

## Fatalities resulting from the use of force by the police in the 2000s

**2000, Merikarvia, shooting.** A man in a state of confusion fled from an ambulance and threatened the police with a billhook. The Supreme Court concluded that one police officer had been guilty of negligent homicide and unjustifiable assault.

**2009, Humpmila, shooting.** During a siege, the police shot an armed man who had threatened to kill a person in the surrounded apartment.

**2010, Pudasjärvi, accidental discharge.** A guard at a police prison died when a police officer accidentally discharged a personal service weapon.

**2012, Vantaa, use of Taser.** The police subdued a man behaving in an uncontrolled manner in a prison by using a Taser on him eight times. The contribution of the electric shocks to his death remains unclear.

**2015, Oulu, shooting.** The police shot a man who was attacking them with an axe, when they raided his flat.

**2016, Tuusula, shooting.** In Riihikallio, Tuusula, the police shot a man during an arrest. The District Prosecutor of the Prosecutor's Office of Eastern Finland decided that there are no probable grounds for suspecting the police officers of a crime, because the police officer using the firearm acted in self-defence. In addition, the pre-trial investigation concluded that there had been no deficiencies in preparing for the use of force. The police who arrived on the scene had equipped themselves with protective shields.

The weapon used by the wanted man turned out to be an air pistol. The District Prosecutor of the Prosecutor's Office of Eastern Finland states that, given the loud noise made by the weapon, the surprising nature of the situation, the lighting and the man's behaviour, the police officer had no way of distinguishing the weapon from an actual firearm. In light of these facts, the police officer acted in self-defence.

**2016 Petäjävesi/Uurainen.** a suicidal and armed man tried to break out of a police blockade on a forest road.

The police were exonerated on the grounds that they had no legal alternatives to the action they took. In the situation, the police had the right to use force. Given that the victim had threatened to kill the police officers, the level of force used – including the shooting of the victim – was deployed in self-defence. The victim had a shotgun and cartridges in his possession. His suicidal behaviour, state of intoxication and resistance to the police were also factors in this assessment.

**2016 Orimattila, VT 4.** A car had run off the road and a man at the scene was in the act of stabbing a woman. A motorcycle officer arrived at the scene and shot the stabber.

According to the statement made by the Prosecutor's Office of Salpausselkä, the police officer's action was one of justifiable homicide. Given the intensity of the unlawful attack on the woman and the nature of the

violence employed, as well as the speed at which the situation developed, the use of force – including the shooting of the man – constitutes protection of the public. In the situation, the police had no genuine alternatives to the action they took.

**2018, Lempäälä, shooting.** On a certain Saturday afternoon (28 April 2018) in Lempäälä, Pirkkala, the police killed a motorist who had shot at a police patrol.

The situation was preceded by a chase of several kilometres, at the end of which the police forced the fleeing motorist to stop by overtaking him and cutting across his car. The man driving the car began shooting at the police patrol, hitting one police officer in the upper body and face. Following this, two police officers fired at the shooter, who died after being struck by the police bullets.

In a press release of 26 June 2018, the Prosecutor's Office of Eastern Uusimaa stated the following :  
No pre-trial investigation would be initiated regarding the police officers. The preliminary investigation had shown that, during the exchange of shots, the police officers had acted in self-defence, proceeded in the appropriate manner, and there were no grounds to suspect that they had committed an offence. Information gathered from the investigation demonstrates that, during the chase, the stopping of the motorist and his apprehension, the preparatory measures used by the police were a response to a situation in which the use of force was necessary. The investigation also confirms that the police acted appropriately and there are no grounds for suspecting them of committing an offence.