



Serious Incident Response Team

Civilian Director's Report
SIRT-NL File No. 2026-0001

Stephen Ring
Director
March 19, 2026

Introduction

On December 30, 2025, the Serious Incident Response Team of Newfoundland and Labrador (SIRT NL) was notified by the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary (RNC) that a person alleged she had been physically assaulted by her former spouse, an RNC officer, during an incident at his residence on December 28¹, 2025.

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 intimate partner violence by an RNC officer, the complaint falls within SIRT-NL mandate. Accordingly, I directed a SIRT-NL investigation into this matter.

The strategy for the investigation was a traditional one; focusing on interviewing the affected person, civilian witnesses, the subject officer 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 she was subjected to intimate partner violence.
- “Subject Officer” or “SO” for the police officer who is the subject of this investigation.
- “Witness Officer #” or “WO#” for any police officer who provided relevant information.
- “Witness #” or “W#” for any civilian who provided relevant information.

Investigation

The SIRT-NL investigation began on January 8, 2026, and concluded on February 25, 2026.

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

- Collected and reviewed:
 - Copy of RNC investigative file
 - Video, text messages, and notes from the subject officer
 - Notes obtained from a civilian witness

¹ While the initial report to SIRT-NL indicated that the incident occurred on December 28, 2025, the investigation determined that the incident occurred on December 27, 2025.

- Text messages from two witness officers
- Police notes from two witness officers
- Obtained audio recorded statements from:
 - SO, W1, WO1, WO2, WO3, WO4, WO5, and WO6
- Obtained a verbal statement from the affected person

Overview

The Serious Incident Response Team of Newfoundland and Labrador initiated an independent investigation on January 8, 2026, following a referral from the RNC. The RNC reported that during an interaction with AP, she disclosed that she had been physically assaulted by her former spouse during an incident at his residence on December 28, 2025.

The investigation spanned from January 9 to February 25, 2026. The offence under review was assault pursuant to section 266 of the **Criminal Code**.

The Affected Person (AP)

On January 2, 2026, the SIRT-NL investigator spoke to AP. Although AP declined to provide a recorded statement, she disclosed the following information:

AP advised that she did not want the subject officer charged and later requested that the investigation not proceed. She reported that the parties were separated and that on December 28, 2025, she attended the subject officer's residence after suspecting he was with another woman. She stated that although she was invited into the porch area, she proceeded further into the home toward a bedroom, at which point the subject officer grabbed her and forcibly removed her from the residence, causing scratches on her arms and legs. She indicated that she did not seek medical attention or photograph her injuries and later declined to provide video footage she later said existed or photographs of the injuries.

Civilian Witness

Witness 1 (W1)

On February 13, 2026, the SIRT-NL investigator interviewed W1. Following is a summary of the interview:

W1 advised that she was present at the subject officer's residence during his interactions with the affected person on the evening of December 26, 2025, and the morning of December 27, 2025. She stated that on December 26, the subject officer picked her up and brought her to his residence before leaving to assist with a child related issue. While he was away, W1 remained upstairs and

did not answer the door, as requested by SO. After the SO returned, W1 reported hearing who she believed was the affected person attend the residence, yelling loudly, demanding to know who was inside, questioning W1's age, and expressing agitation about her presence around the children. W1 did not observe the affected person visually but stated she could hear her attempting to move further into the home and believed the subject officer positioned himself to block her from accessing the upstairs area. W1 described the affected person's tone as aggressive and persistent, and stated that it took considerable effort by the subject officer to have her leave the residence. She reported feeling frightened during this encounter and believed the affected person intended to confront or potentially harm her if she gained access.

W1 stated that she stayed overnight at the residence and that on the morning of December 27, the affected person again attended the home. She reported that the affected person entered the residence while the subject officer went to retrieve items for the children and ran down the hallway toward the bedroom where W1 was located. W1 did not see direct physical contact but observed shadows and movement consistent with the subject officer blocking the affected person in the hallway while telling her that she needed to leave. She recalled hearing the affected person yelling statements such as "I can see you" and asserting that she knew W1 was present. W1 stated that the interaction lasted approximately ten minutes and ended with the affected person leaving the residence. She advised that she did not observe the subject officer strike the affected person, did not see any injuries to either party, and had no further contact with the affected person following these incidents.

Witness Officers

Witness Officer 1 (WO1)

On January 13, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO1. Following is a summary of WO1's interview:

During an interaction with AP, AP alleged that on December 28, 2025, the subject officer allowed her into his porch, became upset when she entered the house, grabbed her around the neck, placed her over his shoulder, and removed her from the residence. AP showed WO1 photographs on her phone depicting marks on her neck, hairline, and hand. No copies of the photographs were taken.

Witness Officer 2 (WO2)

On February 9, 2026, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO2. Following is a summary of WO2's interview:

The subject officer told WO2 about an incident on December 27, 2025, in which the affected person attended his residence, entered the home, attempted to reach a bedroom where another woman was present, resisted being removed, and struck him in the face. WO2 stated she had no

direct contact with the affected person and that her knowledge of the alleged assault was second-hand.

Witness Officer 3 (WO3)

On February 13, 2026, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO3. Following is a summary of WO3's interview:

WO3 confirmed receiving text messages from the subject officer on December 27, 2025, requesting a patrol drive-by of his residence due to the affected person being on the steps. The request was cancelled shortly thereafter when the subject officer advised that the affected person had left. WO3 also confirmed receiving a subsequent message from the subject officer stating that the affected person had entered his house and that he "had to fight her out of here." WO3 did not attend the residence, did not follow up further, and had no direct involvement in the incident.

Witness Officer 4 (WO4)

On February 13, 2026, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO4. Following is a summary of WO4's interview:

WO4, a close friend of the subject officer, provided information based on conversations with the subject officer and limited personal observations. He recalled receiving a text message on December 27, 2025, in which the subject officer stated that the affected person had shown up at his house and punched him in the mouth. WO4 reported that the subject officer later described the affected person forcing her way into the residence, attempting to reach a bedroom where another woman was present, and resisting removal before striking him. WO4 also overheard a later phone call between AP and SO at which time AP asked SO to "come back to her and be a family again" with her demeanour being described as highly variable (crying, anger, pleading, accusatory). He did not witness the alleged assault.

Witness Officer 5 (WO5)

On February 16, 2026, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO5. Following is a summary of WO5's interview:

WO5 described professional interactions with the subject officer and awareness of significant personal stress arising from ongoing conflict with his former spouse. WO5 recalled the subject officer reporting that the affected person attended his residence, entered the home, and continued inside despite being asked to leave, prompting him to place his hands on her to guide her out due to safety concerns. WO5 stated that the subject officer denied pushing or assaulting the affected person and framed his actions as preventative. WO5's focus during these interactions was on de-escalation and the subject officer's wellbeing.

Witness Officer 6 (WO6)

On February 25, 2026, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO6. Following is a summary of WO6's interview:

WO6 stated that he did not witness any physical altercation and had no firsthand knowledge of the alleged assault. WO6 relayed information provided to him by the subject officer, including accounts of the affected person attending his residence, forcing entry, attempting to confront a woman inside, and being pushed or guided out, during which the affected person allegedly struck the subject officer. WO6 described the relationship as highly contentious and emphasized that his information was entirely second-hand.

Subject Officer

On February 12, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from SO. Following is a summary of SO's interview:

The subject officer denied assaulting the affected person. He stated that the parties had been separated since February 2025 and that the affected person had no ownership or right of residence in his home. He acknowledged multiple interactions between December 26 and 28, 2025, including uninvited attendances by the affected person. He described the relationship as high-conflict and reported that on December 26 and 27, 2025, the affected person attended his residence, entered the home, and on December 27 attempted to access a bedroom where W1 was present. He stated that he physically restrained and directed the affected person out of the residence to prevent escalation and protect others, denying that he struck or intentionally injured her. He further reported that on December 27 the affected person struck him in the face while resisting removal. The subject officer characterized his actions as defensive and proportionate, provided typed notes, text messages, and a video recording of the affected person refusing to leave the residence on December 26, 2025, and maintained that no assault occurred on December 27, 2025.

Typed notes, text messages, and a video received from SO

The typed notes provided by the subject officer describe a series of interactions with the affected person between December 26 and December 28, 2025, in the context of a high-conflict marital separation. In those notes, the subject officer recorded that the affected person attended his residence on multiple occasions, including uninvited attendances, and that she entered or attempted to move further into the home despite being directed to leave. He documented that during at least one interaction, the affected person attempted to access a bedroom where another woman was present, and that he physically intervened to prevent this and to remove her from the residence. The subject officer recorded that his actions were intended to de-escalate the situation, protect others in the home, and secure his residence, and that he did not strike or intentionally injure the affected person. He also noted ongoing emotional volatility and repeated contact from AP.

The text message communications provided by the subject officer corroborate that he sought informal police assistance during one incident when the affected person was present at his residence and refusing to leave, requesting a patrol drive-by until she departed. This request was later cancelled once the affected person left the property. Additional text messages show the subject officer reporting to colleagues that the affected person had entered his residence unexpectedly, that he was experiencing significant stress related to the situation, and that he had to physically remove her from the home. The content of the messages reflects contemporaneous reporting of distress and conflict but does not provide detailed descriptions of the degree of force used.

The video provided by the subject officer is approximately three and a half minutes in length and depicts the affected person standing in the porch area of the residence on December 26, 2025. The subject officer is not visible in the recording but can be heard repeatedly directing the affected person to leave the residence. The affected person is heard questioning whether another woman is inside the home and making repeated inquiries about her identity. The video does not depict physical contact between the parties and concludes with the affected person exiting the residence.

Issue and Conclusion

On December 30, 2025, the Serious Incident Response Team of Newfoundland and Labrador (SIRT NL) was notified by the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary (RNC) that a person alleged she had been physically assaulted by her former spouse, an RNC officer, during an incident at his residence on December 28, 2025.

I have determined there is insufficient evidence to conclude that there are reasonable and probable grounds to believe that SO assaulted AP. I base my belief on the following.

The affected person declined to provide a recorded statement but spoke with the SIRT-NL investigator on January 2, 2026. AP advised that she did not want the subject officer charged and later requested that the investigation not proceed. AP reported that the parties were separated and that on December 28, 2025, she attended the subject officer's residence after suspecting he was with another woman. AP stated that although she was invited into the porch area, she proceeded further into the home toward a bedroom, at which point the subject officer grabbed her and forcibly removed her from the residence, causing scratches on her arms and legs. AP indicated that she did not seek medical attention or photograph her injuries and later declined to provide video footage she later said existed or photographs of the injuries.

The subject officer participated in a recorded interview and denied assaulting the affected person. He stated that the parties had been separated since February 2025 and that the affected person had no ownership or right of residence in his home. He acknowledged multiple interactions between December 26 and 28, 2025, including uninvited attendances by the affected person. He described the relationship as high-conflict and reported that on December 26 and 27, 2025, the affected person attended his residence, entered the home, and on December 27 attempted to access a

bedroom where W1 was present. He stated that he physically restrained and directed the affected person out of the residence to prevent escalation and protect others, denying that he struck or intentionally injured her. He further reported that on December 27 the affected person struck him in the face while resisting removal. The subject officer characterized his actions as defensive and proportionate, provided typed notes, text messages, and a video recording of the affected person refusing to leave the residence on December 26, 2025, and maintained that no assault occurred on December 27, 2025.

In her interview, W1 advised that she was present at the subject officer's residence during his interactions with the affected person on the evening of December 26, 2025, and the morning of December 27, 2025. She stated that on December 26, the subject officer picked her up and brought her to his residence before leaving to assist with a child related issue. While he was away, W1 remained upstairs and did not answer the door, as requested. W1 reported hearing who she believed was the affected person attend the residence, yelling loudly, demanding to know who was inside, questioning W1's age, and expressing agitation about her presence around the children. W1 did not observe the affected person visually but stated she could hear her attempting to move further into the home and believed the subject officer positioned himself to block her from accessing the upstairs area. W1 described the affected person's tone as aggressive and persistent, and stated that it took considerable effort by the subject officer to have her leave the residence. She reported feeling frightened during this encounter and believed the affected person intended to confront or potentially harm her if she gained access.

W1 stated that she stayed overnight at the residence and that on the morning of December 27, the affected person again attended the home. She reported that the affected person entered the residence while the subject officer went to retrieve items for the children and ran down the hallway toward the bedroom where W1 was located. W1 did not see direct physical contact but observed shadows and movement consistent with the subject officer blocking the affected person in the hallway while telling her that she needed to leave. She recalled hearing the affected person yelling statements such as "I can see you" and asserting that she knew W1 was present. W1 stated that the interaction lasted approximately ten minutes and ended with the affected person leaving the residence. She advised that she did not observe the subject officer strike the affected person, did not see any injuries to either party, and had no further contact with the affected person following these incidents.

Six witness officers were interviewed throughout the course of the investigation. Witness officers provided accounts primarily related to events following the alleged assault. WO1 recalled viewing photographs on the affected person's phone depicting redness or marks, though no copies were seized. Other witness officers described text communications from the subject officer on December 27, 2025, in which he stated that the affected person had attended his residence, entered the home, and struck him during an effort to remove her. Supervisory officers described awareness of significant personal stress arising from ongoing conflict with his former spouse and stated that he reported physically guiding the affected person out of his home due to safety concerns, while denying pushing or assaulting her.

Section 35 of the **Criminal Code** provides that a person is not criminally responsible for an offence if they use reasonable force to prevent or remove another person from property they are in peaceable possession of, provided the force is used for that purpose and is reasonable in the circumstances. The assessment is objective and fact specific.

The core questions are:

1. Was the subject officer in lawful possession of the property?
2. Was the affected person interfering with or trespassing on the property?
3. Was the purpose of the force to prevent or remove that interference?
4. Was the force used reasonable and proportionate in the circumstances?

The investigation indicates that the subject officer resided alone at the residence in question. The affected person had never lived at the residence, had no ownership interest, and no court order or legal right of occupancy was identified. As such, the subject officer was in lawful and exclusive possession of the home at the relevant time.

The evidence collected indicates a volatile domestic situation, AP suspected that SO was having a relationship with another person and uninvitedly entered SO's home to identify/confront that person. The evidence does not establish that the force used was disproportionate to the objective of removing a trespasser and preventing further escalation. The evidence available does not clearly demonstrate that force used was objectively excessive or unrelated to property protection.

Having regard to the totality of the evidence, and the consistency of the subject officer's account with civilian and documentary evidence, there are insufficient grounds to conclude that the subject officer's actions fell outside the scope of reasonable force for the purposes of s. 35 of the **Criminal Code**.

Further, the availability of the affected person's evidence for trial is a necessary component of the reasonable and probable grounds assessment. In light of the affected person's unwillingness to cooperate and her expressed request that the investigation not proceed, it is doubtful that her evidence would be available or reliable at trial. This further supports the conclusion that there are no reasonable and probable grounds to believe an offence was committed.

SIRT-NL will now conclude this file.

Final Report prepared by:

Stephen Ring, Director
Serious Incident Response Team - Newfoundland and Labrador
March 19, 2026
File No. 2026-0001