

PRELIMINARY REPORT
OF THE STATE'S ATTORNEY

Critical Incident

Bloomington Police Department

Erika Reynolds

McLean County State's Attorney

March 25, 2025

Incident: Officer Involved Fatal Shooting

Date: February 25, 2025

Location: 806 Arcadia Drive, Bloomington

Analysis team: Erika Reynolds, McLean County State's Attorney
Bradly Rigdon, First Assistant State's Attorney- Criminal
Aaron Fredrick, Assistant State's Attorney

Conclusion: On February 25, 2025, officers from the Bloomington Police Department were dispatched to a report of an armed subject who had threatened a civilian with a gun. Officers quickly responded, located the armed subject, and conducted themselves admirably in their attempts to deescalate the situation as they remained patient, calm, and professional while confronted with an armed subject who showed increasing hostility towards the officers. The officers ultimately used deadly force against the armed subject, but only acted with deadly force when they reasonably believed their lives were in immediate danger. This report details the analysis of the McLean County State's Attorney's Office which finds that the course of conduct in which the officers engaged was justified, reasonable, and necessary to protect the public and themselves from great bodily harm.

I. Introduction

At approximately 4:43 p.m. on Tuesday, February 25, 2025, Bloomington Police Department (hereinafter “BPD”) officers responded to a report that there was an armed subject near Arcadia Drive in Bloomington, Illinois. The reporting party informed dispatch that the armed subject had lifted his shirt and shown a gun as a means of threatening harm to the reporting party. Upon arrival, officers located a 15-year-old subject who matched the description provided by the reporting party. Throughout this report, this individual will be referred to as “the subject” or “the armed subject.” The subject refused officer commands to stop and put his hands on top of his head. Instead, he fled from the officers on foot with a hand concealed inside of his sweatshirt. Additional responding officers located the subject at 806 Arcadia Drive, at which time the subject displayed a weapon and began making threats towards the officers. For nearly ten minutes, the officers on scene spoke with the subject and made every effort to get him to drop the weapon. Even as the armed subject’s attitude and demeanor towards officers became increasingly hostile, the officers remained patient, calm, and professional throughout their communications with the subject. The subject refused to put his weapon down, and ultimately raised his weapon and pointed it at the officers. This action by the subject caused multiple BPD officers to fire at the subject, thereby causing his death. The Illinois State Police (hereinafter “ISP”) were notified and took over the investigation a short time after the engagement between the officers and the subject, as is customary in officer involved shooting (hereinafter “OIS”) cases.

The role of the State’s Attorney at this juncture in this matter is to determine whether the conduct of the officers who discharged their weapons was justified under Illinois law. Below, we set forth the sources of information reviewed, a factual summary of the OIS incident, applicable law, and our legal conclusions.

II. Evidentiary Sources

In preparing this preliminary report, my staff and I have reviewed the following evidentiary sources:

- A. Recorded call to BPD dispatch

- B. Recorded radio traffic
- C. Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system report
- D. Approximately 240.3 gigabytes of video footage including officer body worn camera, squad car dash camera footage, cell phone video, interview video, and business surveillance video
- E. Incident narratives (commonly known as police reports) by officers who were on scene including the five officers who discharged their firearms
- F. Recordings of interviews of civilian eyewitnesses to the incident and interviews of civilian eyewitnesses who observed the armed subject prior to the incident
- G. Cellular telephone data
- H. Autopsy and toxicology reports
- I. Analysis conducted by a forensic scientist with the Illinois State Police, Division of Forensic Sciences
- J. Investigative reports prepared by the Illinois State Police

The investigation by the Illinois State Police into this matter is ongoing at this time; however, almost all investigative tasks and reports have been completed. Based on the undisputed facts of this case and ample evidence available to us at this time, we are confident that receipt of additional items of evidence will not alter the legal opinions contained in this report.

III. **Factual Summary**

At approximately 4:43 p.m. on Tuesday, February 25, 2025, BPD dispatch received a call in which the caller reported that he had just been in a confrontation with an armed subject. The caller reported that the armed subject displayed a gun to the caller in a threatening manner. Officers with the Bloomington Police Department responded to that call and located the armed subject. The armed subject fled from officers on foot and officers simultaneously received additional information that the subject had a gun. Additional responding officers located the armed subject near 806 Arcadia Drive. The armed subject fled into a parking lot and displayed a weapon to the officers. Officers set up a perimeter around the parking lot and engaged in efforts to deescalate the situation and to convince the armed subject to put his weapon down. The

officers interacting with the armed subject were all either wearing full Bloomington Police Department uniforms or were otherwise wearing clothing and gear that clearly identified them as police officers. During the interaction with the armed subject, the officers also observed him to be using a cell phone. That cell phone and weapon were identifiable as separate items, and each was held in a different hand. The officers communicated over the radio about which hand was holding the cell phone and which hand was holding the weapon while the armed subject was interacting with the officers. These efforts continued for approximately ten minutes with multiple officers attempting to reason with the armed subject. Once the armed subject drew the weapon in the parking lot behind 806 Arcadia Drive, he did not put down or otherwise relinquish control of the weapon at any point during his interaction with police officers. After almost ten minutes of speaking with the officers, the armed subject chose to raise his weapon and point it at the officers. Five Bloomington Police Department officers responded by firing at the armed subject. All five officers were equipped with functioning body worn cameras which recorded audio and video their activity following their arrival on scene. Three of the five officers were armed with their duty handguns and the other two officers were armed with their duty rifles. The armed subject was immediately incapacitated and was ultimately pronounced dead at the scene. An autopsy was performed on February 26, 2025, and indicated that the subject died from multiple gunshot wounds, including shots to the arm, chest, and neck.

A. Initial Contact with the Armed Subject

At approximately 4:43 p.m. on Tuesday, February 25, 2025, BPD dispatch received a call which reported that three individuals had gotten off a bus and then engaged in a brief confrontation with the caller. The caller reported that one of the individuals “lifted his shirt and uh, showed a gun.” The caller gave a description of the individuals and identified the armed subject by clothing. When asked to further describe the gun, the caller told dispatch “I just seen a black handle, ma’am. That’s it. He didn’t, he just lifted, lifted his shirt...[h]e just said don’t find out foe...” At approximately 4:45 p.m., BPD officers arrived in the area where the caller reported the confrontation occurred. At 4:47 p.m., officers located the subject and his two associates. Multiple uniformed BPD officers exited their marked squad cars and approached the subject and his two associates. The officers immediately gave loud verbal commands for all three to put their hands on their heads. The two associates of the armed subject immediately complied

with those commands. During this initial contact, the officers observed that the subject had his right arm tucked inside of his sweatshirt, with his hand near the waistband of his pants. The subject did not comply with the officers' commands and continued backing away from the officers with his hand concealed in his sweatshirt. The officers continued to give commands to the subject to get on his knees and show his hands to the officers. As the subject was walking away from the officers with his hand still concealed in his sweatshirt, an officer asked the associates, "Does he have a gun on him?" One of the associates answered "Yes". The initial responding officers lost sight of the subject after he rounded a corner in a residential area.

B. Contact at 806 Arcadia Drive

At approximately 4:51 p.m., another responding officer located the subject near 806 Arcadia Drive. As the subject observed the marked squad car, he turned around and ran to the parking lot behind 806 Arcadia Drive. At this point, the armed subject had taken off his sweatshirt and the officer observed him holding a weapon in his hand. At 4:52 p.m., the officer orders the armed subject to "put the gun down." The officer radios to other officers, "He's got a gun in his right hand." The armed subject takes up a position behind a sedan that is parked in the parking lot as additional officers arrive on scene. An officer took the lead on trying to deescalate the situation and to convince the armed subject to put his weapon down. The officers on scene remained calm, polite, and empathetic to the armed subject as they continually engaged in efforts to reason with him and convince him to put his weapon down. The armed subject was audibly and visibly agitated and made multiple threats to shoot the officers. His agitation increased during the interaction with officers even though they maintained their calm demeanor with him. Throughout the interaction with the armed subject, multiple officers from different vantage points were calling out on the radio that they could see the gun in his hand and called out what he was doing so that the other officers were aware. As this contact with the armed subject occurred, multiple other officers made efforts to evacuate civilians from the surrounding apartment buildings to lessen the danger the armed subject posed to them. Meanwhile, efforts were being made to have less lethal tools brought to the scene to allow for their use. At 4:57 p.m., a deputy with the McLean County Sheriff's Office was en route from the Sheriff's Office with those tools. At 5:02 p.m., prior to the deputy arriving on scene, and despite the continued efforts of the officers to get him to put his weapon down, the armed subject raised his weapon at the officers.

The armed subject's action of raising his weapon and pointing it at officers resulted in five of the officers firing at him. After the armed subject was down, BPD officers quickly assembled a group to safely approach the armed subject. When they got to the armed subject, they removed his weapon from his right hand, and then immediately began rendering aid. BPD officers also radioed for paramedics to respond to the subject's location. The subject was pronounced dead on the scene.

C. Threats Made by the Armed Subject

During his time speaking with police officers while in the parking lot at 806 Arcadia Drive, the armed subject made multiple threats to harm the officers by shooting them. The following are some of the exchanges between the armed subject and BPD officers:

- **4:54:12 p.m.:**
 - BPD officer: "Why are you doing this?"
 - Armed subject: "Well, I'm not going back to jail."
 - BPD officer: "Why are you doing this, man?"
 - Armed subject: "I'm not going back to fucking jail."

- **4:54:49 p.m.:**
 - BPD officer: "Hey, just drop it bro. You're not in any trouble right now."
 - Armed subject: "Yes, I am."
 - BPD officer: "No, you're not."
 - Armed subject: "I am."
 - BPD officer: "No, you're not."
 - Armed subject: "I'm on probation."
 - BPD officer: "Okay, dude, we can work through that. We can work through that."

- **4:56:41 p.m.:**
 - Armed subject: "If I point this at ya, y'all gonna shoot me?"
 - BPD officer: "[Subject's name], we don't wanna shoot you."
 - Armed subject: "If I point this at y'all, are you gonna shoot me?"
 - BPD officer: "We don't wanna shoot you, bro."
 - BPD officer: "Put the gun down."
 - Armed subject: "Okay, I'm gonna point it at y'all if y'all don't tell me the answer. If I point this at y'all, are ya gonna shoot me?"
 - BPD officer: "We don't wanna shoot you, bro."
 - Armed subject: "If I point at y'all, gonna shoot? If y'all don't answer me..."
 - BPD officer: "We do not want to shoot you [subject's name]. [Subject's name], we're not gonna play ifs, ands, or buts. We don't wanna hurt you. We don't wanna shoot you. We just want you to drop the gun. We can figure out the rest of the stuff."

- **4:58:24 p.m.:**
Cell phone video captured by an apartment resident shows the armed subject holding an item in his hand that appears to be a firearm. The armed subject can be seen hitting the gun against the trunk of the vehicle and the impact sounds metallic.
- **4:58:28 p.m.:**
BPD officer: (over radio) "He's tapping the gun on the car. Still in his right hand."
- **4:58:52 p.m.:**
BPD officer: "Hey, do you wanna be there for your kid?"
Armed subject: "Yeah, of course I do."
BPD officer: "So then why are we doing this?"
Armed subject: "Because I'm not going back to jail."
- **5:00:43 p.m.:**
Armed subject: "It's over bro."
- **5:01:16 p.m.:**
Armed subject: "Move any closer and I'll double tap ya."

NOTE: "Double tap" is a term commonly used to describe rapidly firing two shots from a gun.
- **5:01:29 p.m.:**
Armed subject: "On my momma [racial expletive], move in, I dare ya...."
- **5:01:37 p.m.:**
Armed subject: "How y'all feel, you finna kill a fifteen-year-old!"
BPD officer: (in a low calm voice) "Hey we're calm with you Bro."
Armed subject: (yelling) "Shut yo ass up [racial expletive]!"
BPD officer: (in a low calm voice) "We're calm with you."
Armed subject: (yelling) "Shut yo ass up [racial expletive], before I blow yo shit in!"
BPD officer: "Okay, [subject's name], what is upsetting you?"
BPD officer: "[Subject's name] If you don't put the gun down, you're going to get shot."
Armed subject: "I'm gonna get shot? Say it again."
BPD officer: "You're going to get shot if you don't put the gun down."
Armed subject: "Oh, for real?"
BPD officer: "Yes [subject's name]."
Armed subject: "Oh, for real?"
- **5:02:02 p.m.:**
Multiple BPD officers can be heard saying "Drop it!"

- 5:02:02 p.m.:

Immediately after the officers repeatedly tell the armed subject to “Drop it!”, the armed subject raises his weapon at the officers. Five officers respond to that threat by firing at the armed subject.

D. The Armed Subject’s Weapon

After the armed subject was down on the ground, BPD officers removed the armed subject’s weapon from his hand. When the weapon was seized, it was learned that the weapon was not a firearm; rather, it was an air pistol. The armed subject’s air pistol was sent to the Illinois State Police’s Division of Forensic Services for analysis. The analysis of the air pistol identified it as a Sig Sauer, model P365, Serial Number 20H4597-2, 4.5 mm Semiautomatic air pistol. The laboratory analysis also showed the air pistol was inoperable due to an internal component that was missing. The notes from that analysis provided the following information: “Magazine is missing CO2 retaining screw. Therefore, sufficient pressure cannot be applied to a CO2 cylinder to direct the gas towards propelling a BB down the barrel.”

Review of images of the weapon show that it does not have any visible markings identifying it as a BB gun or air soft gun. The weapon also did not have an orange tip or other coloring at the end of the barrel that would indicate to others that the gun may not be a real firearm. The size and shape of the weapon are consistent with a real Sig Sauer P365, which is the intent of the design, per that company’s website: <https://www.sigsauer.com/p365-air-pistol.html>.

PHOTOGRAPHS OF WEAPON TAKEN BY ILLINOIS STATE POLICE AFTER IT WAS SEIZED



As noted in the previous section of these findings, the officers could hear the armed subject striking the trunk of the car with the weapon making a sound consistent with the weapon being metallic.

During the communication with officers, the armed subject also referred to his weapon as a “gun”. Specifically, at 4:54:46 p.m., he said “y’all know how much fucking money I just spent on this mother fucking gun?”

The armed subject’s air pistol is manufactured by Sig Sauer, Inc.TM and the company’s website advertises that its “1:1 scale replica allows for the use of holsters designed for the real firearm.” The company’s website further indicates that the air pistol has “[s]imilar weight and feel of the P365 9mm firearm.” Additionally, the air pistol is modeled to function like a real P365 firearm and has functions that mirror a real firearm. “‘Blowback’ models closely mimic the operation of a semi-auto firearm....These models are very entertaining to shoot and are excellent training tools since their operation is so close to a semi-auto firearm.” *See* Sig Sauger website noted above.

Throughout the interaction that officers had with the armed subject and his two associates, the officers were never provided any information to indicate that the armed subject’s weapon was an air pistol as opposed to a firearm. One of the associates of the armed subject told officers that he (the associate) had a BB gun in his backpack; however, that associate also asserted to the officer that he believed the armed subject’s weapon was a real gun. During that interaction, the associate told the officer that he believed the armed subject’s gun was not loaded based on having seen it earlier in the day when the three of them were at another location. Regardless of the associate’s belief, the armed subject’s own words and actions led the officers on scene to reasonably believe that the weapon was an actual, loaded, firearm. This was done by the way in which the armed subject utilized the weapon and the armed subject’s repeated threats to shoot the officers. The belief that the weapon was a real firearm was shared by other eyewitnesses. During the investigation by the Illinois State Police, multiple apartment residents told investigators that they saw the armed subject in possession of what they described as a real firearm. No witness told officers that they believed the object in the subject’s hand was a toy, BB gun, air soft gun, or the like.

Investigators were able to search the armed subject's cellular telephone and located messages which appear to show that the armed subject had purchased the air pistol on February 23, 2025. The messages contain information to the armed subject that the weapon was "fake." However, through the investigation, it was discovered that the armed subject had made representations to multiple other individuals that his weapon was a real firearm. The two associates who were with the armed subject during the initial interaction with police officers spoke with Illinois State Police investigators. During those interviews, both associates described how the subject had shown them the weapon up close and that they believed it was a real firearm. Additionally, investigators learned that the subject had previously shared photos of the weapon with others and represented that the weapon was a real firearm. The subject even went so far as to tell others that he knew an older individual with a FOID card, and that person had procured the weapon for him.

IV. Legal Analysis

A. *Use of Force*

In Illinois, the rules governing use of force by a peace officer are set forth in Article 7 of the Criminal Code of 2012. Under Illinois law, a peace officer is justified in using force likely to cause death or great bodily harm when he "reasonably believes, based on the totality of the circumstances, that such force is necessary to prevent death or great bodily harm to himself or [another]." 720 ILCS 5/7-5(a). Prior to using force, "where feasible, a peace officer shall *** make reasonable efforts to identify himself or herself as a peace officer and to warn that deadly force may be used." 720 ILCS 5/7-5(a-5). The use of deadly force shall only be used when the threat of great bodily harm to the officer or another is "imminent." 720 ILCS 5/7-5(a-5). The statute clarifies that "[a] threat of death or serious bodily injury is 'imminent' when, based on the totality of the circumstances, a reasonable officer in the same situation would believe that a person has the present ability, opportunity, and apparent intent to immediately cause death or great bodily harm to the peace officer or another person." 720 ILCS 5/7-5(h)(2).

The remaining provisions of the statute emphasize the gravity of an officer's decision to exercise force, with a focus on the use of deadly force, and set forth the manner in which such

use of force will be evaluated. Section 7-5(c) states that the “authority to use physical force conferred on peace officers” by Illinois law is “a serious responsibility that shall be exercised judiciously and with respect for human rights and dignity and for the sanctity of every human life.” Deadly force is to be used “only when reasonably necessary in defense of human life,” under the particular circumstances of each situation. 720 ILCS 5/7-5(d). When an officer uses force, that decision “shall be evaluated from the perspective of a reasonable officer in the same situation, based on the totality of the circumstances known to or perceived by the officer at the time of the decision, rather than with the benefit of hindsight, and that the totality of the circumstances shall account for occasions when officers may be forced to make quick judgments about using force.” 720 ILCS 5/7-5(f).

It is our unequivocal opinion that the Bloomington Police Department officers were legally justified in their use of deadly force against this armed subject on February 25, 2025. It is clear that upon arrival, the officers were aware that there was an armed subject at-large in the area, and they had been provided undisputed information that the armed subject had already utilized a firearm in a threatening manner. They were given a description that matched the description of the armed subject they personally observed upon their arrival. This initial contact occurred in a residential neighborhood occupied by single-family residences and multiple apartment buildings. The armed subject fled from the officers after they gave him verbal commands to put his hands on his head. While doing so, he kept his hand concealed in his sweatshirt at the front waistband of his pants.

Less than three minutes after his initial flight from officers, he was located near the apartment buildings within the neighborhood. At this point, the officers personally observed him to be in possession of a weapon that bore the distinct appearance of a firearm. In addition to the fact that there were multiple residences in the area, the officers also observed multiple civilians in the immediate vicinity. This included young individuals who had just seen the subject run past them and helped direct the officers to his location. The officers were aware that any bullet fired by the armed subject not only endangered the lives of the officers but endangered the lives of all civilians in the residential neighborhood as well. Officers took steps to evacuate the buildings, but those efforts could not undo the fact that the armed subject was surrounded on multiple sides by apartment buildings while in a heavily populated residential neighborhood in the middle of

the afternoon as people returned home from work. Based on the facts known to them, the officers held the reasonable belief that the subject was armed with a firearm and was willing to use that firearm against the officers. The fact that the weapon was later determined to be an air pistol does not change the reasonableness of their belief. The fact that the air pistol was inoperable also does not change the reasonableness of their belief because that fact was not known to the officers and was not discernible by them. The armed subject defied repeated commands to “drop the gun,” he referred to the weapon as a “gun” when speaking with the officers, and made multiple threats to shoot the officers by making statements such as “I’ll double tap ya” and saying that he would “blow yo shit in.” These actions and statements by the armed subject conveyed what reasonably appeared to the officers to be his present ability, opportunity, and apparent intent to immediately cause death or great bodily harm to the peace officers or another person.

Ultimately, each of the five officers who discharged their weapon was reasonable in their belief, based on the totality of the circumstances known to and perceived by them at the time, that deadly force was necessary to prevent death or great bodily harm to themselves or others. Their conduct comported with the mandates of Article 7 of the Criminal Code of 2012 that deadly force be “exercised judiciously” and “only when reasonably necessary in defense of human life.”

All of the initial responding officers on scene were wearing full BPD uniforms and arrived in BPD squad cars having traveled to the area using police lights. Additional responding officers were either wearing full BPD uniforms or were wearing clothing and gear that clearly identified them as police officers, such as a vest with the BPD emblem displayed on it. Before any officer discharged a weapon, the officers repeatedly commanded the armed subject to “drop the gun” and the armed subject was explicitly told, “[y]ou’re going to get shot if you don’t put the gun down.” There is no doubt that the armed subject heard the commands to drop the gun and knew that the police officers on scene were prepared to use deadly force against him. Even with that knowledge, he chose to raise his weapon and point it at the officers.

B. Duty to Render Aid

Illinois law also imposes a duty on law enforcement officers to, “as soon as reasonably practical, determine if a person is injured, whether as a result of a use of force or otherwise, and render medical aid and assistance consistent with training and request emergency medical

assistance if necessary.” 720 ILCS 5/7-15. As depicted in the body worn camera footage, immediately upon it being safe for officers to approach the subject to a distance at which they could render aid, they began rendering aid by initiating CPR, utilizing a chest seal bandage on one of the wounds, and then transferring care to paramedics who arrived on scene. Medical aid was continued by paramedics until it was determined he was deceased. At the point of that determination, medical aid was no longer necessary and therefore there was neither a legal nor moral obligation to render aid. The autopsy report confirmed that the subject died within minutes of being shot. That autopsy report also contained a summary diagnosis that noted the subject had an ethanol level of 60 mg/dl in his blood. The toxicology report which accompanied the autopsy report clarified that to mean the subject had a BAC of .060 g/100mL at the time of his death.

V. **Concluding Comments**

The State’s Attorney’s Office understands that the officers were faced with one of the most difficult situations that a police officer can encounter, and despite their diligent and admirable efforts to deescalate the situation, they were forced to make the decision to use deadly force. We are grateful for their courage while faced with such an impossible situation and for their efforts to protect the lives of the countless civilians in the area.

Relevant portions of various audio and video files reviewed and analyzed in the preparation of this report will be made publicly available by the Illinois State Police.

