

Protect the Public.

RESTRICT USE OF FORCE

The lack of direction provided to officers on when to use force and what techniques are appropriate has resulted in **tragic and unwarranted** deaths, injuries, and trauma. Regulations on categorically dangerous policing practices (ex. chokeholds and shooting into moving vehicles) have a proven track record of **reducing officer involved deaths without exposing police to danger**. State legislators can act now to **save lives** by creating explicit barriers to police uses of force.

Departments that prohibit or heavily restrict specific dangerous police practices have

54% FEWER KILLINGS PER ARREST

than agencies with vague standards.

The Use of Force Project 2021

WE NEED A BILL THAT WILL...

Prohibit or sharply restrict violent practices, including

chokeholds; prone restraints; shooting into fleeing vehicles; no knock raids

Establish clear and separate standards

for use of force vs. use of deadly force

Prohibit deadly force in instances when

a person only poses a risk to themselves or property

Require officers to intervene

when a colleague uses excessive force

Require officers to report

all instances of prohibited use of force to command-level supervisors

Require training

on restrictions and standards for use of force

Establish a cause of action for violations of the statute

to ensure victims of excessive force can seek civil remedies

Support non-police crisis intervention programs

*The Truth About***USE OF FORCE****MYTH**

The police should be able to use their discretion on what tactics they use.

FACT

While legal standards should, and do, **provide police officers with some discretion**, there are certain tactics that should be categorically banned or sharply restricted. These tactics—such as chokeholds and shooting into fleeing vehicles—**do not make police more effective**, but do **substantially** heighten the **risk of harm or death** for individuals who come into contact with the police.

MYTH

Issues of excessive force can be addressed through better police training.

FACT

Even among agencies that have created effective restrictions, limitations on consequences for policy violations have severely undermined their ability to enforce those standards. Even in states where police agencies have adopted more restrictive use of force policies, there is **value in creating a mechanism where victims** of police violence **can address concerns** about their treatment through an independent body.

MYTH

More restrictive use of force laws will increase the risk of physical harm to officers.

FACT

Regulations on categorically dangerous policing practices—like chokeholds and shooting into fleeing vehicles—have **a proven track record of reducing officer-involved deaths without exposing police to danger**. Police officers in departments that have implemented more restrictive use of force policies are less likely to be assaulted or killed in the line of duty than those in departments that have not implemented more restrictive policies.

MYTH

Excessive force can be limited by a police department's internal policies.

FACT

While some police departments provide explicit restrictions on when force can be used, these rules provide only piecemeal protection to civilians and are not legally binding. Absent clear, legally enforceable guideposts, communities, in particular communities of color and people with disabilities, are vulnerable to serious injury and death in situations that should be deescalated.

MYTH

There is no use restricting certain uses of force if qualified immunity is still in place.

FACT

Any effective use of force statute would include an enforcement mechanism for precisely this reason. Legislators should include language that permits people harmed by violations of the statute to pursue relief through civil remedies and bar defenses based on immunities. Violations of the statute should also carry a potential penalty of decertification.