



## Serious Incident Response Team

Civilian Director's Report  
SIRT-NL File No. 2025-0025

Stephen Ring  
Director  
February 4, 2026



---

## Introduction

On August 15, 2025, the Serious Incident Response Team of Newfoundland and Labrador (SIRT-NL) was notified by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) regarding an Officer Involved Shooting (OIS). In response, I immediately directed a SIRT-NL investigation into the incident.

## Mandate

SIRT-NL is a civilian led oversight agency that conducts its own investigations into serious incidents. Serious incidents within this context are those involving serious injury, death, sexual offence, domestic violence, or any matter of significant public interest arising from the actions of a police officer in Newfoundland and Labrador. Because this matter involved an allegation of serious injury being caused by police officers, it fell within SIRT-NL mandate. I directed an investigation into this matter on August 15, 2025.

The strategy for the investigation was a traditional one focusing on interviewing witnesses and obtaining any corroborating and/or refuting evidence that was available.

## Terminology

I have made the following substitutions to protect the privacy of those involved:

- “Affected person” or “AP” for the individual who alleged he was assaulted;
- “Subject Officer #” or “SO#” for the police officers who are the subject of this investigation;
- “Witness officer #” or “WO#” for any police officer who provided relevant information; and
- “Witness #” or “W#” for any civilian who provided relevant information.

## Investigation

The SIRT-NL investigation began on August 15, 2025, and concluded on January 8, 2026.

During the investigation, SIRT-NL took the following steps:

- Collected and reviewed:
  - Related RCMP investigative files.
  - Related Royal Newfoundland Constabulary (RNC) investigative files.
  - RCMP body worn camera video (BWC) obtained from the two subject officers and four witness officers.
  - Photos of the affected person’s injuries obtained by the RNC.

- Affected person's medical records.
  - Crime scene photos obtained from the RCMP and RNC.
  - Crime scene examination reports obtained from the RCMP and RNC.
  - RNC and RCMP Operations Communication Center (OCC) recordings.
  - 911 recordings.
  - Witness officers' police notes and reports.
  - Text message communications between the affected person and W1 and W2.
  - Subject officers' police notes and reports.
- Obtained audio recorded statement from AP.
  - Obtained audio recorded statements from:
    - WO1, WO2, WO3, WO3, WO4, WO5, WO6, and WO7.
  - Obtained audio recorded statements from:
    - W1, W2, W3, W4, W5, W6, W7, W8, and W9.

## Overview

There was a series of events on August 14 and 15, 2025, involving AP who was experiencing acute mental health distress and personal crises. Police responded to multiple calls, including concerns about impaired driving, gas theft, and suicidal ideation. After a car accident near Arnold's Cove, RCMP officers attempted to detain AP under the **Mental Health Care and Treatment Act**. During this interaction, AP brandished a gun<sup>1</sup> at the officers, prompting them to discharge their firearms, resulting in serious injuries to AP.

## The Affected Person (AP)

On August 19, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from AP. The following is a summary of AP's interview:

AP described a period of intense personal turmoil leading to the incident, including a tumultuous relationship, homelessness, and ongoing mental health struggles. He admitted to experiencing suicidal thoughts and seeking help from a mental health facility. On the night of the shooting, after his car slid into a ditch, AP interacted with RCMP officers and initially tried to convince them he had someone coming to help, which he later admitted was untrue. Feeling hopeless, he walked away from the officers, then turned and pointed a black plastic BB gun at them, intending to provoke a lethal response as a form of suicide by cop. AP stated that the BB gun was unloaded and not meant to harm the officers. AP expressed remorse for his actions, acknowledged that the officers acted appropriately, and asked SIRT-NL investigators to pass along his apologies.

---

<sup>1</sup> The gun was later identified as a realistic-looking BB gun.

---

## **Witness Officers**

There were seven witness officers interviewed by SIRT-NL investigators.

### **Witness Officer 1 (WO1)**

On August 15, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO1. The following is a summary of WO1's interview:

WO1 responded to a "be on the lookout (BOLO)" for AP's vehicle after reports of a gas theft and suicide risk. WO1 found AP parked legally on the highway shoulder, appearing groggy and emotional but cooperative. AP denied suicidal intent, claiming his ex-girlfriend was trying to get him in trouble. Emergency medical services (EMS) were called, and AP was voluntarily taken to hospital. WO1 described AP's physical appearance and noted he was surprised to later learn of AP's involvement in a serious incident.

### **Witness Officer 2 (WO2)**

On August 15, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO2. The following is a summary of WO2's interview:

WO2 received a call about a male released from hospital and later responded to a car accident involving a possible impaired driver. After a roadside test, signs of drug impairment were noted, but there were no grounds for arrest. WO2 was at the RCMP detachment when he heard a shots fired call and responded to the scene, where he observed blood and a firearm. WO2 followed EMS to the hospital, noting AP's injuries and documenting the chain of custody for his clothing.

### **Witness Officer 3 (WO3)**

On August 16, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO3. Following is a summary of WO3's interview:

WO3 responded to a wellness concern involving possible self-harm and later to the OIS. WO3 helped secure the scene and direct traffic, using an Android Team Awareness Kit (ATAK) to confirm the location.

### **Witness Officer 4 (WO4)**

On August 15, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO4. The following is a summary of WO4's interview:

WO4 was the supervisor on duty at the time of the OIS. He was informed of the incident by WO6 and coordinated resources, then attended the hospital to relieve WO2. WO4 spoke with WO2, who described the BB gun involved as appearing very real. WO4 observed AP unconscious and

---

bleeding from the chest and later visited the scene, which was taped off with a vehicle in the ditch and blood visible on the road.

#### **Witness Officer 5 (WO5)**

On August 15, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO5. The following is a summary of WO5's interview:

WO5 coordinated scene management and officer support after being notified of the OIS. He checked on SOs, who appeared in shock, and ensured the scene was preserved for forensic investigation. WO5 managed evidence, restricted access to body-worn camera footage, and spoke with AP's parents, providing limited information and collecting contact details for future updates.

#### **Witness Officer 6 (WO6)**

On September 24, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO6. Following is a summary of WO6's interview:

WO6 was on leave when notified of the OIS. WO6 contacted several individuals, including SO1, who appeared to be upset. WO6 confirmed that both involved officers were physically okay. She arranged for resources and support, including a gathering for officers to decompress, and instructed officers to not discuss the incident.

#### **Witness Officer 7 (WO7)**

On August 15, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO7. The following is a summary of WO7's interview:

WO7 was called out in the early morning hours to respond to the scene of the OIS. When he arrived with WO3, the area was already secured with police tape and officers present. WO7 assisted in tarping exhibits and observed bullet casings and a car in the ditch. He did not witness the OIS with his role primarily scene security and evidence preservation.

### **Civilian Witnesses**

There were nine civilian witnesses interviewed by SIRT-NL investigators.

#### **Witness 1 (W1) and Witness 2 (W2)**

On August 16, 2025, the SIRT-NL Investigator interviewed W1 and W2 who are AP's parents. The following is a summary of the interview:

W1 and W2 provided a detailed account of AP's deteriorating circumstances and mental health in the days leading up to the OIS. They described AP's relationship with W3 as tumultuous, noting that their two children had been removed from their custody and that AP and W3 were effectively homeless. Beginning Tuesday, August 12, 2025, they observed AP "spiraling," with increased drug use and erratic behavior. W1 remained in close contact through calls and texts on August 14–

---

15, expressing repeated concern for AP's safety. The messages reflected affection, fatigue, and instability which reinforced the parents' fear that AP might harm himself.

W2 recounted a conversation with W3 on August 14 in which she said that AP had a glock-type gun which was the first time either parent became aware of a firearm. Based on their interactions and AP's statements including telling his mother he had tried to kill himself but it "didn't work," both parents believed the incident was an attempted "suicide by cop." They emphasized their son's vulnerability, the rapid escalation in his distress, and their urgent, ongoing efforts to locate and support him.

### **Witness 3 (W3)**

On August 18, 2025, the SIRT-NL Investigator interviewed W3. The following is a summary of W3's interview:

W3 identified herself as AP's fiancé and the mother of his two children. She described their relationship as unstable and "on and off," noting that both she and AP had been struggling with significant personal and mental health issues in recent weeks. The couple were evicted from their home in July, and their children had been removed from their custody.

On August 14, 2025, W3 and AP argued at a gas station, after which AP drove off. W3 tried to contact him multiple times but was unsuccessful. She became increasingly concerned due to alarming text messages from AP including statements such as "tell the kids I love them" and "I will always be with them." W3 called the RNC requesting a wellness check around 2:30 pm that day.

W3 was hesitant to discuss AP's possession of a firearm but eventually confirmed that he had a gun, possibly a .22 caliber Glock-like handgun. W3 last saw the gun around the time of their eviction in July 2025.

W3 also described AP's drug use and mental state. W3 observed that AP appeared "out of it," exhausted, and possibly under the influence on August 14, 2025.

### **Witness 4 (W4)**

On August 16, 2025, the SIRT-NL Investigator interviewed W4. The following is a summary of W4's interview:

W4 observed AP driving erratically and later found his vehicle in a ditch near Arnold's Cove. EMS responded, and W4 noted AP was emotional but cooperative, with no weapons observed.

### **Witness 5 (W5)**

On August 15, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator interviewed W5. The following is a summary of W5's interview:

W5 arrived at the scene with firefighters and established a perimeter. W5 observed AP as being cooperative and not injured. W5 expressed concern that the police might release the driver, whom he had never met before.

#### **Witness 6 (W6)**

On August 20, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator interviewed W6. The following is a summary of W6's interview:

W6 assessed AP after the crash and noted his mental health concerns. W6 returned after the shooting, observed AP injuries, and assisted with his medical care. W6 recalled AP apologizing for what she would have to deal with later that night and identified him as agitated and emotional.

#### **Witness 7 (W7)**

On August 20, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator interviewed W7. The following is a summary of W7's interview:

W7 assisted with the hospital transfer after the OIS. W7 noted AP's gunshot wounds, combative behavior, and significant pain. W7 described the medical interventions performed and confirmed that a BB gun was involved.

#### **Witness 8 (W8)**

On August 20, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator interviewed W8. The following is a summary of W8's interview:

W8 helped with wound care and AP's hospital transfer. She noted AP's pain and struggle during transport and described the medical procedures performed enroute to the hospital.

#### **Witness 9 (W9)**

On August 20, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator interviewed W9. The following is a summary of W9's interview:

W9 assessed AP after the crash, noting exhaustion and mental health issues. W9 assisted with medical care after the shooting and described AP as emotional, distressed, and asked about religious beliefs and prayer.

### **Subject Officers**

Both subject officers declined to participate in an interview but agreed to the release of their notes and reports associated with the incident.

---

### Subject Officer 1 (SO1)

On May 30, 2025, SO1 consented to the release of all notes and reports that he authored in relation to the investigation. The following is a summary of his notes and reports:

SO1 began his shift on August 14, 2025, at 5:30 pm. In the early hours of August 15 (2:07), he administered a roadside screening test to AP with a result of zero. In a later entry, SO1 records responding to a single-vehicle collision in Arnold's Cove involving a possible impaired driver, noting no grounds to arrest. After AP stated he was "at the end of my rope," SO1 formed grounds to detain him under the **Mental Health Care and Treatment Act**. When advised of the detention, AP walked away, then turned and pointed a black handgun at the officers. SO1 and his partner ordered AP to drop the weapon; believing AP intended to cause grievous bodily harm, SO1 fired his service pistol. AP was handcuffed and arrested for possessing a weapon for a dangerous purpose. SO1 moved the gun away and later cleared it, believing it to be a BB gun, while SO2 applied a tourniquet before EMS transported AP to hospital. SO1 also noted AP's utterance that he wanted police to kill him and to "shoot him in the head." All interactions were captured on body-worn camera.

### Subject Officer 2 (SO2)

On May 27, 2025, SO2 consented to the release of all notes and reports that he authored in relation to the investigation. The following is a summary of his notes and reports:

SO2 began his shift on August 14, 2025, at 5:30 pm. In the early hours of August 15 (about 2:20), he and SO1 responded to a single-vehicle crash at a T-intersection in Arnold's Cove. SO2 noted that AP had rapid speech, was unstable on his feet, and said he was not injured, but was reluctant to go with EMS. AP was nodding off in the ambulance, said he had pulled too far forward, and reported a prescription for medication; SO2 recorded that AP had been awake for 16 hours and appeared to be on something. A tow truck was called for the vehicle. While waiting, AP made statements that led SO2 to believe he wanted to kill himself or cause harm, so he attempted to apprehend AP under the **Mental Health Care and Treatment Act**. AP then produced a gun and pointed it at the officers; fearing for his safety and life, SO2 discharged his service pistol, then rendered aid, including placing a tourniquet on AP's left thigh. EMS transported AP to hospital. SO2's notes indicate that all interactions were recorded on body-worn camera.

### Medical Records

By AP's consent, SIRT-NL obtained a copy of his medical records on September 17, 2025. The records contain the following information:

The medical records received from NL Health Services document that AP sustained life-threatening gunshot wounds to the right chest and left thigh, resulting in major vascular injury

to the leg and significant pulmonary injury to the chest. AP underwent extensive trauma care, surgical repair of the identified injuries, and admission to critical care for ongoing stabilization and monitoring. The records reflect coordinated emergency management from initial resuscitation through definitive surgical intervention, followed by intensive care support consistent with the severity of penetrating chest and extremity trauma.

## **RCMP Audio Recordings**

RCMP audio recordings trace the incident from initial notifications through scene management and hospital transfer. On August 14, 2025, OCC captured eight calls linked to a RNC wellness concern: RNC provided details of an earlier impaired-driver check and a later suicide-threat call involving AP, along with cell-phone GPS coordinates placing him near Thorburn Lake/Port Blandford. RCMP issued BOLOs for the vehicle tied to a gas-and-dash and a possible suicidal person.

In the early hours of August 15, at 01:41:26, a member of the public (W4) reported a vehicle in a ditch at Arnold's Cove. A rapid sequence of thirty-seven radio transmissions followed: at 03:30:30 officers broadcast "shots fired"; by 03:32:19 an ambulance was enroute and at 03:32:38 a risk manager was requested. Subsequent calls confirmed a single subject of concern (03:34:13), urgent medical need for a lower-leg injury (03:33:29), and that a BB gun had been pushed aside with the risk manager notified (03:37:33).

As resources converged, dispatch logged EMS arrival (03:45:21), the request for an officer to accompany the patient with an arrest for a weapon for a dangerous purpose (03:47:52), and ambulance departure (03:49:48). Officers confirmed the suspect vehicle cleared (03:51:26), that neither officer was injured (03:51:40), and that SO1 had spoken with WO6 (03:57:46). Through 04:27–04:44, units were assigned to traffic control at the scene and hospital coverage; by 04:55:26, WO5 was asked to call Criminal Operations. Final transmissions captured scene arrival times, instructions not to move anything (05:05:14), and a request that SO1 clear the emergency on his portable (05:06:26), reflecting the transition from emergency response to secured scene and coordinated investigation.

## **Body Worn Cameras**

The body-worn camera footage presents a sequence of RCMP interaction with AP over the course of two days. On August 14 at 4:09 pm, WO1's camera shows him approaching a vehicle parked on the gravel shoulder of the TCH and waking a drowsy, emotionally distressed AP, who repeatedly nods off while speaking. At 4:16 pm, WO3 arrives and EMS is called; the footage

shows cooperative engagement and a non-confrontational transfer to the ambulance. By 5:22 pm, the cameras capture arrival at GB Cross Memorial Hospital, where AP is left for assessment.

The August 15 footage starts at 2:05 a.m. with SO1 and SO2 at a single-vehicle ditch crash in Arnold's Cove. SO1's camera records a roadside screening result of "0," and at 2:17 a.m. AP exits his vehicle to be assessed—without a hoodie or backpack. Between 2:43 and 3:25 a.m., SOs' recordings show calm but concerning conversations: AP explains the low-speed ditch entry, mentions being prescribed medication, reacts to the impending tow of his vehicle ("end of my rope"), signs a medical refusal, and, in candid exchanges at the patrol car, discloses past attempts and a current "plan," for committing suicide while saying hospital visits haven't helped.

At 3:29 a.m., after a brief private exchange between the officers inside the cruiser, both exit; SO2 advises AP that he is being detained under the **Mental Health Care and Treatment Act**, while SO1 moves around the rear of the car toward the driver's side. At 3:30:06 a.m., the cameras show AP walking away, then turning back while rummaging in the front of his pants and pointing a handgun toward the officers. Six shots are heard. The footage shows SO2 backpedaling over the embankment while firing, and SO1 moving to cover at the rear and passenger side of the cruiser. AP falls; the officers approach, handcuff him, and SO1 kicks the firearm aside. At 3:31:52 a.m., audio captures AP stating he did not fire because it was a BB gun and that he had hoped they would hit him in the head. The cameras then show a tourniquet applied to AP's leg, SO1 dismantling the BB pistol at 3:35 a.m., and AP's arrest for possessing a weapon for a dangerous purpose at 3:37 a.m.

EMS arrives at 3:45 a.m., and WO2 reaches the scene at 3:50 a.m.; by 3:56 a.m., the ambulance departs with AP, with WO2 following. WO2's footage at 4:08 a.m. captures EMS stopping at Goobies where a second gunshot wound to the chest was identified; at 4:35 a.m., cameras record arrival at hospital, followed by WO4's arrival at 4:46 a.m. Later recordings show scene-security handovers and logistics.

Overall, the BWC narrative depicts cooperative RCMP interactions with AP on August 14, an escalating risk conversation on August 15, the sudden presentation of a realistic-looking BB pistol prompting officers' defensive fire, immediate first aid, and coordinated medical transport and scene preservation.

## Forensic Examinations

Forensic examination unfolded in two phases. First, on August 15, a RCMP officer secured the scene and took photographs of the marked police vehicle and surrounding area, a step requested by SIRT-NL to protect exhibits from incoming weather. The officer seized the subject officers' uniforms and use-of-force equipment, including their pistols with magazines and chambered rounds, plus duty belts, vests, boots, spare magazines, and body-worn cameras. The officer also received AP's clothing (bagged at the hospital) from WO2. All items were packaged, labeled, and

---

transferred to forensic storage; digital images were burned to DVD and provided to SIRT-NL. Between August 15 and 21, RNC Forensic Identification (Ident) conducted a comprehensive scene and exhibits examination.

## Issue and Conclusion

The issue for my consideration is whether there are grounds to believe that SOs committed the offence of attempted murder contrary to section 239 (1) and/or assault with a weapon contrary to Section 267(a) of the **Criminal Code** when they discharged their firearms at AP.

I have reviewed the investigative file and have not formed reasonable grounds to believe SO1 or SO2 committed a criminal offence when they discharged their firearms at AP. I base my opinion on the following.

On August 14, 2025, the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary (RNC) responded early in the morning to a report of an impaired driver at an Irving gas station in St. John's. The vehicle, registered to AP, had already left the scene, but officers later located AP and confirmed he was not impaired. AP and W3 had spent the night in his car and became embroiled in a verbal argument which resulted in AP telling her to get out of the vehicle. Later that morning, the RCMP received a call about a gas theft in Whitbourne involving AP's vehicle.

By mid-afternoon, the RNC received a request to conduct a wellness check because AP was threatening self-harm. W3 was speaking to the affected person on the phone when AP told her to say goodbye to their kids, and then she heard a loud bang. A ping was completed on the affected person's cell phone which placed him in RCMP jurisdiction. The RNC called the RCMP to report their call for service and provided the location of the cell phone ping. The RCMP located AP asleep in his vehicle which was pulled off the Trans-Canada highway near Port Blanford. AP was transported to hospital for a mental health assessment and released later that day.

In the early morning of August 15, 2025, SO1 and SO2 responded to a call about a vehicle in a ditch in Arnold's Cove. Upon arrival, they found AP alone in the driver's seat. SOs administered a roadside screening device which indicated no signs of impairment. As they waited for a tow truck, AP engaged in conversation with the officers, expressing deep emotional distress and making statements such as being "at the end of my rope." These remarks led SOs to determine that AP should be detained under the **Mental Health Care and Treatment Act** (MCHTA) for his own safety.

When SOs informed AP of their intent to detain him, he began to walk away from them. Suddenly, AP turned back toward the officers, brandished what appeared to be a black handgun from his clothing, and pointed it directly at them. The officers immediately responded to the perceived threat by drawing their service pistols, firing, and striking AP in the leg and chest. AP fell to the ground, and the officers quickly approached, handcuffed him, and assessed his injuries. SO1

---

kicked the firearm aside to secure the scene, and both officers rendered first aid, including applying a tourniquet to AP's leg to control bleeding.

Throughout the incident, the SOs' and AP's behavior were captured on body worn cameras. After the shooting, SOs called for emergency medical services, who arrived and transported AP to the hospital for treatment of life-threatening injuries.

In his statement to SIRT-NL, AP revealed that his weapon was a BB gun, unloaded, and that his intent was not to harm the officers but to provoke "suicide by cop." AP expressed remorse and acknowledged that the officers acted appropriately and followed protocol. AP requested SIRT-NL investigators to pass along his "apologies to the officers involved." Body worn camera footage captures AP telling SOs immediately after the incident "I didn't fire any shots because it was a BB gun. I was hoping that you were going to hit me in the head." In her statement, AP's mother told investigators that she believed the incident was an attempt by her son to commit suicide by police which was based upon their phone conversations and his behavior leading up to the event.

Witness officers and civilian witnesses contributed statements that helped clarify the sequence of events and the context surrounding the incident involving AP. WOs who arrived at the scene post shooting described finding AP injured and receiving medical attention, with the area secured and evidence such as spent casings and blood stains documented. WOs noted that AP appeared emotionally distressed but was cooperative during earlier interactions, and that he had discussed personal struggles and mental health issues with police and paramedics. Civilian witnesses, including firefighters and paramedics, observed AP's emotional state, reporting that he was tired, unstable, and expressed concerning statements about his wellbeing. Paramedics described AP as agitated, in significant pain, and at times combative during treatment. Family members and close contacts recounted his recent struggles with addiction, homelessness, and the loss of custody of his children, which contributed to his deteriorating mental health. Collectively, these witness accounts painted a picture of a vulnerable individual in crisis, whose interactions with police and emergency responders were marked by emotional volatility, distress, and ultimately, a tragic escalation.

The investigation included a review of body worn camera footage, police notes, witness officer and civilian statements, forensic examinations, medical records, and communications. All accounts and physical evidence gathered were consistent with SOs police notes and reports. There were no significant questions as to what occurred or the sequence of events in this investigation.

Under section 25(1) of the **Criminal Code**, peace officers are justified in using force if they act on reasonable grounds and the force is necessary and proportionate. Courts recognize that officers often make split-second decisions in volatile situations, as such:

- they are not held to a standard of perfection.
- they are not required to use the absolute least amount of force possible.
- the test is whether the force was reasonable in the circumstances, not whether it could have been done better in hindsight.

- reasonableness must be judged from the perspective of the officer at the time, considering the urgency and danger.

Under RCMP policy and the Incident Management/Intervention Model, firearm discharge is considered a deadly force option and must be:

- Necessary and proportionate to the threat.
- Used only when all lesser options have been exhausted or are not viable.
- Accompanied by a verbal warning where feasible (unless it would increase risk).
- Officers must render medical aid immediately after a discharge incident.

From my review of the evidence collected during this investigation, I am of the opinion that SOs were acting under lawful authority in attempting to detain AP under the MHCTA. I am also of the opinion that the use of force was necessary, proportionate, and lesser options were not viable given that AP suddenly turned towards officers brandishing what appeared to be a black handgun and pointing it directly at them. I am also of the opinion that SOs' actions were consistent with their training and operational policy.

Further, the SOs reasonably believed they were in danger of serious bodily harm or death, as there was a real risk of being shot. If the SOs attempted to negotiate with AP to lower his gun, they objectively risked being killed. I am of the opinion that SOs acted in self-defence and did nothing wrong.

Given the totality of the circumstances outlined above, I have not formulated reasonable and probable grounds to believe that subject officers committed a criminal offence.

SIRT-NL will now conclude this file.

**Final Report prepared by:**

Stephen Ring, Director  
Serious Incident Response Team - Newfoundland and Labrador  
February 4, 2026  
File No. 2025-0025