

Police motorcycle officer unjustified in pursuing motorcyclist

1. On 13 July 2023, Mr Z died when his motorcycle hit a lamppost in Greenhithe, Auckland, after being pursued for almost 11 km by a Police officer who was also on a motorcycle.
2. Police notified us of the incident as required by section 13 of the Independent Police Conduct Authority Act 1988.¹ We conducted an independent investigation into the matter. Our investigation included interviewing involved Police officers, and reviewing all witness statements and other relevant documents.
3. We reviewed footage from 12 CCTV traffic cameras operating in main roads and the highways in Auckland. The footage captured the motorcyclists at various points from Lincoln Road through to the Tauhinu Road turn-off, where Mr Z crashed.
4. Officer A, the motorcycle officer who pursued Mr Z, was charged and acquitted of Dangerous Driving Causing Death. He was convicted of Driving a Motor Vehicle in a Dangerous Manner and disqualified from driving for six months. An employment process was commenced. In April 2026, near the end of this process, Officer A resigned from Police.
5. The Authority delayed the release of its public report until after the conclusion of Officer A's Court proceedings and employment process.
6. The Authority acknowledges this matter involves the death of Mr Z and we extend our sympathy to his family.

¹ Section 13 says: “Where a Police employee acting in the execution of his or her duty causes, or appears to have caused, death or serious bodily harm to any person, the Commissioner shall as soon as practicable give to the Authority a written notice setting out particulars of the incident in which the death or serious bodily harm was caused.”

The Authority's Findings

Issue 1: Was the pursuit justified?

Officer A was not justified in initiating a pursuit of Mr Z.

Officer A should have told the Northern Emergency Communications Centre (Comms) that he was intending to signal Mr Z to stop.

Issue 2: Did Officer A act in accordance with Police policy during the pursuit?

Officer A's assessment of the risks posed by the pursuit was fundamentally flawed. He did not comply with Police policy, and, in our assessment, he should have abandoned the pursuit soon after entering State Highway 16, given he was unable to communicate with Comms, and the speeds involved in pursuing Mr Z.

It was appropriate for Police to charge Officer A.

Analysis of the Issues

ISSUE 1: WAS THE PURSUIT JUSTIFIED?

7. At about 10.10am on Thursday, 13 July 2023, Officer A, a road policing officer, was assisting with a general Police checkpoint near the Lincoln Road and Universal Drive intersection in Henderson. Traffic was heavy and slow-moving, stopping at times due to traffic lights.
8. Officer A noticed Mr Z's red Ducati motorcycle moving through the traffic, going into tight spaces between cars at a speed that *"certainly wasn't compatible with the traffic."*
9. Officer A recognised the Ducati based on its distinctive sound, black tank top and the first two characters of its licence plate. He says he had noticed it *"a number of times"* over the past three years and that it was *"always going quickly"*. During these times, he had seen the Ducati passing between vehicles, using highway on-ramp and off-ramp lanes to get around cars, going quickly through traffic, and not abiding with markings on urban roads.
10. Officer A had never been in a position to stop the Ducati and did not have enough of the registration number to make enquiries, so did not know the identity of the rider.
11. Two officers at the checkpoint also saw the Ducati weaving through the middle of two lanes between vehicles. One of the officers told us: *"... it was kind of just trying to avoid wing mirrors and stuff like that, not like massive weaving. It was kind of just small, like slight movements...."* These officers estimated the Ducati was travelling between 15-30 kph.

Why did Officer A signal Mr Z to stop?

12. Officer A says he was concerned Mr Z's driving down Lincoln Road would result in an accident and possibly significant harm, given the tight confines of the traffic in which he was riding. He says:
- officers were moving in and out, standing on the road;
 - if someone had pulled out on Mr Z, they would not have seen him, and he would not have had anywhere to go. Neither party would have the ability to react;
 - drivers were often distracted and not looking for 'what's going on' and may not realise Mr Z was there;
 - the road surface "*isn't brilliant*" and there was a lot of rubbish on the road; and
 - people have a tendency to walk in between the lines of traffic to cross the road in slow-moving traffic.
13. Officer A says he decided to stop Mr Z so he could:
- speak to him about his driving actions; and
 - find out who he was and address "*any matters arising out of finding out who he is*".²
14. Section 114 of the Land Transport Act 1998 provides Police officers with the power to require a driver to stop and provide identification for the purposes of enforcing the Act. Therefore, the decision to signal for Mr Z to stop was lawful.
15. Police 'Fleeing driver' policy says officers must request support when they decide to stop a driver if they suspect the driver may flee. Officer A told us that the Ducati had "*always been fleeing*" when he had seen it in the past. Given this, Officer A should have requested support before attempting to stop him.
16. Officer A says he put on his riding gloves and helmet and plugged his Police radio into his motorcycle. He began following Mr Z, turning on his siren and flashing lights to signal for Mr Z to stop.

What happened when Mr Z stopped?

17. After travelling for about 400 metres, they approached the Lincoln Road interchange. Officer A says the interchange was "*very busy*" with "*a lot of traffic*". A car in front of Mr Z stopped and Mr Z came to a stop behind him. Officer A says that, in his assessment, Mr Z had definitely seen him, indicated left, and stopped.

² Mr Z was on a Learner's licence. He had been forbidden to ride motorcycles until he had a current motorcycle endorsement. However, Officer A was unaware of this at the time.

18. Officer A positioned his motorcycle to the rear, right side of Mr Z's motorbike, on an angle. He turned off his siren but left his flashing lights on. Officer A says he recalls seeing that the Ducati had no mirrors and that it appeared to be an "*old tatty thing*".³
19. According to Officer A, Mr Z was looking at him. Officer A says he shook his head at Mr Z, then nodded while maintaining eye contact with him. Mr Z shrugged as if to say "*sorry*" and mouthed something (unknown). He then pulled around the car and entered the State Highway 16 on-ramp.⁴
20. Officer A says this interaction with Mr Z only lasted a few seconds. He says that by shaking his head and nodding at Mr Z, he intended to indicate to him that he should pull over. However, he believes Mr Z misinterpreted his movements and thought Officer A was telling him he was signalling for the car in front of him to stop, rather than him.
21. While stopped, Officer A learned one further character of Mr Z's motorbike's registration number. However, this was still not enough to identify the owner. He noticed that the rider:
- was not wearing gloves;
 - had a tattoo on his right hand and a gold ring;
 - was a Caucasian male with blue eyes;
 - wore a black jacket and black trousers;
 - was "*not 16*" (meaning the rider was not young); and
 - wore a black full-face helmet.
22. Officer A says that as Mr Z left to go down the on-ramp, he demonstrated a good use of the rider controls, negotiating around the car in front of him "*very smoothly*". Based on this, and seeing Mr Z's manner of driving prior, he believed Mr Z to be a competent rider.

Was Mr Z a 'fleeing driver'?

23. Officer A says he does not believe Mr Z 'failed to stop' for Police and therefore, that this was not a fleeing driver incident. He believes Mr Z could only have been deemed to be a 'fleeing driver' if he knew Officer A was signalling for him to stop and did not comply with the instruction.

³ It is unclear from CCTV footage whether the Ducati had mirrors at the time Officer A began following him. While an inspection of the Ducati following the crash said damage was sustained to its mirrors, the Fatal Crash Report indicated they may have been torn off (during the crash) or missing.

⁴ There is no CCTV footage showing the interaction between Mr Z and Officer A when they stopped prior to going down the on-ramp onto State Highway 16.

24. However, Police ‘Fleeing driver’ policy says that *all* drivers who fail to stop after being signalled to do so, will be managed in accordance with the ‘Fleeing driver’ policy:

“This includes drivers who... are unaware of the signal to stop....”

25. Therefore, Officer A’s subsequent actions must be assessed by reference to the ‘Fleeing driver’ policy in place at the time of this incident.

Was Officer A justified in initiating a pursuit?

26. Police ‘Fleeing driver’ policy at the time did not specifically define a pursuit. The current policy (which we take to reflect the understanding at the time) says that a pursuit occurs when:

“i. a driver indicates by their actions and/or by continuing their manner of driving that they have no intention of stopping following a direction to do so; and

ii. the enforcement officer decides to continue to follow behind the vehicle with a view to reporting on its progress or stopping it.”

27. Officer A denies engaging in a pursuit. We disagree. It is clear to us that he pursued Mr Z. He followed Mr Z for almost 11 km, in close proximity at times, and at high speed, with his siren and lights activated for most of the time.

28. Policy requires officers to consider whether the immediate risk to safety posed by a fleeing driver justifies a pursuit. Safety must be prioritised over the immediate apprehension of a fleeing driver. Given this, it follows that safety must also be prioritised over the identification of an unknown fleeing driver.

29. According to policy, Officer A was only justified in pursuing Mr Z if he either:

- posed a level of threat that Officer A considered to be ‘assaultive or above’;⁵ or
- had committed a serious offence, and there was a risk of him committing ongoing offending or harm.

30. Officer A believed Mr Z had used an ‘unsafe passing manoeuvre’ by the Lincoln Road checkpoint, which is an offence under the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004. He says the unsafe passing manoeuvre was bordering on being dangerous because officers were moving back and forth and standing on the road.

31. Officer A says he decided to follow the Ducati to gather enough information to make inquiries into who the rider was.⁶ He believed it was necessary to do so as, over a period of time *“he had always ridden in a manner that gives risk to other people...”*. While Officer A assumed that Mr Z

⁵ According to Police policy, ‘assaultive’ is when a person shows *“intent to cause harm, expressed verbally, through body language/physical action.”* Above ‘assaultive’ is when a person *“shows action intended to or likely to cause grievous bodily harm or death to any person”*.

⁶ Officer A says, before this incident, he had been trying to identify the rider of the Ducati for a long time. He says he asked other Police staff if they had seen the Ducati, with no success.

was the same person he had seen committing offences over a period of approximately three years, it transpired that Mr Z had only had the bike for five months.

32. The other two officers who saw the Ducati at the checkpoint did not see Mr Z driving in a way that they considered to constitute an offence. The only available footage shows Mr Z riding down Lincoln Road at a similar speed to the car in front of him. Twelve seconds later, Officer A can be seen riding down the road with his red and blue lights on.
33. In our assessment, there was no urgent reason to identify Mr Z. The essential point is that his riding behaviour at the checkpoint was not posing a risk.
34. Officer A was not justified in initiating a pursuit as:
 - the level of threat posed by Mr Z was not ‘assaultive or above’; and
 - Mr Z’s alleged offending was not serious enough to outweigh the risks posed by Officer A pursuing him.

FINDINGS ON ISSUE 1

Officer A should have told Comms that he was intending to signal Mr Z to stop.

Officer A was not justified in initiating a pursuit of Mr Z.

ISSUE 2: DID OFFICER A ACT IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICE POLICY DURING THE PURSUIT?

35. Mr Z rode onto State Highway 16, travelling approximately three kilometres before turning onto State Highway 18. State Highway 16 consists of three lanes and State Highway 18 consists of two lanes in the areas travelled during the pursuit. There were merging lanes for vehicles entering each of the highways. Both highways have a 100 kph speed limit. The level of traffic varied and was generally free flowing throughout the pursuit. The weather conditions were fine, and the roads were dry. Visibility was good.
36. The average speeds were calculated by Police, as best as possible, using footage showing short segments of parts of the pursuit that were captured on cameras. An ‘expert witness’ provided some differing calculations in Court. Where speeds are indicated below, we have accounted for the discrepancies by providing a range incorporating the calculations of both.⁷ The discrepancies do not affect our findings.

Did Officer A comply with policy when initiating the pursuit?

37. Officers must tell the Emergency Communications Centre (Comms) when they are initiating a pursuit and provide their justification for pursuing. Comms have command and control in all

⁷ We were not privy to the Court transcript. In good faith, we have incorporated the ‘expert witness’ calculations as stated by Officer A.

pursuits. The pursuing officers must ensure all the relevant risk information is communicated to Comms throughout a pursuit.

38. Officer A did not attempt to advise Comms that he was pursuing Mr Z, due to his belief that Mr Z was not a 'fleeing driver' and therefore, that he was not 'in pursuit'.
39. Officer A did, however, want to ask Comms to organise for the highway camera operators to locate the Ducati and assist in getting identifying information. He hoped they might use the cameras to zoom in on the Ducati and get its registration number so he could make enquiries and follow up with the rider.
40. Officer A says that while moving down the on-ramp, he pushed his radio transmission button to communicate with Comms. However, a red light came on, indicating no transmission. (After the crash, Officer A realised the microphone cord had accidentally become unplugged from his helmet.)
41. Officer A says he unsuccessfully continued attempting to contact Comms throughout the pursuit when traffic cleared. However, this was not to update them on the pursuit but rather to obtain assistance from the camera operators in identifying Mr Z. He says that while making these attempts, he would turn his siren off for four or five seconds so any transmissions could be heard.

What happened as the motorcyclists entered State Highway 16?

42. Officer A said that, when he went down the on-ramp, Mr Z was already *"quite a way up the highway by that time"*, beyond the end of the ramp.
43. However, Mr Z travelled at an average speed of 131-134 kph as he went down the on-ramp. Officer A was initially 0.4 seconds behind him, but reduced the gap between them, travelling at an average speed of 141-144 kph. Footage shows Officer A caught up to Mr Z at the bottom of the on-ramp, where the lane goes onto State Highway 16. Officer A then moved within about two metres of Mr Z, positioned to the right-hand side and slightly behind Mr Z. Mr Z then pulled directly in front of Officer A to continue along the highway.
44. Upon seeing the footage, Officer A was surprised to be confronted by his faulty recollection. He says he did not realise he was anywhere near that close to Mr Z. Upon reflection, he believed he must have been preoccupied with the fact his transmission to Comms was not working.
45. In our assessment, it is most likely that Mr Z looked to his right to merge onto the highway, before pulling in front of Officer A. However, we cannot be sure of this due to the camera being some distance from the riders. Given the likelihood that he looked towards Officer A, we regard it as more likely than not that Mr Z knew Officer A was following him for the duration of the pursuit. Officer A does not agree that Mr Z likely saw him when he merged onto the highway.
46. Pursuing Police officers must consider the impact of their presence on fleeing drivers. Officer A recalls that, about two kilometres into the pursuit, he tried to determine whether Mr Z knew he was following him. He believed the Ducati had no mirrors; he did not think Mr Z would be able

to hear the siren; and concluded that Mr Z's driving was no different to that which he had observed on previous occasions. Given these factors, Officer A believed Mr Z did not realise Police were following him, and therefore, that Mr Z's manner of driving was unrelated to his presence.

What was Mr Z and Officer A's driving manner like throughout the pursuit?

47. Mr Z and Officer A travelled 10.8 km from the Lincoln Road on-ramp to the Tauhinu Road exit. Mr Z completed the distance in 3.58 minutes and travelled at an approximate average speed of 162 kph.
48. Footage provides the following consecutive 'snapshots' of the average speeds at which Mr Z and Officer A were travelling and the distance between them at certain points of the pursuit:

Camera Location	Mr Z's average speed	Approximate distance between motorcycles ⁸	Officer A's average speed	Average speed of road users near to motorcyclists ⁹
Huruhuru Road	149 kph	25 m	135 kph	-
Hobsonville Interchange (going onto SH18)	149 kph	120 m	134 - 156 kph	87 kph
Trig Road	180 - 187 kph	130 m	186 - 192 kph	93 kph
Waiarohia Creek	180 - 185 kph	100 m	189 - 192 kph	96 kph
Sinton Road	173 - 180 kph	100 m	168 - 171 kph	93 kph and 96 kph
Squadron Drive (unmarked Police car about 170 m behind Officer A)	180 kph	100 m	191 kph	103 kph

⁸ Police calculation.

⁹ Police calculation.

49. Footage shows both Mr Z and Officer A moving between other vehicles, often near them. They both crossed lanes on several occasions and were clearly travelling at a significantly higher speed than the other vehicles on the road.

What does policy say about continuing a pursuit?

50. Pursuing officers must continually assess the risks posed during a pursuit as factors and circumstances often change throughout. If the level of risk outweighs the necessity to continue the pursuit, then the pursuit must be abandoned.¹⁰ The pursuing officer may abandon the pursuit at any time.
51. According to Police policy, a pursuit must be abandoned if:
- an officer's assessment identifies that the risk of harm outweighs the initial or ongoing threat posed by the fleeing driver, and the need to immediately apprehend them; or
 - the officer has sustained loss of visual contact with the fleeing driver; or
 - if the officer has a sustained loss of communication with Comms.

What does Officer A say?

52. Officer A says Mr Z appeared to be *"familiar and proficient with the use of the throttle, the clutch, how the bike handled. He seemed quite at one with the way the bike worked.... He was quite fluid."* He was *"weaving between lanes"*, but Officer A did not believe he was creating a disturbance in traffic. Officer A thought most drivers were unaware of his presence as he approached them, as motorcycles are often unseen by drivers.
53. Officer A was very experienced in riding motorcycles on highways. He had confidence in his own level of skill and the condition of the Police motorcycle he was riding. Officer A told us he was acutely aware of what other road users were doing while he was following Mr Z. He indicated to other road users that he was there by having his flashing lights and siren going, and he was on a marked Police motorcycle. He says he could safely pass the other vehicles on the road. He says he always rode in a manner that ensured he would be able to take *"avoiding action"* without upsetting the flow of traffic or affecting other road users, if necessary.
54. Officer A says he did not know the speeds he and Mr Z were travelling at. He explained he never uses the motorcycle's standard speedometer. The calibrated speedometer that he usually uses was turned off as it had not been calibrated recently. He says he was unable to judge his and Mr Z's speed based on the speed of the flow of traffic. Given Officer A's vast experience as a motorcyclist, we found this implausible.

¹⁰ A risk assessment should include factors such as the time of day, traffic conditions and condition of the vehicle, whether the driver may be under the influence of substances and their age. Blood tests later revealed Mr Z's ability to think clearly and to drive safely may have been impaired due to being under the influence of illegal drugs.

55. Officer A recalled that Mr Z was *“going significantly faster than me”* the majority of the time. He thought he was able to keep up with Mr Z because the ebb and flow of the traffic slowed Mr Z down at times. However, Officer A’s recollection is clearly incorrect as demonstrated in the table at paragraph 48.
56. Before seeing footage, Officer A recalled the closest he got to Mr Z was about 100 metres or so.

Should Officer A have abandoned the pursuit?

57. Officer A followed Mr Z, hoping Mr Z would come to a stop if traffic stopped, or if he turned off and came to traffic lights. He thought this would provide him with an opportunity to get Mr Z’s full registration number and would allow him to let Mr Z know he was wanting him to stop.
58. Officer A says he believed Mr Z was posing a *“significant threat”*, yet also says he deemed the risk posed by continuing to follow Mr Z to be acceptable. He says:
- *“I could see what was going on”*;
 - Mr Z was not deliberately cutting other road users off, as younger fleeing drivers tend to do. Rather, he was *“... just looking for holes and riding through holes”*;
 - Mr Z was unaware of the presence of Police, yet was continuing to ride in his usual manner, which put other people at risk; and
 - while Mr Z was posing a danger to other members of the public by riding ‘dangerously’, he did not consider Mr Z to be riding ‘recklessly’.
59. Officer A says Mr Z *“had little regard... for his actions where I had due regard for mine.”*
60. Officer A’s recollection of the pursuit is fundamentally inconsistent with the footage. In our view, his assessment of the risks was fundamentally flawed.
61. In particular, our view is that Officer A overestimated his ability to take into account all the necessary risk factors and to make sound decisions.
62. Officer A pursued Mr Z with no communications with Comms, leaving his actions unchecked by those tasked with command and control of pursuits.
63. In our assessment, the speed and manner of riding of *both* Mr Z and Officer A posed a serious risk of injury or death to themselves and other road users. Critically, Mr Z’s alleged offending did not justify the risk of continuing to follow Mr Z at high speed.
64. Our conclusion is that Officer A should have abandoned the pursuit and stopped following Mr Z soon after entering State Highway 16 given he was unable to communicate with Comms, and the high speeds involved.

What happened just prior to the crash?

65. About 9 km into the pursuit route, the highway passes Squadron Drive before taking motorists onto the Upper Harbour Bridge, which widens into three lanes. On the other side of the bridge, partway up a hill, is the Tauhinu Road off-ramp. The off-ramp has a 400 metre long straight before curving to the left at the top.

What does Officer A say happened?

66. As Officer A approached Squadron Drive, he noticed an unmarked Police car.
67. Officer A says soon afterwards, Mr Z turned around in his seat and looked behind him.
68. Officer A was unsure whether Mr Z looked at him or recognised the unmarked Police car. However, he believes it was at this point that Mr Z realised Police were following him. He now considered Mr Z was 'failing to stop' and had therefore become a 'fleeing driver'.
69. Officer A also recalls Mr Z cut left around a truck which suddenly moved from the right lane into the left.
70. Officer A says he decided that, without the ability to communicate with Comms, he would now stop following Mr Z, whose driving was "*not going to improve*".
71. Officer A says there was nowhere for him safely to pull over on the bridge, so he planned to ride to the Tauhinu Road turn-off, and stop there. Once off his motorcycle, he intended to work out what was wrong with his radio then update Comms, providing them with Mr Z's description and location.
72. However, before he was able to stop, Officer A saw a lamppost ahead of him shake and realised Mr Z had crashed as he took the turn at the Tauhinu Road exit. Officer A immediately got off his motorcycle, checked on Mr Z, and sought assistance using the communication system he uses when not on his motorcycle.

What does footage show happened?

73. Footage does not capture the motorcyclists passing the unmarked Police car nor Mr Z turning to look behind him. However, it shows that a short time after passing the unmarked Police car, and just prior to Mr Z going onto the bridge, a large, heavy truck and trailer unit was moving from the right lane into the left lane, at about 90 kph. The truck was about 15 to 20 metres behind a car. Mr Z rode parallel to the truck at speed, on the fog line at the edge of the left lane. Mr Z then cut straight across in front of the truck, moving between the truck and the car on an angle.
74. Officer A was about 70 metres behind the truck travelling at an average speed of 135 kph, when Mr Z made the dangerous manoeuvre. Officer A moved across into the right lane, passing the truck and trailer unit, following Mr Z as he reappeared in the right lane.

75. There is no evidence in footage, that Officer A intended to stop following Mr Z at this point. Footage shows that after the truck and trailer incident, Officer A continued travelling at speed, closely behind Mr Z while on the bridge. Mr Z moved between cars and crossed the lane in front of other vehicles before taking the Tauhinu Road off-ramp. Officer A followed, changing lanes between a cluster of vehicles, only discernibly slowing down as he approached the corner on the off-ramp.
76. Mr Z was travelling at an average speed of between 130 to 144 kph as he approached Tauhinu Road. He braked just prior to the curve, hit a raised traffic island and crashed into a lamp post. Officer A was on the off-ramp, 96 – 98 metres behind Mr Z when he crashed. He slowed down significantly, approaching Mr Z eight seconds later.

What did the officer in the unmarked Police car say?

77. The officer in the unmarked Police car did not see Mr Z turn around to look at them and did not see the motorcycles travel around the large truck and trailer. He initially turned on his flashing lights and siren, intending to assist Officer A. However, he soon lost sight of the motorcyclists so turned off his lights and siren and returned to the posted road speed. Upon learning Mr Z had crashed on the off-ramp, he made his way to the scene to assist.

Did Officer A stop following Mr Z?

78. While Officer A maintains he decided to abandon the pursuit, there is no independent evidence to support this.
79. According to Police policy, once Officer A made the decision to abandon a pursuit, he should have immediately reduced his speed to increase the distance between himself and the Ducati, stopping as soon as it was safe to do so. He should have turned off his flashing lights and siren once below the posted speed limit.
80. Footage provides no evidence that Officer A attempted to stop following Mr Z while on the bridge. On the contrary, it shows him continuing to follow Mr Z at speed, crossing lanes, with his flashing lights on.

Our Conclusion

81. Despite his account of the pursuit being fundamentally flawed, we accept that Officer A was genuine in his belief as to what occurred. It was evident to us that he had difficulty reconciling his recollection with the evidence of what actually occurred, as seen in the CCTV footage. However, Officer A's actions were dangerous, were in breach of policy, and were a material contributing factor to the crash. Therefore, we agree with the Police decision to charge Officer A.

FINDINGS ON ISSUE 2

Officer A's assessment of the risks posed by the pursuit was fundamentally flawed. He did not comply with Police policy and should have abandoned the pursuit soon after entering State Highway 16, given he was unable to communicate with Comms, and the speeds involved.

It was appropriate for Police to charge Officer A.



Judge Kenneth Johnston

Chair
Independent Police Conduct Authority

13 August 2026

IPCA: 23-18803

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
