

DIRECTIONS: 1) Determine the perceived degree of compliance or non-compliance presented. 2) Follow the arrows to the right, stopping at the green boxes. Follow the arrows downward. Appropriate force options, depending upon the circumstances confronted, may include one or more of the intersected choices, either used alone or in combination with others. 3) Continually reassess use of appropriate force options by repeating steps 1 and 2. NOTE: No use of force decision can be accurately reduced to a simple diagram while adequately taking into consideration all of the facts and circumstances with which an officer is confronted when deciding what force is appropriately used in any given circumstances. As a result, the Matrix should be considered only as a guide and a training aid in framing the use of force decision.

BASIC CONCEPTS UNDERLYING THE USE OF FORCE MATRIX

- 1. All legitimate uses of force in a law enforcement or custodial setting are ultimately justified by an articulable need to exert some level of *control* over another person.
- 2. It is the *subject's actions* which dictate the quality and quantity of force used by an officer in response thereto in order to exert control.
- 3. The need to exert control over another person in a law enforcement or custodial setting is often characterized by rapid and unpredictable changes requiring the officer to continually reassess a subject's actions as well as his or her response to those actions.
- 4. A proper application of force in any given set of circumstances is as much influenced by the *quality* of the force applied, and by the *timeliness* with which it is applied, as it is by the *quantity* of force applied.
- 5. The decision to use force in a tactical environment is *not progressive* in nature. Rather, the use of force inquiry focuses on the *reasonableness* of the force options actually employed.
- 6. The use of force inquiry focuses not on what the most prudent course of action may have been, but instead whether the seizure actually effectuated falls within a range of conduct which is objectively reasonable. There exists no legal requirement to choose the one "correct" means of gaining control over a subject through the use of force.
- 7. The appropriateness of a use of force decision is properly judged on the basis of the *reasonableness of an officer's perception* of the subject's actions with which he was confronted at the time he made the decision to use force rather than upon absolute fact.
- 8. The appropriateness of a decision to employ a *particular tool* in response to a perceived threat depends on the *degree of control* which is reasonably likely to result based on all of the circumstances known to the officer at the time the tool is employed.
- 9. The degree of force which can be appropriately used to respond to a threat *increases proportionally* in relation to the degree of threat reasonably perceived by an officer, and to the immediacy of the response required.
- 10. The reversibility of a decision to use force is inversely proportional to the degree of force employed.
- 11. The greater the degree of force employed, the more likely it is that (a) *physical injury* will result, and (b) the resulting *physical injury will be serious in nature*.
- 12. The greater the probability of injury to a subject, the greater the potential for *liability* to the officer. The greater the probability that a particular technique will result in officer control, the greater the *advantage* for the officer.