



IPCA

Independent Police
Conduct Authority

Mana Whanonga Pirihiimana Motuhake

Complaint that officer used excessive force during arrest in Wellington

Summary of the Incident

1. On 12 January 2020, a Police officer in Wellington used force to take a youth, Mr Z, to the ground following his arrest for theft and driving related matters.
2. That evening, Officer A had set up an alcohol checkpoint on Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt. He was later joined by Officer B.
3. At approximately 8.30pm, Officer A saw a black 4WD car appear to avoid the checkpoint and told Officer B to stop the car. The car pulled into a driveway and Mr Z, the driver, along with 3 passengers got out of the car.
4. Officer B ascertained the car had been unlawfully taken, and Mr Z was a disqualified driver. Officer B arrested Mr Z for these matters. Mr Z did not comply with instructions given by Officer B, resulting in him breaking free once handcuffed.
5. Officer A stepped in and guided Mr Z towards the Police patrol car. Mr Z began to physically pull away and was taken to the ground by Officer A. The level of force used is disputed, as was how he was treated when held on the ground.
6. Mr Y, who was a passenger in the car, filmed part of the incident on his mobile phone. This shows Officer A taking Mr Z to the ground.
7. On 13 January 2020, Mr Z made a complaint to Police stating he was punched in the face and thrown to the ground by Police. He also said the officers did not listen when he told them he was having difficulty breathing due to asthma.

Issue examined by the Authority

Was the use of force during the arrest of Mr Z justified?

The Authority's Findings

8. The Authority found that the use of force to take Mr Z to the ground to effect his arrest was justified and proportionate in the circumstances, but the placement of Officer A's knee on Mr Z's head when he was on the ground was not justified.
9. We also concluded that Officer A should have submitted a Tactical Options Report (TOR)¹.

Analysis of the Issue

10. Mr Z was arrested and handcuffed by Officer B for driving related matters. Officer B warned Mr Z that if he did not behave, she would have to use pepper spray and, at this point, Officer A stepped in to assist.
11. Mr Z was placed up against the Police patrol car by Officer A and from this point Mr Y began filming.
12. The footage shows Mr Z handcuffed with his arms behind him and being held up against the patrol car by Officer A. Officer A has hold of the handcuffs with one hand and is placing his forearm on Mr Z's upper back.
13. Mr Z pushes away from the car with his upper body and Officer A reacts by removing his forearm from his upper back and using this arm to take hold of Mr Z's clothing near his collar. He misses the first time, tries again, this time grabbing hold of the clothing and pulling Mr Z backwards and taking him down to the ground.
14. Mr Z lands on his back and Officer A immediately turns him on to his side. While in this position, Officer A is kneeling with his right knee against Mr Z's back and his left knee placed on the side of Mr Z's head. In our assessment there appears to be a minimal application of force with his left knee. Officer B comes to assist and stands behind Mr Z with her leg on his hip appearing to prop him up.
15. Shortly after this, another Police car is seen to pull up in the background and the footage ends.
16. Officers C and D brought Mr Z to his feet and transported him to Upper Hutt Police Station where he was processed.

¹ An officer is required to complete a TOR when he or she used a certain level of force on a member of the public. The report includes each tactical option and a description of the force used and reasons for using it.

17. Mr Z was charged with unlawful taking of a motor vehicle, driving whilst disqualified, resisting police and wilful damage.
18. Police say the charges of wilful damage and resisting police were discontinued to obtain a quick resolution because of restrictions in COVID-19 level 4 lockdown. However, Mr Z says these were later dropped at Court when the mobile phone footage emerged.

WAS THE USE OF FORCE DURING THE ARREST OF MR Z JUSTIFIED?

Mr Z's version of events

19. Mr Z says he was driving home and pulled into his drive about 20 metres before a checkpoint he saw up ahead. He and his three passengers got out of the car and two officers turned up.
20. He was aware he was disqualified from driving at the time but denied trying to *"dodge the checkpoint"*.
21. Officer B approached and asked who had been driving. Mr Z said he was the driver.
22. Officer B grabbed his hand from behind, so he instinctively pulled away. He turned around to see Officer B, who said, *"Oh, you f***ing idiot. You're resisting now and I'm going to pepper spray you"*. This is the point at which Officer B placed the handcuffs on his left hand.
23. From here things escalated quickly. Officer A rushed over and shoved Mr Z against the Police patrol car. Mr Z said to the officer *"I'll sit in the car"*. It is at this point that Officer A applied the other handcuff.
24. Mr Z was getting upset because he was being restrained and pushed up against the car by Officer A. He says Officer A then punched him in the face twice and threw him down onto the ground, where he landed on his back.
25. He was pushed onto his stomach and Officer A put his knee on Mr Z's neck, causing his cheek to be pushed into the concrete. Mr Z was struggling to breathe so he tried to turn over, to get sufficient air.
26. Mr Z admits he was very angry and anxious at this point. Officer A kept telling him *"don't move, don't move, you're resisting arrest now"*. He was swearing at Officer A as he was not listening to him.
27. He was on the ground for about two minutes. Another Police car arrived and that was when he was brought to his feet and taken to the car by different officers.
28. Mr Z described his injuries as faint bruising around his wrists from handcuffs and to the left cheek and side of his body. He did not think it necessary to see a doctor for the injuries.

Independent Witness Accounts

29. We spoke to one of the passengers (Mr W) and a further witness, Ms X. Mr Y and the other passenger in the car did not wish to speak with us.
30. Mr W describes Mr Z making a U-turn before the checkpoint as he said he needed to get something from his house. They all jumped out of the car when it stopped, and Police pulled into the driveway. Police were asking Mr Z why he had evaded the checkpoint.
31. Ms X is the legal guardian of Mr Z and witnessed the event. She had filed a report to Police in relation to her car being unlawfully taken by Mr Z. She was present when Mr Z turned up in the driveway, followed by Police.
32. Mr W says Mr Z was being asked to do something by Officer B, but Mr Z was saying he could not. He described Mr Z as *“not co-operating”*. Ms X described Mr Z as *“answering back”* and *“swearing”*.
33. Mr W says Officer A came over and told Mr Z he was under arrest. Mr Z went to walk over to his car, so Officer A grabbed his arm and told him *“stay here”*. He kept telling Mr Z to *“stop resisting”* but Mr Z was just standing there. Officer A put Mr Z on the ground by sweeping his legs out from underneath him.
34. Ms X says Officer A grabbed Mr Z by the wrist and shoved him up against the Police car. Officer A was twisting Mr Z’s wrist to the point he was telling Officer A to stop. Officer A told Mr Z to stop resisting. Ms X says that Officer A grabbed the back of Mr Z’s neck and either kned him in the calf or swept him in the ankles to get him to the ground. Mr Z landed on his side.
35. The accounts from Mr W and Ms X as to how Mr Z is taken to the ground are not consistent with what is seen in the footage.

The officers’ version of Mr Z’s arrest

Initial interaction with Mr Z

36. Officer A told the Authority he saw the car make a U-turn suddenly before the checkpoint. He called out to Officer B, who followed in her patrol car. Officer A saw four people get out of the car so went to assist Officer B.
37. Officer B pulled into the driveway seconds after the car arrived there. She told the Authority she thought the car was stolen at the time she confronted the driver. She saw Mr Z try to walk away so told him, *“I need to speak to you”*.
38. Officer B managed to identify Mr Z using the Police intelligence system, at which point she became aware that he was a disqualified driver.
39. When Officer A arrived, he saw Officer B talking to Mr Z. He walked past and Officer B told him the car was stolen and the driver disqualified. Mr Z was nearby, and Officer A believes he would

have heard this. Officer A described Mr Z as “fine”, so he went to speak with the three passengers.

40. Officer B describes Mr Z as “quite aggressive off the bat”. In response to her questions, he was saying “oh f***k off you stupid b***h”.
41. Officer B told Mr Z he was under arrest and stepped toward him. He responded with “f***k off you dumb b***h”.
42. Officer B describes trying to talk to Mr Z and talk him through the process, telling him she was going to put handcuffs on. The response from Mr Z was “f***k you, f***k off”.
43. Officer B was concerned that Mr Z was a lot bigger than her. She says she managed to calm him a bit and was able to put one handcuff on him. He kept pulling away, so she told him, “if you don’t comply, I’m going to have to spray you”.
44. Officer B managed to put the other handcuff on and started to guide him towards the patrol car. She describes this as the point Mr Z got “really angry” and kicked back into the car he had been driving, pushing Officer B forward. Officer B moved out of the way of Mr Z and he walked away towards Officer A.
45. Officer A describes how he heard shouting from behind him. He turned around to see Mr Z walking towards Officer B with his hands behind his back and heard her say, “I’m going to spray you if you don’t behave”.

Taking Mr Z to the ground

46. Officer A believed Mr Z to be a threat and thought he might assault Officer B. He ran over and guided Mr Z away by taking hold of his left upper arm. Mr Z started to pull away from him so was told “don’t be stupid, just calm down, relax”.
47. Officer A assessed the risk Mr Z posed at that stage as between actively resisting and assaultive.²
48. Officer A leaned Mr Z up against the patrol car maintaining hold of the handcuffs to control him. Mr Z started to push back off the car towards Officer A, who describes being pushed backwards.
49. Officer B says she told the passengers to keep back. She turned around to see Officer A holding Mr Z up against the car and saying, “stop pushing, stop pushing”. She thought she needed to help Officer A.
50. At this point, Officer A says he had already given Mr Z plenty of opportunity, but he was not responding to verbal communication. He believed there was a threat of assault and he needed to take Mr Z to the ground to gain better control of him.

² Police use a matrix to continually assess an incident based on information known about the situation and the subject’s behaviour. There are five categories in the matrix – cooperative, passive resistance, active resistance, assaultive, grievous bodily harm (GBH) or death.

51. Officer A says that he did not know where Officer B was as he was focused on Mr Z who was the immediate threat. In later recalling what happened when Mr Z started to push away (as seen on the footage), Officer A said:

“What I have done, I believe, is the bare minimum of force used. I’ve tried to tell him to relax and calm down because my actions are determined by how someone else behaves... He has pulled away from [Officer B], he has pulled away from me, then pushed me backwards. I have had to take him down”.

52. Officer A attempted to grab hold of the top of Mr Z’s shirt but missed, so tried again. He tried to use his bodyweight to pull Mr Z to the ground with control. At some point, he had to let Mr Z drop to the ground as he could no longer hold his weight but maintained hold of his head to ensure it did not hit the ground.
53. Officer A describes Mr Z as landing on his back, so he immediately moved him onto his side, placing him in a position similar to the recovery position.
54. Officer B arrived at the point that Mr Z was already on the ground and Officer A was telling him to calm down. She radioed for assistance, as she believed they needed more officers to assist due to Mr Z’s behaviour.
55. Officer A describes Mr Z as being verbally abusive towards him saying *“old c**t, bald c**t”*. Officer B describes Mr Z as assaultive whilst on the ground, struggling and saying, *“get the f**k off me”*.
56. Officer B says Officer A was telling Mr Z to calm down.

Use of force

57. Section 39 of the Crimes Act 1961 allows Police to use reasonable force to overcome any force used in resisting arrest. The use of force will only be justified if the arrest cannot be made *“by reasonable means in a less violent manner”*.³
58. Under the Police ‘Use of Force’ policy⁴, Police officers are taught a range of ways to safely use force without a weapon, known as ‘empty hand techniques’ (e.g., physical restraints and strikes). Officers can use empty hand techniques against a person to:
- distract;
 - physically control; and/or
 - defend themselves or another.

³ See paragraph 92 - 93 for the relevant section.

⁴ See paragraph 94 - 100 for the relevant policy.

Was the use of force to take Mr Z to the ground justified?

59. The Authority did not find Mr Z truthful and prefers the accounts of the officers for the following reasons:
- Mr Z says he was not trying to avoid the Police checkpoint; however, Mr W's account does not support this.
 - Mr W and Ms X describe Mr Z as not co-operating and answering back to the officers, which is consistent with the officers' accounts.
 - Mr Z's account is not consistent with the footage. Mr Z says he was punched twice in the face by the officer, but the footage shows Officer A attempt to grab the front of Mr Z's clothing, miss, and instantaneously try again. From here, he uses his hold on the front of Mr Z's clothing to help pull Mr Z to the ground.
60. The footage starts when Mr Z is being held up against the patrol car by Officer A. Mr Z can be heard repeatedly saying "*let go of me*" before he pushes back into Officer A.
61. We accept that attempts at communication with Mr Z had failed and that this left Officer A with limited options. Officer A felt there was no other way to de-escalate the situation and deemed it necessary to take Mr Z to the ground to control the situation.
62. Given that Mr Z was resisting, Officer A was justified to use force under Section 39 of the Crimes Act 1961 to complete the arrest process. In determining whether the force used by Officer A was reasonable, we accept Officer A believed he was on his own and the size difference between the two was a relevant factor in his decision-making process.
63. The footage shows Mr Z is taken down to the ground in a reasonably controlled manner given the circumstances and the Authority considers Officer A's actions were reasonable and proportionate to overcome Mr Z's resistance.
64. We accept that this use of force was justified and necessary and that there were no less violent means with which to complete Mr Z's arrest.

Restraining Mr Z whilst on the ground

65. While on the ground, Mr Z says he was struggling to breathe and nothing was done about this by the officers.
66. Both Mr W and Ms X told the Authority that once Mr Z was on the ground, Officer A had his knee on Mr Z's neck. Mr Z was telling the officers he could not breathe but they did not do anything.
67. Mr W says he could hear a wheezing noise from Mr Z and could see his face puffing up and going bright red. Mr Z was saying "*dude, you're hurting me*" and "*dude, I can't breathe*".
68. Ms X says that Mr Z was yelling "*I can't breathe*" and was on the ground for about 30 seconds before two officers lifted him up and put him in a Police car.

69. The footage shows Officer A knelt by Mr Z with his left knee placed on the side of Mr Z's head while his right knee is behind Mr Z's back. Officer A places his left hand on Mr Z's shoulder and his right hand appears to be holding the handcuffs behind Mr Z's back. The left knee remains in place for about 30 – 35 seconds, during which time, Mr Z says, *"I'm having trouble breathing, you better let go or you're going to f***ing kill me"*. Officer A responds with *"I'm not going to kill you"*.
70. Mr Z can be heard saying *"get off of my chest"* to which Officer A replies *"I'm not on your chest"*.
71. Mr Z then says, *"I can't breathe bro"* and Officer A says, *"you can breathe because you're talking, just relax"*. From this point onwards, Officer A removed his left knee and it is no longer making any direct contact with Mr Z.
72. Positional asphyxia can occur when the position of a person's body stops them from breathing enough oxygen.⁵ Police policy on 'use of force' contains a section on positional asphyxia to ensure officers are aware, can identify the dangers and how to prevent it.
73. Officer A says his knee was on Mr Z's head, but it was not applying any pressure that would hurt him. He believed it was the minimal force he could use in the circumstances. He did this to prevent Mr Z from getting back up from the ground, as he describes him as being actively resistant. Although, he says he was unaware his knee was on Mr Z's head until he was asked to get off, at which point he did.
74. There is a discrepancy in the accounts of witnesses as to where Officer A's knee was placed, however, footage shows that Officer A's knee was placed against the side of Mr Z's head.
75. When Officer A was asked by the Authority about his response to Mr Z saying he could not breathe, he said *"if they can't breathe, they can't talk"*. However, within the positional asphyxia policy it contains the following reminder:
- "There is a common misconception that if a person can talk then they are able to breathe, this is **not** the case. **Remember:** Never assume you know better - if an offender is complaining of difficulty breathing or feeling sick, seek medical attention immediately!"*
76. Officer A responded by saying that he still looked for other signs⁶ that Mr Z was breathing, such as his stomach moving and ensuring no red spots on his face. He was also telling Mr Z to relax.
77. Officer B was also present once Mr Z has been taken to the ground. The footage shows her standing behind Mr Z with her knee propped up against his hip. She says she placed no pressure on him at all, it was more to stabilise him.
78. She also said she could clearly see Mr Z's stomach rising and falling, and he was talking.

⁵ See paragraphs 101 – 103 for more information on positional asphyxia policy.

⁶ See paragraph 102 for details of warning signals as set out in 'Positional Asphyxia' policy

79. Officer C and D arrived on scene once Mr Z was already on the ground and they assisted to bring him to his feet.
80. Officer C describes Mr Z as *“in a state of agitation”* and that he was trying to get up from the ground. Neither Officer C nor D recall Mr Z mentioning he could not breathe.

Was the use of force to restrain Mr Z whilst on the ground justified?

81. Although Mr Z had been moved onto his side once on the ground, there were still several risk factors⁷ that could have increased his risk of positional asphyxia. Mr Z is of a large build and the placement of Officer A’s left knee on the side of Mr Z’s head had the potential to increase these risks.
82. Based on the footage, we agree that there was minimal force applied to Mr Z’s head. However, we do not agree that the placement of Officer A’s knee on the side of Mr Z’s head was necessary and this is likely to have caused distress for Mr Z. Officer A did not appear to fully recognise the risk that this posed.
83. Officer A was initially dismissive of Mr Z’s claims he could not breathe and although officers say they checked Mr Z for signs of breathing, there was no attempt at communicating this to Mr Z.
84. The footage shows Mr Z lying on his side, not moving, being restrained by Officer A (as described in paragraph 69). Mr Z makes no attempt at moving until after he told Officer A he could not breathe and when Officer A’s knee has been moved from his head. Mr Z tries to kick out his legs in what looks like an effort to move onto his back rather than any genuine attempt to get up from the ground. Officer A is able to control Mr Z with the use of his hands and his right knee behind Mr Z supporting him to ensure he does not roll onto his back.
85. The only force necessary to hold Mr Z in place, was the use of the officer’s hands and his right knee.
86. The placement of Officer A’s knee on Mr Z’s head was not justified.

Should a Tactical Options Report (TOR) have been submitted?

87. Police policy states that officers must complete a TOR for uses of empty hand techniques excluding touching, guiding, escorting, lifting, and pushing where a person does not fall to the ground.
88. The report includes each tactical option, a description of the force used, and the reasons for using it. An officer must submit the TOR to their supervisor before the end of the shift in which they used force, or with their supervisor’s approval, within three days of the end of shift and prior to any rostered days off or leave during this period.

⁷ See paragraph 103 for details of risk factors as set out in ‘Positional Asphyxia’ policy.


89. Officer A accepted that he did not complete a TOR. He told the Authority that he believed his force equated to guiding Mr Z to the ground, which falls outside of the requirement for a TOR.
90. We do not accept that Mr Z was guided to the ground. Footage shows Mr Z being taken to the ground from behind by Officer A who used the element of surprise to grab onto the front of Mr Z's clothing and pull him backwards until he landed on his back.
91. Although we say that Officer A was justified in the use of force to take Mr Z to the ground, he was still required to submit a TOR.

FINDINGS

Officer A was justified in his use of force to take Mr Z to the ground to effect his arrest.

The placement of Officer A's knee on Mr Z's head was unjustified.

Officer A should have submitted a Tactical Options Report.



Judge Colin Doherty

Chair
Independent Police Conduct Authority

17 June 2021

IPCA: 20-1966

Appendix – Laws and Policies

LAW

Crimes Act 1961

92. Section 39 of the Crimes Act 1961 provides for law enforcement officers to use reasonable force in the execution of their duties such as arrest and enforcement of warrants. Specifically, it provides that officers may use *“such force as may be necessary”* to overcome any force used in resisting the law enforcement process unless the process *“can be carried out by reasonable means in a less violent manner.”*
93. Under section 62 of the Act, anyone who is authorised by law to use force is criminally responsible for any excessive use of force.

POLICY

Police ‘Use of Force’ policy

94. The Police ‘Use of Force’ policy provides guidance to Police officers about the use of force. The policy sets out the options available to Police officers when responding to a situation. Police officers have a range of tactical options available to them to help de-escalate a situation, restrain a person, effect and arrest, or otherwise carry out lawful duties. These include communication, mechanical restraints, empty hand techniques (such as physical restraint holds and arm strikes), OC spray, batons, Police dogs, Tasers, and firearms.
95. Police policy provides a framework for officers to assess, reassess, manage, and respond to use of force situations, ensuring the response (use of force) is necessary and proportionate given the level of threat and risk to themselves and the public. Police refer to this as the TENR (Threat, Exposure, Necessity and Response) assessment.
96. Police officers must also constantly assess an incident based on information they know about the situation and the behaviour of the people involved; and the potential for de-escalation or escalation. The officer must choose the most reasonable option (use of force) given all the circumstances known to them at the time. This may include information on the incident type, location, and time; the officer and subject’s abilities; emotional statement, the influence of drugs and alcohol, and the presence or proximity of weapons; similar previous experiences; and environmental conditions. Police refer to this assessment as an officers Perceived Cumulative Assessment (PCA).
97. A key part of an officers decision to decide when, how, and at what level to use force depends on the actions of, or potential actions of, the people involved, and depends on whether they are: cooperative; passively resisting (refuses verbally or with physical activity); actively resisting (pulls, pushes or runs away); assaultive (showing an intention to cause harm, expressed verbally or through body language or physical action); or presenting a threat of grievous bodily harm or

death to any person. Ultimately, the legal authority to use force is derived from the law and not from Police policy.

98. The policy states that any force must be considered, timely, proportionate, and appropriate given the circumstances known at the time. Victim, public and Police safety always take precedence, and every effort must be taken to minimise harm and maximise safety.

Tactical communications

99. The Police 'Use of force' policy states that tactical communication is the preferred option for resolving incidents where Police action is necessary in response to uncooperative subjects. Tactical communication may enable incidents to be de-escalated and resolved without the use of force. Where possible, tactical communication should be used throughout an incident, alone or with other tactical options.
100. Police provide a five-step communications process for officers which includes passing on information, making requests, commanding responses, and ordering lawful directives.

Positional asphyxia policy

101. Policy states if you restrain a person in a position that compromises the airway or expansion of the lungs (i.e., in the prone position) you may seriously impair a person's ability to breathe and this can lead to asphyxiation. This includes pressure to the neck region, restriction of the chest wall and impairments of the diaphragm.
102. Warning signs related to positional asphyxia:
- An individual struggling to breathe
 - Complaining of being unable to breathe
 - Evidence or report of an individual feeling sick or vomiting
 - Swelling, redness or bloodspots to the face or neck
 - Marked expansion of the veins in the neck
 - Individual becoming limp or unresponsive
 - Changes in behaviour (both escalative and de-escalative)
 - Loss of, or reduced levels of, consciousness
 - Respiratory or cardiac arrest
103. A person may be predisposed to positional asphyxia and sudden death while under restraint as the result of interplay of several of these risk factors:
- Physical exhaustion (or any factors that increase the body's oxygen requirements, for example anxiety in a highly stressed or struggling individual).
 - Excited delirium.
 - Pressure on stomach and chest areas restricting breathing.
 - Restriction of the airway (including covering the face).
 - Alcohol or drug effects reducing the subject's ability to breathe sufficiently even if they are not obviously drugged (because sedative drugs and alcohol act to depress breathing so reducing oxygen taken into the body).

- Position of the body interfering with breathing. This position may be the result of a mechanical (handcuffs) or physical restraint (being held), especially in a prone, face-down position.
- Concussive head injury or physical disability. One or more of these contributory factors may also help explain the subject's inability to change the position of their body, which can have fatal consequences.
- Obesity (a large stomach will interfere with breathing when the person is lying in a face-down position).
- An object pushing on the stomach area will reduce the body's ability to breathe.
- Wild, threatening or bizarre behaviour with possible mental disturbances.
- Violent behaviour and/or resistance.
- Being male.
- Physically ill persons (for example, hay fever, sinusitis, asthma).
- Mentally impaired persons

About the Authority

WHO IS THE INDEPENDENT POLICE CONDUCT AUTHORITY?

The Independent Police Conduct Authority is an independent body set up by Parliament to provide civilian oversight of Police conduct.

We are not part of the Police – the law requires us to be fully independent. The Authority is overseen by a Board, which is chaired by Judge Colin Doherty.

Being independent means that the Authority makes its own findings based on the facts and the law. We do not answer to the Police, the Government or anyone else over those findings. In this way, our independence is similar to that of a Court.

The Authority employs highly experienced staff who have worked in a range of law enforcement and related roles in New Zealand and overseas.

WHAT ARE THE AUTHORITY'S FUNCTIONS?

Under the Independent Police Conduct Authority Act 1988, the Authority receives and may choose to investigate:

- complaints alleging misconduct or neglect of duty by Police;
- complaints about Police practices, policies and procedures affecting the complainant in a personal capacity;
- notifications of incidents in which Police actions have caused or appear to have caused death or serious bodily harm; and
- referrals by Police under a Memorandum of Understanding between the Authority and Police, which covers instances of potential reputational risk to Police (including serious offending by a Police officer or Police actions that may have an element of corruption).

The Authority's investigation may include visiting the scene of the incident, interviewing the officers involved and any witnesses, and reviewing evidence from the Police's investigation.

On completion of an investigation, the Authority must form an opinion about the Police conduct, policy, practice, or procedure which was the subject of the complaint. The Authority may make recommendations to the Commissioner.

THIS REPORT

This report is the result of the work of a multi-disciplinary team of investigators, report writers and managers. At significant points in the investigation itself and in the preparation of the report, the Authority conducted audits of both process and content.



PO Box 25221, Wellington 6140
Freephone 0800 503 728
www.ipca.govt.nz
