GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

FINDINGS OF FACT IN USE OF FORCE INCIDENT

Force Type (s):	Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (to a handcuffed prisoner) and Excessive Force Allegation Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (pre-handcuffing) Neck Restraint Allegation
Incident Date:	June 21, 2023
Publication Date:	October 14, 2025
Involved MPD Member(s): **Rank, Division Assigned, Race/Gender:**	Officer 1 Seventh District Black/Male Officer 2 Seventh District Black/Male Officer 3 Seventh District White/Male Officer 4 Seventh District Black/Male
Subject of the Force's Race/Gender and Age at time of the use of force incident:	Black/Male 32 years old
Use of Force Review Board Date:	May 8, 2025

SYNOPSIS OF USE OF FORCE

The SOF was uncooperative with arrest processing in the cellblock and resisted going into a cell. He pushed OFC1 against a wall and officers used hand controls to get him in a cell and to secure him by handcuffing one wrist to a fixed object. After he was handcuffed, OFC1 deliberately applied pressure on the SOF's handcuffed wrist causing pain. Consistent with MPD policy, this use of force incident was referred to MPD's Internal Affairs Division (IAD) for investigation. MPD's use of force investigative procedures are outlined in GO-RAR-901.07 (Use of Force). After all available evidence was collected and analyzed, and statements from the subject of the force, and police witnesses were reviewed, the IAD final investigative report was completed on May 1, 2025. The material facts regarding this use of force incident are outlined below.

EVENTS THAT LED TO POLICE CONTACT

1. On June 21, 2023, the subject of force (SOF) was arrested in an unrelated incident.

2. Later that day the SOF was in the Seventh District cellblock for processing.

3. The SOF was uncooperative with being fingerprinted and photographed.

4. The SOF threatened OFC2. The SOF was directed to go back to his cell and officers escorted him, but he refused to comply and was argumentative.

EVENTS THAT LED TO THE USES OF FORCE

5. The SOF swung his body around toward OFC2 aggressively. OFC1 stepped in between the SOF and OFC2.

6. OFC1 pushed the SOF back and the SOF pushed OFC1 against the wall.

7. OFC1, OFC2 and OFC4 used hand controls to get the SOF, who was resisting, into a cell.

8. During the struggle, the SOF grabbed OFC1 by the vest. The SOF lowered himself to the floor and then tried to stand. OFC1 pushed the SOF towards the floor, during which time his hands touched the back of the SOF's head/neck/back area but did not appear to restrict the SOF's airway, blood flow or breathing.

9. OFC1 and OFC2 continued using hand controls to struggle to control the SOF, and OFC4 assisted. OFC2 placed a single handcuff strand on one of the SOF's wrists. The SOF grabbed OFC2's hand.

10. OFC1 mounted the SOF to keep him from getting up.

11. OFC3 entered the cell and assisted with hand controls.

12. OFC1, OFC2, OFC3 and OFC4 rolled the SOF toward a fixed metal bunk in the cell.

13. The SOF spit at OFC1.

14. OFC2 secured the second handcuff strand to the railing of the fixed metal bunk, securing the SOF to the bunk. OFC1 had a grip of the SOF's wrist that was in the first handcuff strand.

15. Post-handcuffing, OFC1 deliberately applied pressure to the SOF's handcuffed wrist causing pain for about sixteen seconds.

ACTIONS AFTER THE USES OF FORCE

16. Later that day, the SOF complained to other MPD members that he was beat, including while handcuffed, and that his wrist hurt.

17. The SOF was treated at a hospital for non-serious injuries and released back to MPD custody.

PROSECUTORIAL REVIEW BY THE US ATTORNEY'S OFFICE (USAO)

As outlined in MPD policy, GO-RAR-901.07 (Use of Force), use of force indicating potential criminal conduct includes, but is not limited to, all strikes, blows, kicks or other similar uses of force against a handcuffed subject and all accusations or complaints of excessive force made against the member where there is objective, corroborating evidence indicating potential criminal conduct or other serious misconduct. This includes any use of force that clearly goes beyond that which an objectively reasonable officer would use in light of the circumstances under which the force was used, or any use of force which may rise to the level of a criminal act. Uses of force indicating potential criminal conduct are referred to the USAO to make an independent determination whether the use of force involved any criminal wrongdoing that should be prosecuted. On January 8, 2025, the USAO notified the MPD they were declining to prosecute the incident.

FINDINGS OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION (IAD) ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION

On May 1, 2025, the IAD final investigation made the following finding based on a preponderance of the evidence regarding the use of force by the involved member:

- The Use of Force – Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (pre-handcuffing) - by OFC1 was **JUSTIFIED.**

- The Use of Force – Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (pre-handcuffing) - by OFC2 was **JUSTIFIED.**

- The Use of Force – Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (pre-handcuffing) - by OFC3 was **JUSTIFIED.**

- The Use of Force – Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (pre-handcuffing) - by OFC4 was **JUSTIFIED.**

- The Use of Force – Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (to a handcuffed prisoner) - by OFC1 was **NOT JUSTIFIED.**

- The allegation that OFC1 used excessive force related his use of Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (to a handcuffed prisoner) was **SUSTAINED.**

- The allegation that OFC1 used a neck restraint was **UNFOUNDED.**

FINDINGS OF THE USE OF FORCE REVIEW BOARD (UFRB)

On May 8, 2025, the UFRB convened to review the final investigative report prepared by the IAD and the evidence regarding the uses of force by the involved member. The UFRB ruled:

- The Use of Force – Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (pre-handcuffing) - by OFC1 was **JUSTIFIED.**

- The Use of Force – Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (pre-handcuffing) - by OFC2 was **JUSTIFIED.**

- The Use of Force – Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (pre-handcuffing) - by OFC3 was **JUSTIFIED.**

- The Use of Force – Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (pre-handcuffing) - by OFC4 was **JUSTIFIED.**

- The Use of Force – Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (to a handcuffed prisoner) - by OFC1 was **NOT JUSTIFIED.**

- The allegation that OFC1 used excessive force related his use of Hand Controls with Injury/Pain (to a handcuffed prisoner) was **SUSTAINED.**

- The allegation that OFC1 used a neck restraint was **UNFOUNDED.**