



SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

BILL BROWN, SHERIFF- CORONER

Professional Results In Daily Effort

Sworn Personnel, Custody and Supervisors

On, Tuesday August 20th, 2019, Assembly Bill 392 was signed by the Governor. This is the piece of legislation that changes the use of force standard in California. This bill will become **Effective** as of **January 1, 2020**.

Here are some important highlights of the legislation:

1. AB 392 changes Penal Code 196 and 835(a).
2. Use of force must be “objectively reasonable” rather than “reasonable”, meaning it is no longer a subjective standard. Now the standard, is what a reasonable officer would think, rather than what they would do.
3. Any peace officer who has reasonable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed a public offense may use objectively reasonable force to effect the arrest, to prevent escape, or to overcome resistance.
4. Deadly force can only be used when necessary to defend against an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or another person. (see definition of imminent threat in bill language)
5. That the decision by a peace officer to use force 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.
6. Individuals with physical, mental health, developmental or intellectual disabilities are more likely to experience greater use of force. Officers will need to take this into consideration as these individuals may not have the ability to comply or follow commands based upon their disability.
7. When apprehending a fleeing felon, it must be for a felony that threatened or resulted in death or serious bodily injury AND the officer must reasonably believe that the person will cause death or serious bodily injury to another unless immediately apprehended. ADDITIONALLY, when feasible a peace officer shall, prior to the use of force, make reasonable efforts to identify themselves as a peace officer to warn that deadly force may be used.
8. Deadly force should not be used when the danger is just to the subject only (i.e. solo suicide subject) and/or the officer believes the subject does not pose an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the peace officer or another person.

The Training Bureau Cadre strongly encourages you to read the **Attached Final Version of the Bill**.

This standard has not been changed since it was enacted in 1872. Much of the update complies to what agencies are already practicing.

Last week, POST EXO and LTR staff worked with Commission Chair, Joyce Dudley and District Attorneys from Riverside and Imperial Counties to dissect the terminology in this bill and interpret it for all POST agencies. With the information we established, the DA's participated in the video that will serve as a legal update. Please look for that information in the coming months.

Also, Senate Bill 230 (the use of force training bill) is still in Assembly Appropriations. That bill is expected to move forward but given the fiscal components will most likely go all the way until the bill signing deadline in October. That bill directly affects POST. The Training Bureau Cadre will keep you updated as it moves along.

Respectfully,

Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Training Bureau

Assembly Bill No. 392
CHAPTER 170

An act to amend Sections 196 and 835a of the Penal Code, relating to peace officers.

[Approved by Governor August 19, 2019. Filed with Secretary of State August 19, 2019.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 392, Weber. Peace officers: deadly force.

Existing law authorizes a peace officer to make an arrest pursuant to a warrant or based upon probable cause, as specified. Under existing law, an arrest is made by the actual restraint of the person or by submission to the custody of the arresting officer.

Existing law authorizes a peace officer to use reasonable force to effect the arrest, to prevent escape, or to overcome resistance. Existing law does not require an officer to retreat or desist from an attempt to make an arrest because of resistance or threatened resistance of the person being arrested.

Under existing law, a homicide committed by a peace officer is justifiable when necessarily committed in arresting a person who has committed a felony and the person is fleeing or resisting such arrest.

Existing case law deems such a homicide to be a seizure under the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and as such, requires the actions to be reasonable.

This bill would redefine the circumstances under which a homicide by a peace officer is deemed justifiable to include when the officer reasonably believes, based on the totality of the circumstances, that deadly force is necessary to defend against an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or to another person, or to apprehend a fleeing person for a felony that threatened or resulted in death or serious bodily injury, if the officer reasonably believes that the person will cause death or serious bodily injury to another unless the person is immediately apprehended.

The bill would also affirmatively prescribe the circumstances under which a peace officer is authorized to use deadly force to effect an arrest, to prevent escape, or to overcome resistance.

DIGEST KEY

Vote: MAJORITY Appropriation: NO Fiscal Committee: NO Local Program: NO

BILL TEXT

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1.

Section 196 of the Penal Code is amended to read:

196. Homicide is justifiable when committed by peace officers and those acting by their command in their aid and assistance, under either of the following circumstances:

- (a) In obedience to any judgment of a competent court.
- (b) When the homicide results from a peace officer's use of force that is in compliance with Section 835a.

SEC. 2.

Section 835a of the Penal Code is amended to read:

835a.

(a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(1) That the authority to use physical force, conferred on peace officers by this section, 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. The Legislature further finds and declares that every person has a right to be free from excessive use of force by officers acting under color of law.

(2) As set forth below, it is the intent of the Legislature that peace officers use deadly force only when necessary in defense of human life. In determining whether deadly force is necessary, officers shall evaluate each situation in light of the particular circumstances of each case, and shall use other available resources and techniques if reasonably safe and feasible to an objectively reasonable officer.

(3) That the decision by a peace officer to use force shall be evaluated carefully and thoroughly, in a manner that reflects the gravity of that authority and the serious consequences of the use of force by peace officers, in order to ensure that officers use force consistent with law and agency policies.

(4) That the decision by a peace officer to use force 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, 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.

(5) That individuals with physical, mental health, developmental, or intellectual disabilities are significantly more likely to experience greater levels of physical force during police interactions, as their disability may affect their ability to understand or comply with

commands from peace officers. It is estimated that individuals with disabilities are involved in between one-third and one-half of all fatal encounters with law enforcement.

(b) Any peace officer who has reasonable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed a public offense may use objectively reasonable force to effect the arrest, to prevent escape, or to overcome resistance.

(c) (1) Notwithstanding subdivision (b), a peace officer is justified in using deadly force upon another person only when the officer reasonably believes, based on the totality of the circumstances, that such force is necessary for either of the following reasons:

(A) To defend against an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or to another person.

(B) To apprehend a fleeing person for any felony that threatened or resulted in death or serious bodily injury, if the officer reasonably believes that the person will cause death or serious bodily injury to another unless immediately apprehended. Where feasible, a peace officer shall, prior to the use of force, make reasonable efforts to identify themselves as a peace officer and to warn that deadly force may be used, unless the officer has objectively reasonable grounds to believe the person is aware of those facts.

(2) A peace officer shall not use deadly force against a person based on the danger that person poses to themselves, if an objectively reasonable officer would believe the person does not pose an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the peace officer or to another person.

(d) A peace officer who makes or attempts to make an arrest need not retreat or desist from their efforts by reason of the resistance or threatened resistance of the person being arrested. A peace officer shall not be deemed an aggressor or lose the right to self-defense by the use of objectively reasonable force in compliance with subdivisions (b) and (c) to effect the arrest or to prevent escape or to overcome resistance. For the purposes of this subdivision, “retreat” does not mean tactical repositioning or other deescalation tactics.

(e) For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) “Deadly force” means any use of force that creates a substantial risk of causing death or serious bodily injury, including, but not limited to, the discharge of a firearm.

(2) 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 serious bodily injury to the peace officer or another person. An imminent harm is not merely a fear of future harm, no matter how great the fear and no matter how great the likelihood of the harm, but is one that, from appearances, must be instantly confronted and addressed.

(3) “Totality of the circumstances” means all facts known to the peace officer at the time, including the conduct of the officer and the subject leading up to the use of deadly force.

