

Head and face strikes during Whangārei arrest unjustified

1. On 10 January 2023, Whangārei Police tracked and arrested Mr Z, who was in hiding. Upon his arrest, Mr Z complained to Police that an officer hit him on the head with his gun while he was being handcuffed. Police notified the Authority of Mr Z's complaint as required by section 15 of the Independent Police Conduct Authority Act 1988.¹
2. The incident began at about 2.30pm, when Police signalled a car to stop after identifying the driver, Mr Y, as a person they wanted to arrest on suspicion of burglary. Police saw a front seat passenger but did not identify this person as Mr Z (who Police were also looking for).
3. Mr Y failed to stop and fled from Police, who did not pursue. Mr Y and Mr Z abandoned the car a short distance away and ran into an area of mangroves.
4. A Police dog handler and two officers tracked both offenders. The dog located and bit Mr Z. One of the assisting officers struck Mr Z in the face and allegedly hit him on the top of the head with a 40mm weapon used to fire sponge rounds.
5. Police took Mr Z to hospital for treatment for his face, head and dog bite wounds before returning him to custody. We are satisfied he received adequate care, and his wounds were photographed to support his complaint.
6. Police investigated this incident and charged the officer with assaulting Mr Z with a weapon.²

The Authority's Findings

Issue 1: Was Officer A justified in using the Police dog to apprehend Mr Z?

Officer A was justified in using his Police dog to apprehend Mr Z.

Officer A complied with policy requirements when deploying the Police dog.

¹ Section 15 says: “The Commissioner shall notify the Authority of every complaint received by the Police, other than a complaint notified to the Commissioner by the Authority.”

² Pursuant to section 202C of the Crimes Act 1961.

Issue 2: Did Officer B use justifiable force when arresting Mr Z?

We agree with Police's decision to charge Officer B.

In our assessment, on the balance of probabilities, Officer B did strike Mr Z in the head with his 40mm weapon, and this constituted an unjustified use of force for the reasons set out in our report.

Officer B was not justified in striking Mr Z on the face with his palm.

Analysis of the Issues

ISSUE 1: WAS OFFICER A JUSTIFIED IN USING HIS POLICE DOG TO APPREHEND MR Z?

7. In this section we describe what happened when the dog handler, Officer A, located Mr Z and released the dog to apprehend him. We then assess whether Officer A's actions were legally justified or protected from criminal responsibility under section 40 of the Crimes Act 1961, which justifies the use of reasonable force to prevent a person escaping lawful custody.³

What do the officers say happened?

8. Officer A says he knew he was looking for two people when he entered the mangroves, and that Mr Y was an experienced and dangerous offender who was known to carry knives. Officer A assumed that the unknown person with Mr Y was also potentially dangerous. He requested Officer B (a trained member of the Armed Offenders Squad) and Officer C accompany him to provide cover and assist with the arrests.
9. All the officers describe wading through mud, hip-high water and thick vegetation. Officer A says the creek was full, swiftly flowing and uncrossable, and that he knew he would not be able to follow either offender into the creek due to the risk to the Police dog.
10. Officer A says Mr Z "*popped up*" from a crouched position about 10 metres ahead of him in a clearing. He recognised Mr Z as a person Police had been looking for in order to return him to prison and regarded him as a dangerous offender.⁴ He also knew that Mr Z was suspected of shoplifting in the local area and avoiding Police.
11. Officer A says he warned Mr Z to stay where he was, or he would release the dog. He says Mr Z got up and started to run towards the creek, approximately 50 metres away. Concerned they would lose Mr Z in the dense vegetation or the creek, he commanded the dog to apprehend him. The dog caught Mr Z and bit him on the right forearm. Mr Z stumbled and fell to the ground.
12. Officers B and C were several metres behind Officer A climbing through vegetation and did not see the Police dog bite Mr Z. Officer A estimates they arrived approximately 5-10 seconds after he released the dog. Both officers heard Officer A challenging Mr Z, and Officer C recalls hearing

³ Section 40 is set out in paragraph 79.

⁴ Mr Z had been issued a Parole Recall Warrant in November 2022. See paragraph 23 for further details.

Mr Z scream. Once both officers reached the clearing, they saw Mr Z on the ground with the dog biting his arm. Officer B, who was 1-2 metres ahead of Officer C, says Mr Z was trying to fight the dog.

What does Mr Z say happened?

13. Mr Z has not complained about being bitten by the Police dog. He says he was hiding because he knew he had a Parole Recall warrant and did not want to be arrested that day. He also commented that he was finding life evading Police difficult, and in some respects was ready to go back to prison. He had become very skinny (he believes he weighed about 50kg) and had taken drugs so was not thinking very clearly.
14. However, he also says that he was lying down in the reeds when he saw the Police dog approaching. He sat up and put his hands up to surrender, and the dog bit him. He acknowledged he has experience of being apprehended by a Police dog, he knew that once the dog had found you *"the game is over"* and there is no point running away or resisting.

What do we conclude happened?

15. Obviously, there is a direct conflict between the accounts of Officer A and Mr Z. The other officers cannot corroborate either account.
16. Officer A is clear that he saw Mr Z turn and run towards the creek as soon as he issued the challenge.
17. Mr Z had already fled from Police, and, while not confirmation that he continued trying to get away once he saw the dog, it does indicate that his frame of mind at the time was to escape. It seems unlikely that he was ambivalent about being returned to prison, as he had been on the run for months. Further, Mr Z has a history of attempting to escape Police custody.
18. On balance, we accept Officer A's account.

Was Officer A justified in using the Police dog to prevent Mr Z from escaping?

19. Officer A says he released the Police dog to prevent Mr Z from escaping arrest. Section 40 of the Crimes Act 1961 empowers Police to use *"such force as may be necessary"* to prevent the escape of someone who takes to flight in order to avoid arrest. The proportionality of an officer's use of force under section 40 should be assessed against two factors:
 - a) the seriousness of the offence for which the person is to be apprehended (and the consequent public interest in detaining them in order to bring them to justice); and
 - b) the likelihood and degree of risk the person poses if escape is not prevented.

Did Officer A believe Mr Z was fleeing to avoid arrest?

20. As discussed in paragraphs 16-18, we accept that Officer A believed Mr Z was fleeing to avoid arrest.

Was Officer A's use of force to prevent Mr Z's escape reasonable and proportionate when weighed against the offences for which Mr Z was to be arrested and the likelihood and severity of the risk that he posed?

21. The Authority regards the use of a Police dog against a person as significant force, as dog bites can cause extremely serious injuries. Police policy requires a dog handler carefully to consider his or her decision to use a Police dog and ensure it is legally justified.
22. Mr Z has a lengthy criminal record, predominantly offences involving theft, but also family violence. He has alerts for carrying a firearm and for escaping custody.
23. Mr Z was released from prison on 2 March 2022 while serving a three year and four-month sentence for burglary. He was suspected of shoplifting, theft, threatening behaviour and assaulting a child while out on parole. On 25 November 2022, the Parole Board issued a Parole Recall Warrant because Mr Z had breached his bail conditions and was deemed to pose an undue risk to the safety of the community. Police suspected Mr Z continued to commit crimes in the local area, including shoplifting and fraud offences. Officer A was aware of this information.
24. In this context, we agree with the view formed by Officer A that it was important to arrest Mr Z. Local Police had been looking for him since the warrant was issued, but Mr Z was transient and difficult to locate. Officer A says that local business owners had approached him about Mr Z's alleged shoplifting, and he believed it likely Mr Z posed a risk of offending until arrested. We agree.
25. We accept that Mr Z was found in swampy and thickly vegetated terrain that made chasing him on foot extremely difficult. Further, Officers B and C were not yet close enough to help.
26. Officer A explained that, if Mr Z was able to get away into the creek, he would not be able to follow with the dog. Police did not have cordons downstream. Officer A adds that they did not manage to locate Mr Y in the mangroves, and believes he likely escaped via the creek.
27. As Mr Z had been deemed such a risk to the community that he should be returned to prison, and with no viable options other than to use the Police dog, we accept that Officer A was justified in using the dog to apprehend Mr Z.
28. Police policy is prescriptive about how a dog should be deployed. Dog handlers are required to issue a warning that the dog will be released if a person does not comply with instructions, and to give the person time to comply. The dog handler must also retain control of the Police dog at all times. In this case, we are satisfied that Officer A gave the appropriate warning (that Mr Z ignored), and that he retained control of his dog on the tracking line when he commanded it to apprehend Mr Z. We are also satisfied that the Police dog was removed as soon as it was safe to do so, once Mr Z was handcuffed.

FINDINGS ON ISSUE 1

Officer A was justified in using his Police dog to apprehend Mr Z.

Officer A complied with policy requirements when deploying the Police dog.

ISSUE 2: DID OFFICER B USE JUSTIFIABLE FORCE WHEN ARRESTING MR Z?

29. In this section we describe what happened when Officer B arrested Mr Z. We then assess whether Officer B's actions were legally justified or protected from criminal responsibility under the Crimes Act 1961, which covers force used:

- to overcome force used by another person to resist arrest (section 39);⁵
- to prevent a person from escaping arrest (section 40); and
- to defend oneself or another person (section 48).⁶

30. These legal provisions require us to consider whether the force the officer used was necessary, proportionate, and reasonable in the circumstances.

What happened?

31. We are satisfied from Mr Z's and the officers' accounts that Officers B and C reached Mr Z while he was on the ground with the dog biting his right forearm. Both officers recognised Mr Z.

32. It is accepted that Officer B hit Mr Z in the face while arresting him. Officer A then removed the dog and Mr Z was handcuffed. Officer C escorted Mr Z out of the mangroves to his sergeant at a waiting Police car, while Officers A and B continued searching for Mr Y, ultimately unsuccessfully.

33. Mr Z sustained three injuries:

- a bleeding cut above his right eye (the result of Officer B hitting him in the face);
- a crescent-shaped wound on the top of his head, the cause of which is disputed; and
- dog bite wounds to his right arm.

34. There are three factual issues:

- Whether Mr Z was resisting or lashing out while the dog was biting him.
- Whether Officer B delivered a palm strike or a punch to Mr Z's face when trying to control him.
- Whether Officer B deliberately brought the weapon down on the top of Mr Z's head.

⁵ Section 39 is set out in paragraph 78.

⁶ Section 48 is set out in paragraph 0.

What do Mr Z and Officer C say happened?

35. Mr Z says he did not resist or lash out when the Police dog bit his arm, and he told the officers he was not resisting. He recalls Officer C holding his left arm, and the Police dog being removed from his other arm. Officer C handcuffed his left wrist.
36. Then, Officer B ran towards him yelling: *"Don't fucking move!"* Mr Z does not recall Officer B striking him on the face, he says Officer B *"smashed"* him over the head with the butt of a gun using a *"knock out level of force"* and *"everything went blurry"* after that.
37. Officer C's account corroborates Mr Z's version in its essentials. He says he was only a couple of metres behind Officer B on approach, and Mr Z was under control and not resisting. Officer B immediately punched Mr Z in the eye with his right hand, causing a cut above the eye. Mr Z yelled: *"I won't do anything, sorry, get the dog off!"* Officer B told him to stop resisting and struck Mr Z on the top of his head with the weapon, bringing the barrel of the weapon down with both hands.
38. The wound above Mr Z's eye started bleeding immediately. Officer C says he grabbed Mr Z's left hand and applied handcuffs. Officer A removed the dog and Officer B grabbed his right hand and handcuffed it.
39. Officer C escorted Mr Z out of the mangroves while Officers A and B went on searching for Mr Y. Officer C says Mr Z asked him repeatedly why the officer had hit him on the top of his head with a gun, and Officer C replied that he did not know. Mr Z also recalls this conversation.
40. At the Police car, Mr Z complained to the sergeant that an officer hit him on the head with gun. The sergeant saw the blood on Mr Z's face. He looked at Officer C, who nodded in confirmation. Both Officer C and the sergeant corroborate the details of this exchange. The sergeant rang the custody sergeant to alert them about Mr Z's injuries and allegations. The custody sergeant alerted the duty senior sergeant and took photographs of Mr Z's injuries to accompany his complaint. Mr Z was taken to the Whangārei Hospital for treatment.

What do Officers A and B say happened?

41. Officer B prefaces his account by stating that, as he was running towards Mr Z, he was also attempting to stow the weapon (which was slung across his chest) within two bungee straps attached to his body armour for this purpose. He never managed to secure it using his left hand, which meant he was left trying to secure Mr Z one-handed.
42. Officer B says, when he first ran towards Mr Z, Mr Z was resisting and punching the Police dog with his left hand.
43. Officer B told Mr Z he was under arrest and tried to grab Mr Z's left arm with his right hand to apply handcuffs, but Mr Z pulled his arm away and did not say anything. Officer B describes Mr Z *"...swinging his arms round violently and trying to get to the dog"*. He says it was possible Mr Z had a weapon in his unsecured left hand (although he did not see one, and Mr Z was later confirmed to be unarmed).

- 44. Officer A agrees that Mr Z was resisting and would not follow instructions. He says Mr Z wrapped his legs around the dog's neck and shoulder area, and Officer A could not see what he was doing with his left hand, which he also believed posed a risk.
- 45. Officer B assessed that Mr Z's actions and demeanour indicated he intended to cause the officers harm. He would not comply with instructions or allow his left arm to be secured. Officer B knew Officer A would not remove the Police dog from Mr Z's right arm until this was done. He did not know where Officer C was at this point and thought he was operating alone.
- 46. He delivered a palm strike to Mr Z's face to distract him so he could take control of Mr Z's left arm, and to protect himself and the dog handler from Mr Z. Officer B is adamant that he did not then hit Mr Z on the head with the weapon.
- 47. Officer A saw Officer B strike Mr Z's face but does not recall if it was a palm strike or a punch. He did not see Officer B hit Mr Z on the head with the weapon and says he was focusing on his dog.
- 48. Officer B says Mr Z continued resisting following the palm strike, and *"I stood over him using my weight and we wrestled on the ground while I tried to get his hands behind his back"*. He managed to get Mr Z onto his stomach. Officer A told us that he did not see Officer B on the ground wrestling with Mr Z. Officer C arrived and gave Officer B handcuffs, which Officer B applied after the dog was removed.
- 49. Officer B believes that the wound on top of Mr Z's head may have been caused by the unsecured weapon when he was trying to secure him.

What do we conclude happened?

- 50. We consider the most likely scenario is that Mr Z was initially resisting – or at least appeared to be resisting when the dog bit his arm. We know from several witnesses that Mr Z was screaming out in pain when he was bitten. It is likely Mr Z was using his left arm to try to disengage the dog and not following instructions to stop resisting.
- 51. Officer A says Mr Z was still resisting when Officer B struck him in the face. Officer C disputes this, believing he was under control. Since Officer C was behind Officer B, it is possible he did not see Mr Z's actions as clearly or for as long, but it is unlikely he would not have seen prolonged and violent resistance. We therefore conclude that while Mr Z may have been resisting, he was not using significant force.
- 52. It is not disputed that Officer B initially struck Mr Z in the face with enough force to cause a cut above his eye, whether it was a palm strike or a punch. As Mr Z does not recall it happening, and there is an unresolvable conflict between the nature of the strike (as described by Officers B and C), we accept Officer B's account that he used a palm strike.
- 53. Officer B denies deliberately hitting Mr Z with the weapon, despite both Mr Z and Officer C saying he did. Officer A did not see this happen, but he also says he was focused on controlling his dog at this stage. The crescent-shaped wound, and the immediate and consistent nature of

Mr Z's complaint about being hit on the head with a gun-shaped object, lead us to conclude that this is what happened. We find Officer B's explanation that the wound could have been caused accidentally during the arrest process implausible.

54. We conclude that:

- Mr Z was resisting, but not violently or for a prolonged period;
- Officer B delivered a palm strike to Mr Z's face; and
- Officer B deliberately hit Mr Z on the head with the weapon.

Was Officer B justified in striking Mr Z on the face?

55. Officer B states he was justified in delivering a palm strike to Mr Z's face under sections 39, 40 and 48 of the Crimes Act 1961.

56. We do not accept that section 40 is applicable. By the time Officer B reached Mr Z, he was sitting on the ground with the Police dog biting his arm. It is not plausible that Officer B believed Mr Z was in the process of fleeing because the dog was still engaged. Rather, Mr Z was resisting arrest. Therefore, we will assess Officer B's use of force against sections 39 and 48.

Was Officer B legally justified in using force against Mr Z to effect his arrest under section 39?

57. As discussed in paragraph 51, we accept that Officer B believed Mr Z was physically resisting and was not heeding instructions, but we do not believe Mr Z was using prolonged or significant force. We must therefore assess whether the palm strike was proportionate and reasonable in the circumstances.

58. Officer B says he believed Mr Z was trying to pull his arm away in order to continue hitting the dog and to avoid being handcuffed and was prepared to harm himself, Officer A and the dog in the process.

59. Officer B was wary of Mr Z given his history and thought it possible that Mr Z was holding a weapon in his left hand he could not see. Officer B also commented that he was unsure where Officer C was, and they were away from additional Police assistance. He considered the use of other tactical options, such as pepper spray, impractical as it could affect himself and Officer A.

60. We accept that empty hand tactics, such as a palm strike, can be helpful to distract or control an uncooperative person. However, the level of force Officer B applied, sufficient to cut Mr Z's brow, was, in our assessment, excessive in the circumstances. We are also concerned that Officer B targeted Mr Z's face, and specifically his eye, when Mr Z's shoulder, clavicle or upper arm were also likely to have been available.

61. In our view, the situation was not so urgent as to require Officer B to act as he did. He could simply have waited for Officer C to arrive and assist. It is unclear why he would not think Officer C was following him when they went into the mangroves as a team. The Police dog had control of Mr Z, and there was time for Officer B to stop and assess the situation, secure his weapon so

he was not operating one-handed, assess whether Mr Z was armed and wait for Officer C to move into position. Mr Z may well have subjected himself to a prolonged bite by failing to comply with instructions, delaying Officer A from releasing the dog. However, in our view, Officer B's actions in fact made the situation unnecessarily worse for Mr Z, subjecting him to additional injury.

62. We conclude that Officer B's palm strike was not justified under section 39.

Was Officer B justified in striking Mr Z on the face to defend himself and Officer A under section 48?

63. Section 48 of the Crimes Act provides that any person, including a Police officer, is legally justified in using reasonable force in defence of themselves or another. To rely on a defence under section 48, the individual officer's actions must be assessed on both a subjective and an objective basis. This assessment involves three questions:

- a) What were the circumstances as the officer believed them to be? (a subjective test)
- b) Was the officer's use of force against Mr Z for the purpose of defending himself or another? (a subjective test)
- c) Was the officer's use of force against Mr Z reasonable in the circumstances as the officer believed them to be? (an objective test)

What did Officer B believe the circumstances to be?

64. In addition to what is described in paragraphs 57-59 and 61, Officer B also says he believed Mr Z posed a threat to himself (Officer B) and Officer A due to the violence of his actions, and the fact he could have a weapon in his left hand.

65. We accept that Officer B perceived a potential threat. However, given the situation at the time that Officer B arrived, he could not, in our view, have regarded Mr Z as posing a serious threat.

Was Officer B's use of force for the purpose of defending himself and Officer A?

66. We accept that Officer B acted in part to ensure Mr Z did not harm himself or Officer A, but primarily to overcome Mr Z's resistance to arrest.

Was Officer B's use of force against Mr Z reasonable in the circumstances as he believed them to be?

67. We do not accept that the level of force Officer B used was proportionate, reasonable and necessary for the same reasons as discussed in paragraphs 60 and 61. There was no indication that either officer was in imminent and serious danger and nor do we accept that Officer B could have concluded that this was the case. The Police dog had secured Mr Z; Officer A was standing behind the dog and so was out of immediate reach; Officer B had not seen a weapon; and he had the option to wait for Officer C to arrive to help him secure Mr Z's arm, therefore neutralising the main source of threat.

68. We also disagree with Officer B's decision to target Mr Z's face.

Was Officer B justified in hitting Mr Z on the head with the weapon?

- 69. Having found that the palm strike was not justified under sections 39 and 48 of the Crimes Act 1961, this far more significant use of force was not, in our assessment, necessary, proportionate, and reasonable in the circumstances that we have concluded Officer B perceived.
- 70. It was a dangerous act, and we agree with Police's decision to charge Officer B.
- 71. Following a trial before a judge and jury in August 2024, the jury was unable to reach a decision. After a second trial in August 2025, Officer B was acquitted of the charge of assault with a weapon.
- 72. The outcome of a criminal proceeding is not necessarily determinative of any employment related process, albeit that the two processes address the same factual situation. They give rise to different issues and involve the application of different standards of proof. Police proceeded with a disciplinary process in this case.
- 73. At the conclusion of that process, Police concluded that Officer B struck Mr Z with a palm strike. They further concluded that Officer B had not deliberately struck Mr Z with his 40mm weapon. It is by no means easy to reconcile this conclusion with the fact that Police had earlier concluded that there was adequate evidential foundation to justify charging the officer with just that.
- 74. In any event, it will be apparent from this report that based on the evidence that emerged we reached a different conclusion.

Police and Officer B submissions

- 75. As required by section 31 of the Independent Police Conduct Authority Act 1988, having completed our investigation and prepared a draft report, we provided copies to Police and Officer B in respect of whom we were proposing to reach adverse findings. Police responded by acknowledging and accepting our findings.
- 76. Officer B requested that we review the notes of evidence from both trials, which we have done. We emphasise that the issues in the criminal proceeding were not the same as those that have to be considered here, and that the jury was applying the criminal standard of proof beyond reasonable doubt, whereas our assessment of whether Officer B's actions were justified is made on the basis of a civil standard, on the balance of probabilities.
- 77. Our view as to the justifiability of the actions of Officer B remains unchanged.

FINDINGS ON ISSUE 2

We agree with Police's decision to charge Officer B.

In our assessment, on the balance of probabilities, Officer B did strike Mr Z in the head with his 40mm weapon, and this constituted an unjustified use of force for the reasons set out in our report.

We also find that Officer B was not justified in striking Mr Z on the face with his palm.



Judge Kenneth Johnston KC

Chair

Independent Police Conduct Authority

30 July 2026

IPCA: 23-17114

Appendix – Laws and Policies

LAW

Crimes Act 1961

78. Section 39 says:

“Force used in executing process or in arrest

Where any person is justified, or protected from criminal responsibility, in executing or assisting to execute any sentence, warrant, or process, or in making or assisting to make any arrest, that justification or protection shall extend and apply to the use by him or her of such force as may be necessary to overcome any force used in resisting such execution or arrest, unless the sentence, warrant, or process can be executed or the arrest made by reasonable means in a less violent manner:

provided that, except in the case of a constable or a person called upon by a constable to assist him or her, this section shall not apply where the force used is intended or likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm.”

79. Section 40 says:

“Preventing escape or rescue

(1) *Where any person is lawfully authorised to arrest or to assist in arresting any other person, or is justified in or protected from criminal responsibility for arresting or assisting to arrest any other person, that authority, justification, or protection, as the case may be, shall extend and apply to the use of such force as may be necessary—*

(a) *to prevent the escape of that other person if he or she takes to flight in order to avoid arrest; or*

(b) *to prevent the escape or rescue of that other person after his or her arrest—*

unless in any such case the escape or rescue can be prevented by reasonable means in a less violent manner:

provided that, except in the case of a constable or a person called upon by a constable to assist him or her, this subsection shall not apply where the force used is intended or likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm.”

80. Section 48 says:

“Self-defence and defence of another

- (1) *Every one is justified in using, in the defence of himself or herself or another, such force as, in the circumstances as he or she believes them to be, it is reasonable to use.”*

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 Kenneth Johnston KC.

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. At significant points in the investigation itself and in the preparation of the report, the Authority conducted audits of both process and content.



Mana Whanonga Pirihimana Motuhake

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