options, injuries, and policy compliance.

Prepared for the Thomas R. Braidwood, Q.C., Commissions of Inquiry

by Karen A. Ryan

November 5, 2008

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES..... 507

INTRODUCTION..... 508

METHODOLOGY 508

CONTEXT..... 509

RESULTS..... 509

 Subject Characteristics..... 509

 Incident Characteristics..... 510

 Subject Behaviours/Actions..... 512

 Weapons 513

 Nature of CEW Deployment..... 513

 Use of the CEW in Display Mode 513

 Use of the CEW in Stun Mode 514

 Use of the CEW in Probe Mode..... 514

 Use of the CEW in Stun and Probe Modes 515

 Subject Behaviour and the Use of Conducted Energy Weapons..... 515

 Use of Other Force Options 516

 Injuries and Medical Attention 517

 Policy Compliance 517

 Conclusions..... 517

APPENDIX 1: CEW INCIDENT FILE REVIEW (SHERIFFS) CODING FORM..... 518

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table 1: Number of CEW Incidents by Year</i>	<i>509</i>
<i>Table 2: Number of CEW Incidents by Originating Office</i>	<i>511</i>
<i>Table 3: Subject Behaviours/Actions</i>	<i>512</i>
<i>Table 4: Method of CEW Use by Highest Level of Subject Resistance.....</i>	<i>516</i>
<i>Table 5: Use of Other Intervention Methods or Use-of-Force Options in Conjunction with CEW Use.....</i>	<i>516</i>

INTRODUCTION

Phase One (the “Study Commission”) of the Braidwood, Q.C., Commissions of Inquiry was mandated to “inquire into and report on the use of conducted energy weapons” by sheriffs in the performance of their duties and the exercise of their powers under the *Sheriff Act*. In partial fulfillment of this mandate the Commission undertook a review of all CEW incidents involving Sheriff Services Division officers in British Columbia.²⁹⁶

METHODOLOGY

In May 2008 a request was made to the Ministry of the Attorney General, asking for “CEW incident reports,” including any video records of CEW incidents, dating from 2001 to the end of 2007.

In order to facilitate and expedite access to documents and videos, Sharon Samuels, Research Counsel, negotiated and signed a confidentiality agreement with the Ministry of the Attorney General (and approved by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Office) that ensured that the privacy of individuals involved in CEW incidents (both staff and subjects) would be safeguarded by the Commission.

A coding form (see Appendix 1) was developed to capture information about subject characteristics and behaviours, incident type and location, mode of CEW deployment, use of other force options, injuries, and policy compliance. File coding was completed in September 2008.²⁹⁷

For the purposes of this research, the unit of analysis was defined as “the discharge of a CEW on an individual during a single event.” If the CEW was used in stun or probe mode on more than one subject during a single event, a “CEW Incident File Review Coding Form” was completed for each subject and would be counted as multiple instances of CEW use. If the CEW was used as a display only/compliance tool on multiple subjects, a single coding form was completed for the incident.

Commission researchers met with a senior member of Sheriff Services in August 2008 to view video records of CEW incidents. In total 16 video records (including CCTV images) were viewed, including 14 probe deployment incidents and two display compliance incidents. “TASER Deployment Reports” and/or “Court Services Incident Reports” were reviewed in Ministry of the Attorney General offices as per the above noted confidentiality agreement. Incidents reports relating to 127 CEW use incidents were provided to researchers for review.²⁹⁸

The period covered by this review is from 2001 (when sheriffs and sheriff’s deputies were first equipped with CEWs) through to the end of 2007.

296 Sheriff Services (Court Services Branch) is responsible for court security, escort of prisoners, detention of prisoners, jury management, service of court-related documents, execution of court orders and warrants, and coroner’s court assistance.

297 Significant research assistance was provided by Jennifer B. Morgan, who completed the file coding and provided general research support.

298 A “TASER Deployment Report Summary” provided by Sheriff Services indicates that between October 2001 and the end of 2007, 128 incidents had been reported; however, one report (involving a probe deployment) was not included in the package of reports provided to the Braidwood Commission. The summary also included reports of 53 “accidental discharges” of a CEW; however, as no subject was involved these incidents are not included in the review.

CONTEXT

The following information provides background for the use of CEWs by BC Sheriff Services.

Sheriff and deputy sheriff officers were given access to CEWs beginning in 2001 when the service obtained 80 units. In 2005, 24 units were added to inventory for a total of 104. In 2006, 95 units were available for use, and in 2007, sheriffs and sheriff's deputies had access to 91 units. CEWs are issued to officers on an as-needed basis and are not carried routinely.

The number of regular deputy sheriffs employed province-wide has grown slightly over this time period from 438 in 2001 to 457 in 2007.²⁹⁹

Ministry of Attorney General operational volume statistics indicate that Sheriff Services were responsible for escorting 125,000 prisoners in 2005/2006 and 124,600 prisoners in 2006/2007.³⁰⁰ During the same period officers provided courthouse security to 44 courthouses in the province.

RESULTS

Incident reports relating to 127 CEW use events dating from October 2001 through to the end of 2007 were reviewed. Table 1 below lists the number of incidents per year.

Table 1: Number of CEW Incidents by Year

Year	Number of CEW Incidents	Percentage of Total
2001	10	7.9
2002	18	14.2
2003	19	15.0
2004	14	11.0
2005	22	17.3
2006	21	16.5
2007	23	18.1
Total	127	100.0

Subject Characteristics

Nearly all of the 127 reported incidents involved male subjects (92.1%). Eight incidents (6.3%) involved female subjects. In two instances the gender of the subject was not indicated.

Most of the subjects of the CEW incidents were adult prisoners (112, or 88.2%). Most of these prisoners were male (105). Four incidents (3.1%) involved youth prisoners (three males

²⁹⁹ Throughout this time period Sheriff Services also included an estimated 30 managers. All figures provided by Sheriff Policy and Projects, Court Services Branch.

³⁰⁰ www.ag.gov.bc.ca/public/ministry_operational_volumes.pdf

APPENDIX H

and one female) and seven incidents (5.5%) involved members of the public (five males and two females). In four cases the type of subject was not indicated.

The subject's age at the time of the CEW incident was rarely recorded in the reports reviewed. In 103 cases the subject's age was unknown. In relation to the 24 cases where age was known, the average age was 31 years, with a minimum age of 19, a maximum age of 44, and a median age of 29.5.

The race or ethnicity of the subject was not recorded in the incident reports reviewed.

A history of mental illness was noted for 38 (29.9%) subjects.

Nearly two-thirds (64.6%) of incident reports noted that the subject had a history of violence.

Incident Characteristics

In the majority of cases the primary type of duty being performed by sheriffs or deputy sheriffs when the CEW incident occurred was jail/holding cell security (91 cases, or 71.7%).³⁰¹ Eighteen incidents (14.2%) occurred during the performance of escort duties. Sixteen (12.6%) incidents occurred during the provision of criminal court security and one (0.8%) was related to civil court security. The remaining case concerned "other" duties.³⁰²

The primary type of event occasioning the use of a CEW was often extraction or placement of a prisoner in a cell (53 cases, or 41.7%). Twenty-two incidents involved prisoner transfer (17.3%), while the primary event was a cell search in 11 cases (8.7%) and a prisoner search in 11 (8.7%) cases. The remaining 30 incidents involved a variety of event types, including maintaining cell order, maintaining courtroom order, taking remanded prisoners into custody, and serving court orders or warrants.

With respect to the location of the CEW incident, just over half (67 cases, or 52.8%) occurred in courthouse/sheriff's cells. Nineteen incidents (15%) took place in police cells, 17 (13.4%) happened in a courtroom or in public areas of a courthouse, and seven (5.5%) occurred in prison cells (pretrial centre). Six incidents (4.7%) occurred in a motor vehicle during transport and five incidents (3.9%) took place in a loading area or transfer point. One incident (0.8%) took place in each of the following locations: prison cell of a regional correctional centre, jail interview room, and hospital. In three cases, the location of the incident was not indicated.

Table 2 below lists the number of CEW incidents by the location (or type) of the sheriff's office providing service. The largest proportion of incidents (26%) originated with the Surrey office, which provides services to the Surrey Pretrial Centre.

301 In 15 of these cases, Sheriff Services officers were also tasked with escort duties. In another case, jail security duties were combined with criminal court security duties.

302 As the case specifics could potentially identify the case, no other details are provided here.

Table 2: Number of CEW Incidents by Originating Office

Office	Number of CEW Incidents	Percentage of Total
Abbotsford	15	11.8
Chilliwack	6	4.7
Courtenay	2	1.6
Cranbrook	1	0.8
Fort St. John	1	0.8
Lower Mainland Regional Escorts	7	5.5
Vancouver	12	9.4
Nanaimo	3	2.4
New Westminster	2	1.6
North Vancouver	2	1.6
Port Coquitlam	8	6.3
Powell River	2	1.6
Prince George	5	3.9
Richmond	3	2.4
Salmon Arm	1	0.8
Sechelt	2	1.6
Smithers	1	0.8
Surrey	33	26.0
Victoria	21	16.5
Total	127	100.0

Subject Behaviours/Actions

Incident descriptions, narratives, and synopses of events recorded in the reports completed by Sheriff Services staff were used to extract the characteristics of subject behaviours or actions as observed by staff members on the scene of the CEW use incident. Levels of resistance as outlined in the National Use of Force Framework were supplemented with other descriptors of subject behaviour as noted in the reports. Table 3 below lists the frequency that these behaviours or actions were observed and noted by Sheriff Services staff.

Table 3: Subject Behaviours/Actions

Subject Behaviours/Actions	Frequency (N=127)	Percentage
Cooperative/compliant to directions	3	2.4
Passive resistance ³⁰³	1	0.8
Agitated	21	16.5
Pacing	1	0.8
Yelling	20	15.7
Disturbance	13	10.2
Smashing/damaging property	17	13.4
Verbally abusive/verbal threats/verbal aggression	58	45.7
Active resistance ³⁰⁴	76	59.8
Assaultive ³⁰⁵	53	41.7
Violence/threatened violence to staff	16	12.6
Violence/threatened violence to self	5	3.9
Violence/threatened violence to others	28	22.0
Escape/escape attempt	2	1.6
Grievous bodily harm or death ³⁰⁶	0	0.0
Staff member assaulted	4	3.1

Note: Each incident may contain multiple (not mutually exclusive) descriptors of subject behaviour/actions (including levels of resistance).

303 Passive resistance is defined as refusal, with little or no physical action, to cooperate; refusal to show hands.

304 Active resistance is defined as non-assaultive physical action to resist; e.g., pulling away.

305 Assaultive is defined as attempts to apply or application of force to any person; kicking, punching, threatening acts or gestures, aggressive body language, “pre-assault cues.”

306 Grievous bodily harm or death is defined as actions intended to or likely to cause grievous bodily harm or death; assault with weapon; actions that would result in serious injury to any person; actions that warrant use of deadly force.

Weapons

In three incidents (2.4%) the subject of the CEW use incident was armed with some type of weapon. In two instances the subject was armed with a blunt weapon and one instance involved a pointed weapon.

Nature of CEW Deployment

In 89 (70.1%) of the 127 CEW incidents the subject was warned that a CEW might be used if he or she failed to comply with direction. In almost one-quarter (23.6%) of these cases, the subject was warned more than once. In none of the 89 incidents was a warning alone sufficient to gain the subject's compliance. In 66 cases (74.2%) the warning was followed or used in conjunction with a display of the CEW in an attempt to gain compliance with no further use of the CEW.

In relation to the remaining 23 of 89 cases where the subject was warned that the CEW might be used:

- The CEW was displayed and then used in probe mode in 10 cases (11.2%).
- The CEW was displayed and then used in stun mode in 10 cases (11.2%).
- The CEW was displayed and then used in both stun and probe modes in three cases (3.4%).

In total, display mode usage of the CEW occurred in 126 of the 127 cases (99.2%). The CEW was used in display mode only (with no stun or probe mode usage) in over three-quarters of the 127 incidents (101 cases, or 79.5%).

In total, use of the CEW in stun mode occurred in 14 of the 127 cases (11%). The CEW was never used in stun mode only (with no display or probe mode usage).

In total, the CEW was used in probe mode in 15 of the 127 cases (11.8%). In one case, only probe mode was used (with no display or stun mode usage).

The deployment of the CEW in both stun and probe mode (following display of the weapon) occurred in three incidents (2.4%).

In all incidents the CEW used was the TASER M26, the CEW used exclusively by the Sheriff Services.

The following four sections will review the more detailed results relating to display mode, stun mode, probe mode, and combined stun and probe mode usage.

Use of the CEW in Display Mode

As previously reported, display of the CEW in the attempt to gain subject compliance was present in 126, or 99.2 per cent, of the 127 CEW incidents. This type of use of the CEW includes simple display of the weapon, "sparking" of the weapon, and targeting of the laser sight on the subject. This method was often used (70.6%) in conjunction with one or more verbal warnings.

APPENDIX H

In most cases (122 cases, or 96.8%) one attempt to gain the subject's compliance through the display of the CEW occurred. In four cases (3.2%) two attempts were made to gain compliance via this method.

In over three-quarters of incidents (102 of 126, or 81%) in which display compliance was attempted the method was effective (or ultimately effective, where multiple attempts were made) in gaining the subject's compliance. This method was ineffective in 23 (18.3%) cases and only temporarily effective in one (0.8%) case.

Where display compliance was ineffective the CEW was subsequently used in probe mode in 10 cases (43.5%), stun mode in 10 cases (43.5%), and both stun and probe modes in three cases (13%). In the single case where display compliance was only temporarily effective, no other CEW use was recorded.

Use of the CEW in Stun Mode

As previously reported, use of the CEW in stun mode occurred in 14 of the 127 cases (11%).

In all cases, use of stun mode was preceded by an attempt to gain compliance through display of the weapon. In three cases (21.4%) use of the CEW in probe mode also preceded the stun mode deployment of the CEW.

In over three-quarters of the 14 incidents (11 cases, or 78.6%) in which the CEW was used in stun mode the subject was exposed to one stun deployment. In three cases (21.4%) the subject was exposed to two stun deployments.

The single or first stun deployment most commonly targeted the subject's back (five cases, or 35.7%), followed by the subject's buttocks (three cases, or 21.4%), ribs (two cases, or 14.3%), abdomen (one case, or 7.1%), and thigh (one case, or 7.1%). In two cases, the location on the subject's body targeted by the stun deployment was not noted in the incident report. In the three cases where there was a second stun deployment, the targeted area was the back, the buttocks, and unknown.

Use of the CEW in stun mode was effective (or ultimately effective in the case of multiple stuns) in controlling the subject in all cases.

Use of the CEW in Probe Mode

As previously reported, the CEW was used in probe mode in 15 of the 127 cases (11.8%).

In most probe mode incidents (14, or 93.3%) deployment followed display of the weapon. The CEW was used in probe mode without a prior attempt to gain compliance through either display of the weapon or a verbal warning in only one case.

Most probe mode incidents (12 of 15, or 80%) involved a single probe deployment cycle. Three subjects (20%) were exposed to two probe cycles.

Information about the distance the officer was from the subject when the CEW probes were fired was not recorded in three incident reports. The deployment distance was between one foot (three cases) and 10 feet (three cases) where this information had been recorded (average distance: 5.5 feet).

The duration of the probe cycles was recorded in 14 cases. In all of these cases the duration of the probe cycles was listed as five seconds (the default duration) or less.

In one-third of probe use incidents (five cases, or 33.3%) the location on the subject's body hit by the probe darts was not recorded in the incident report. Among the 10 cases where the body location was known the most common location was the subject's chest (50%), followed by the back (20%), torso (10%), arm (10%), and leg (10%).

In one case (10%) the probe darts hit the subject's bare skin.

Use of the CEW in probe mode was effective (or ultimately effective in the case of multiple probe cycles) in controlling the subject in 11 incidents (73.3%). The method was ineffective in two incidents (13.3%) and only temporarily effective in two incidents (13.3%). In relation to the four cases where the probe deployment was ineffective or only temporarily effective, the method failed due to poor electrical conduction in three cases and a technical problem with the CEW in one case.

One or both probe darts were embedded in the subject's skin in 12 cases. In these cases the dart(s) was/were removed by a hospital physician in four cases (33.3%), Sheriff Services officers in two cases (16.7%), and the subject in one case (8.3%). Information about dart removal was missing for five incidents (41.7%).

Use of the CEW in Stun and Probe Modes

In three of the 127 (2.4%) CEW use incidents, the CEW was deployed in both stun and probe modes (always following an attempt to gain compliance through display of the weapon). In two of these cases, a single probe cycle was followed by a single stun mode deployment. In the third case, one probe cycle was followed by two stun mode applications.

Subject Behaviour and the Use of Conducted Energy Weapons

Thus far, the review of CEW use by Sheriff Services officers has presented the characteristics of subject behaviour and the nature of CEW use in isolation from each other. However, the justification for the use and method of use of the CEW is dependent upon the behaviour of the subject. This section will summarize how the CEW has been used by sheriff officers when dealing with subjects who displayed various levels of resistance.

Table 4 presents the methods of CEW use in the context of the highest level of subject resistance faced by Sheriff Services officers. Subject resistance is categorized according to the National Use of Force Framework, which describes subject behaviour as cooperative, passive resistance, active resistance, assaultive, and posing a threat of grievous bodily harm or death to anyone. As can be seen from this analysis, the CEW was not deployed in stun or probe mode when the subject was displaying anything less than active resistance. Most stun and/or probe deployment incidents (21 of 26, 80.8%) involved subjects displaying assaultive resistance, but in no case was the subject posing an immediate threat of gross bodily harm or death.

Table 4: Method of CEW Use by Highest Level of Subject Resistance

Highest Level of Resistance	Cooperative	Passive	Active	Assaultive	GBH/Death	Other	Total
CEW Use							
Display Only Deployment	3	1	31	32	0	34	101
Display & Stun	0	0	2	9	0	0	11
Display & Probe	0	0	3	8	0	0	11
Stun Only	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Probe Only	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Stun & Probe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Display & Stun & Probe	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Total	3	1	36	53	0	34	127

Note: The “other” category includes all cases where the subject’s behaviour did not involve any of the National Use of Force Framework resistance categories. In 20 of the 34 cases in this category, the subject had verbally threatened violence to others.

Use of Other Force Options

In addition to the CEW, Sheriff Services staff also recorded the use of other intervention methods or force options to control subjects. Table 5 below lists the frequency with which these methods were used before, during, or after use of the CEW.

Table 5: Use of Other Intervention Methods or Use-of-Force Options in Conjunction with CEW Use

Intervention Method	Before CEW Use		During CEW Use		After CEW Use	
	Total (N=127)	%	Total (N=127)	%	Total (N=127)	%
Verbal Intervention	121	95.3	6	4.7	1	0.8
“Soft” Physical Control	27	21.3	2	1.6	13	10.2
“Hard” Physical Control	11	8.7	1	0.8	2	1.6
Restraints	7	5.5	1	0.8	96	75.6

Note: “Soft” physical control includes arm and wrist locks, hands-on force to pressure points, and taking the subject to the ground. “Hard” physical control includes open and empty hand strikes, punches, and kicks to target areas.

Verbal intervention before CEW use often (87 cases, or 71.9%) comprised or included a verbal warning that the CEW might be used if the subject refused to comply with direction.

In relation to the seven cases where the subject was restrained prior to use of the CEW, the CEW was displayed only.

In most CEW incidents (75.6%) the subject was restrained following the use of the CEW. Most commonly (56 of 96 cases, or 58.3%) the subject was handcuffed only. In 21 cases (21.9%) the subject was both handcuffed and put in leg irons. Another nine subjects (9.4%) were handcuffed, put in leg irons, and also restrained by another form of restraint (such as a belly chain). In three cases (3.1%) handcuffs were combined with another form of restraint other than leg irons (such as a belly chain). In seven cases (7.3%) the type of restraint used was not recorded.

Injuries and Medical Attention

In six of the 127 CEW incidents (4.7%) one or more Sheriff Services officers suffered some type of injury. All of these injuries were described as minor in nature (including bruises, cuts, and strains).

The subject sustained some form of injury in 15 of the 127 (11.8%) CEW incidents. Three injured subjects (20%) sustained injuries both related to the use of the CEW and unrelated to CEW use.

In total, eight (6.3%) subjects suffered a CEW-related injury. All of these injuries were described as minor in nature and involved the penetration of probe darts into the skin.

A non-CEW-related injury was suffered by 10 subjects (7.9%). One-half of these injuries (five) occurred during intervention by Sheriff Services officers. Four injuries occurred prior to intervention by officers. One injury was self-inflicted by the subject during the incident. For the most part (90%), non-CEW-related injuries were relatively minor in nature. The single serious injury occurred during intervention by Sheriff Services officers.

Subjects were checked by medical staff on the scene following eight incidents (6.3%). Four subjects (3.1%) were examined by Provincial Ambulance Service paramedics. Seven subjects (5.5%) were transported to hospital.

Policy Compliance

The characteristics of CEW use incidents were compared to Sheriff Services policy regarding use of the CEW. This review concluded that policy compliance with respect to actions to be taken before, during, and after CEW use is high.

Conclusions

The review of CEW use by sheriffs and sheriff's deputies in BC found that CEWs are used relatively rarely. From 2001 through 2007, the CEW was used 127 times, and in the vast majority of these cases (79.5%), the weapon was displayed to gain or maintain a subject's cooperation and compliance without any stun or probe mode usage.

In addition, the CEW was not deployed in stun or probe mode when the subject was displaying anything less than active resistance. Most stun and/or probe deployment incidents (21 of 26, 80.8%) involved subjects displaying assaultive resistance, but in no case was the subject posing an immediate threat of gross bodily harm or death.

APPENDIX 1: CEW INCIDENT FILE REVIEW (SHERIFFS) CODING FORM

Note: the unit of analysis is the discharge of a CEW on an individual during a single event – if the CEW is used (in stun or probe mode) on two subjects during one event, it will be counted as two incidents and should be assigned two case numbers and recorded on two coding forms. If the CEW is used as a display only/compliance tool on multiple subjects, complete a single coding form for the incident.

Case Number

Date of Incident (code Year, Month, Day)

Lighting 1=good 2=poor

SUBJECT CHARACTERISTICS

Age (in years)

Gender 1=male 2=female 3=unknown

Physical Size 1=small 2=medium 3=large

Race/Ethnicity (specify)
1=Caucasian 2=Aboriginal 3=Asian 4=South Asian 5=Black 6=Other 7=Middle Eastern 8=Hispanic

History of mental illness (known to staff prior to incident) 1=yes

History of violence (known to staff prior to incident) 1=yes

Preexisting medical conditions (e.g., pregnancy, heart disease, epilepsy, diabetes)
1=yes 2=no

If yes, specify

Subject type 1=adult prisoner 2=youth prisoner 3=member of public 5=other

ORIGINATING OFFICE (specify)

TYPE OF DUTY

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Escort | 4. Court Security (civil) |
| 2. Jail Security | 5. Document Service |
| 3. Court Security (criminal) | 6. Other (specify) <input type="text" value=""/> |
| | Duty Type #1 <input type="text" value=""/> |
| | Duty Type #2 <input type="text" value=""/> |

TYPE OF EVENT

- 1. Cell extraction or placement
 - 2. Cell search
 - 3. Prisoner search
 - 4. Prisoner transfer
 - 5. Other (specify) _____
- Event Type #1
Event Type #2

LOCATION OF INCIDENT

- 1. Police cells
 - 2. Courthouse/sheriff's cells
 - 3. Prison cell (pre-trial centre)
 - 4. Prison cell (regional corrections centre)
 - 5. Loading area/transfer point
 - 6. In transit (motor vehicle)
 - 7. Courtroom/courthouse public areas
 - 8. Jail interview room
 - 9. Hospital
-

SUBJECT BEHAVIOURS/ACTIONS (As observed by sheriffs on scene)

(code 1 if present during incident)

- Cooperative/compliant to directions
- Passive Resistance (refusal with little or no physical action, to cooperate; refusal to show hands)
- Agitated
- Pacing
- Yelling
- Smashing property
- Disturbance
- Verbally abusive/verbal threats/verbal aggression
- Alcohol/Drug intoxication
- Symptoms of mental health crisis
- Symptoms of "excited delirium"
- Symptoms of drug induced psychosis
- Symptoms of drug overdose
- Active Resistance (non-assaultive physical action to resist; e.g., pulling away; "resistor")
- Assaultive (attempts to apply or applies force to any person; kicking, punching, threatening acts or gestures, aggressive body language, "pre-assault cues"; "assailant")
- Violence/threatened violence to staff
- Violence/threatened violence to self
- Violence/threatened violence to others
- Grievous bodily harm or death (actions intended to or likely to cause GBH or death; assault with weapon, actions that would result in serious injury to any person; actions warrant use of deadly force)
- Staff member assaulted
- Escape/attempt escape

APPENDIX H

WEAPONS

Armed subject 1=yes

Type of weapon: (code 1 if present)

Firearm

Edged (knife, glass, scissors)

Blunt force (bat, hockey stick, pipe, hammer)

Pointed (needle, fork, pickaxe)

NATURE OF CEW DEPLOYMENT

Warning/Challenge issued 1=yes 2=no

Number of warnings

Display only/compliance (presence, display, "spark", laser sight) 1=yes 2=no

Number of display only presentations

Display only order (in relation to CEW use, 1st, 2nd, 3rd)

Display only – Effective? 1=yes 2=no 3=ultimately 4=temporarily

Stun Deployment (drive stun, push stun, contact stun) 1=yes 2=no

Number of stun deployments

Stun deployment order (in relation to CEW use, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc.)

Location on subject's body (specify; if multiple deployment list in order)

Stun – Effective? 1=yes 2=no 3=ultimately 4=temporarily

Probe Deployment 1=yes 2=no

Number of probe deployments/cycles

Probe deployment order (in relation to CEW use, 1st, 2nd, 3rd)

Probe deployment distance (in feet, if multiple deployments list in order) 1st

2nd

3rd

Probe deployment duration (in seconds; if multiple deployments list in order) 1st

2nd

3rd

Location on subject's body (specify; if multiple deployment list in order)

Subject in vulnerable position (e.g., roof, tree, open window) 1=yes 2=no

Probe – Effective? 1=yes 2=no 3=ultimately 4=temporarily

If ineffective, why? 1=miss 2=technical problem 3=poor conduction

If probe darts embedded in skin, who removed them?
1=staff 2=health care staff 3=hospital physician 4=u/k 5=N/A 6=subject

If CEW was used in any mode, what model of CEW was used?
1=Taser M26 2=TaserX26 3=Unknown

Was CEW used in stun or probe mode against bare skin?

1=yes

USE OF OTHER FORCE OPTIONS

Verbal intervention: before CEW use 1=yes
 (dialogue) during CEW use 1=yes
 after CEW use 1=yes

“Soft” physical control: before CEW use 1=yes
 (arm & wrist locks, hands during CEW use 1=yes
 on force to pressure points) after CEW use 1=yes

“Hard” physical control: before CEW use 1=yes
 (open & empty hand strikes, during CEW use 1=yes
 punches, kicks to target areas) after CEW use 1=yes

OC/Pepper spray warning: before CEW use 1=yes
 (presence, display) during CEW use 1=yes
 after CEW use 1=yes

OC/Pepper spray use: before CEW use 1=yes
 during CEW use 1=yes
 after CEW use 1=yes

Baton use: before CEW use 1=yes
 (ASP) during CEW use 1=yes
 after CEW use 1=yes

ARWEN gun use: before CEW use 1=yes
 (flexible baton) during CEW use 1=yes
 after CEW use 1=yes

Restraints: before CEW use 1=yes
 (handcuffs, zip straps, during CEW use 1=yes
 hobble, hogtie) after CEW use 1=yes
 Highest level of restraint applied (specify) _____

INJURIES

Injuries to staff 1=yes 2=no 3=unknown
 If yes, note severity 1=minor 2=serious 3=unknown
 If yes, specify nature of injury _____

Injuries to subject (related to CEW use) 1=yes 2=no 3=unknown
 If yes, note severity 1=minor 2=serious 3=unknown
 If yes, specify nature of injury _____

APPENDIX H

Injuries to subject (unrelated to CEW use) 1=yes 2=no 3=unknown []
If yes, note severity 1=minor 2=serious 3=unknown []
If yes, note: 1=injuries present prior to staff arrival
2=injuries self-inflicted during incident
3=injuries sustained during intervention
4=unknown when injuries sustained
(before or during intervention) []

Subject examined by paramedics (PAS) on scene 1=yes 2=no 3=refused []
Subject examined by medical staff on scene 1=yes []
Subject transported to hospital 1=yes []

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS (Reference use-of-force policy to complete this section)
(code 3=unknown 4=Not applicable 5=No policy 6=Borderline/discretion)

Was the CEW deployed in accordance with use-of-force policy? (i.e., subject actions warranted use of CEW) 1=yes 2=no []
If not, explain:

Were policy prescribed steps taken before deployment of the CEW? (eg., was a warning/challenge issued?) 1=yes 2=no []
If not, explain:

Were policy prescribed steps taken while discharging the CEW? (eg., was the CEW aimed at an allowable part of the subject's body?) 1=yes 2=no []
If not, explain:

Was the CEW deployed (stun or probe) in the presence of flammable vapors or liquids? 1=yes 2=no []

Was policy relating to multiple CEW deployments followed? 1=yes 2=no []
If not, explain:

Was policy relating to duration of CEW deployment followed? 1=yes 2=no []
If not, explain:

Were policy prescribed steps to be taken after deployment of the CEW followed? (eg., removal of probes, attendance of PAS, prevention of positional asphyxia) 1=yes 2=no []
If not, explain:

Was photographic evidence collected at the scene? 1=yes 2=no []

Note any other comments or observations below or on the reverse of this page.