

Non-Fatal Officer Involved Shooting of [REDACTED]

Los Angeles Police Department

Officer Steven Earner, #42543

Officer Jordan Fifer, #43607

J.S.I.D. File #25-0001



NATHAN J. HOCHMAN

District Attorney

Justice System Integrity Division

July 14, 2026

MEMORANDUM

TO: CAPTAIN OMAR BAZULTO
Los Angeles Police Department
Force Investigation Division
100 West First Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

FROM: JUSTICE SYSTEM INTEGRITY DIVISION
Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office

SUBJECT: Non-Fatal Officer Involved Shooting of [REDACTED]
J.S.I.D. File #25-0001
L.A.P.D. File #F056-24

DATE: July 14, 2026

The Justice System Integrity Division of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office (LADA) has completed its review of the December 26, 2024, non-fatal shooting of [REDACTED], a minor, by Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) Officers Steven Earner and Jordan Fifer. We have determined the evidence supports a reasonable belief by the officers that the use of deadly force was necessary in self-defense and the defense of others.

The LADA Command Center was notified of the shooting at approximately 8:35 p.m. on December 26, 2024. The District Attorney Response Team responded to the scene and was given a briefing and walk-through by LAPD Lieutenant Anthony Ljubetic.

The following analysis is based on LAPD investigative reports and other materials, including recorded interviews, photographs, body worn camera video (BWV), digital in-car video systems (DICVS) and radio communications submitted to this office by the LAPD Force Investigation Division (FID) on April 8, 2026.¹ Compelled statements of the shooting officers, if they exist, were not considered in this analysis.

FACTUAL ANALYSIS

On December 26, 2024, at approximately 6:39 p.m., LAPD Southeast Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) Officers Earner and Fifer were on patrol in the area of 92nd Street and Hooper Avenue in

¹ FID's investigation included reviews of 51 BWV recordings, DICVS footage, ballistic testing, trajectory analysis, and witness interviews. Investigators canvassed the area but located no civilian witnesses and no external surveillance footage.

the City of Los Angeles.² As the officers approached the intersection, the patrol vehicle's DICVS captured an individual, later identified as [REDACTED], a minor, spray painting a wall.^{3,4}

DICVS also captured [REDACTED] as he stood near the rear of a parked gray Nissan Rogue sport utility vehicle.⁵ As Earner and Fifer drove toward the location to take enforcement action, DICVS captured [REDACTED] raising a handgun and firing in the direction of the officers.

Within seconds of shots being fired at them, Fifer exited the patrol vehicle and fired multiple rounds from his service weapon at [REDACTED]. Earner exited the patrol vehicle, used the patrol vehicle's door for cover, and also fired rounds from his service weapon.

Immediately after the shooting, the three suspects fled eastbound in the Nissan Rogue. Earner and Fifer re-entered the patrol vehicle and joined responding officers in pursuit.

Officers Isaiah Peltekian and Lorenzo Dominguez, who had been following loosely behind, heard the gunfire and observed the Nissan Rogue fleeing. The vehicle had a shattered rear windshield. Peltekian requested backup and initiated a vehicle pursuit.

The high-speed pursuit continued through multiple streets and into the City of Compton.⁶ The Nissan Rogue ultimately pulled over voluntarily near Bullis Road and Compton Boulevard. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] exited the vehicle and were taken into custody without incident. [REDACTED] did not exit the vehicle because he had been shot.

An arrest team approached the vehicle, removed [REDACTED] from the rear seat, confirmed he had a pulse, and immediately began rendering medical aid until paramedics arrived. [REDACTED] was transported to Saint Francis Medical Center, where he underwent surgery for a gunshot wound to his lower back.

² Earner was the driver of the patrol vehicle. Fifer was seated in the front passenger seat. The patrol vehicle was marked and equipped with DICVS.

³ Neither Earner's nor Fifer's statements, if any, have been reviewed. Thus, this factual analysis references only what is observable via DICVS and BWV, rather than any statements by the officers.

⁴ Both officers' BWV devices were in "buffer mode" when the shooting occurred. As a result of BWV manufacturer settings, audio and video are both recorded upon activation by the officer. The previous minute of video, without audio (buffer mode) is also captured.

⁵ Investigators determined a third individual, later identified as [REDACTED], remained seated in the driver's seat. Because of his location, [REDACTED] was not captured on DICVS.

⁶ Investigators determined the pursuit lasted approximately seven minutes and forty seconds and covered approximately seven miles.

Witness Statements⁷

Statement of Officer Peltekian⁸

On December 28, 2024, investigators interviewed Peltekian. Peltekian said he and Dominguez were following Earner and Fifer's patrol vehicle when he heard gunshots coming from the direction of Hooper Avenue.

As they approached the intersection, he observed Earner and Fifer's patrol vehicle stopped with its doors open. The two officers were actively engaged in a gunfight with suspects he could not yet clearly see.

He immediately broadcast a call for assistance. He then observed the suspects' gray Nissan SUV fleeing eastbound with its rear windshield shot out. Peltekian and Dominguez activated their lights and sirens and initiated the vehicle pursuit.

Statement of Officer Dominguez⁹

On December 28, 2024, investigators interviewed Dominguez. Dominguez stated he observed Earner and Fifer conducting a stop near 92nd Street and Hooper Avenue. As he turned eastbound toward the stop to assist, he heard approximately eight gunshots and observed Fifer taking a shooting stance outside the patrol vehicle.

Dominguez stated he then observed multiple suspects jump into a vehicle with a shattered rear windshield and flee eastbound from the scene. He and Peltekian pursued the Nissan Rogue which drove in excess of 100 miles per hour.

Statement of [REDACTED]

On December 28, 2024, investigators interviewed [REDACTED].¹⁰ [REDACTED] said he drove his vehicle to Ted Watkins Memorial Park after receiving a text message from his cousin, [REDACTED], requesting a ride. [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] entered the front passenger seat while [REDACTED] sat in the rear seat. [REDACTED] told investigators he had never previously met [REDACTED], who introduced himself as "[REDACTED]."

[REDACTED] said [REDACTED] directed him to stop the vehicle near a wall marked with "[REDACTED]," [REDACTED] observed [REDACTED] retrieve a spray-paint can from inside the vehicle and exit the car with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] then crossed out the "MTS" with spray paint.¹¹

⁷ All interviews referenced in this memorandum were recorded.

⁸ This interview was compelled.

⁹ This interview was compelled.

¹⁰ [REDACTED] was advised of and waived his Miranda rights and agreed to speak to investigators.

¹¹ Gang members and taggers frequently cross out rival graffiti to assert control over a location, retaliate against rivals, or signal conflict between groups.

Approximately 30 seconds later, [REDACTED] heard gunshots. [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] told him [REDACTED] had “shot the cop.” Simultaneously, [REDACTED] repeatedly instructed [REDACTED] to “Go! Go! Go!”

[REDACTED] said he drove away from the scene because he was scared and believed officers might shoot at him.

Video Recordings

Investigators reviewed multiple video recordings related to the incident, including DICVS, and BWV recordings from the shooting officers.

DICVS captures [REDACTED] spray painting a wall, [REDACTED] standing near the suspects’ vehicle, and [REDACTED] firing a handgun at the officers. The footage shows the officers returning fire and the suspects fleeing in their vehicle. BWV recordings show the officers taking cover behind their patrol vehicle, returning fire after being shot at, pursuing the fleeing suspects, coordinating a high-risk vehicle stop, and rendering medical aid to [REDACTED].

The following is a timeline of the incident derived from the combined relevant recordings:

At 6:39:15 p.m., DICV captures the officers approaching the intersection of 92nd Street and Hooper Avenue. [REDACTED] can be observed spray-painting graffiti on a wall at the southeast corner of the intersection. [REDACTED] is standing near the rear of a gray Nissan Rogue SUV parked at the curb.

At 6:39:16 p.m., DICV captures [REDACTED] producing a handgun and firing directly toward the officers. The video captures a visible muzzle flash from [REDACTED]’s firearm.

At 6:39:18 p.m., BWV depicts Earner exiting the driver’s side of the patrol vehicle, utilizing the door as cover, and firing five rounds from his service weapon in the direction of [REDACTED].¹²

At 6:39:20 p.m., BWV depicts Fifer moving from the rear of the patrol vehicle into a position behind and to the left of Earner.

At 6:39:22 p.m., BWV captures Fifer discharging six total rounds from his service weapon. Fifer fires four rounds from a standing position and two additional rounds from a kneeling position as the suspects’ vehicle flees eastbound.¹³

At 6:39:25 p.m., DICV captures Peltekian and Dominguez arriving eastbound on 92nd Street immediately after the shooting. The video depicts their patrol vehicle pulling behind the fleeing Nissan Rogue with emergency lights activated.

At 6:39:26 p.m., BWV depicts Earner re-entering the driver’s side of the patrol vehicle while Fifer enters the passenger side. The officers initiate pursuit of the Nissan Rogue.

¹² Investigators determined this distance to be approximately 43 feet.

¹³ Investigators determined this distance to be increasing from approximately 63 feet to 183 feet.

At 6:47:00 p.m., DICV and BWV captures the Nissan Rogue stopping.

At 6:53:53 p.m., BWV captures the tactical approach to the Nissan Rogue.



DICVS Still from Earner and Fifer's Patrol Vehicle at the moment [REDACTED] Fired.

Forensic and Physical Evidence

Investigators recovered a .45-caliber semi-automatic pistol from the Nissan Rogue. Investigators determined the pistol contained one live round in the chamber and four live rounds in the magazine.

Two .45 caliber cartridge casings recovered at the scene were forensically matched to [REDACTED]'s handgun.

A bullet fragment recovered during surgery from [REDACTED]'s back had rifling characteristics consistent with Earner's service weapon.

Ballistic and trajectory analysis identified multiple bullet impacts on the suspects' vehicle and at the scene.

Testing confirmed both officers' ammunition counts were consistent with the number of rounds fired.



Firearm was Recovered from inside the Nissan Rogue.

Additional Information

On December 30, 2024, [REDACTED] was charged in juvenile case CM0889B with two counts of assault with a semi-automatic firearm on a peace officer, in violation of Penal Code section 245(d)(2). On February 26, 2026, the matter was resolved for a grant of home on probation.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

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. 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 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 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. Penal Code § 835a(b), (c)(1)(A), and (c)(1)(B).

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. Penal Code § 835a(e)(2).

“Totality of circumstances” means all facts known to or perceived by the peace officer at the time, including the conduct of the officer and the subject leading up to the use of deadly force. The peace officer’s decision to use force is not evaluated with the benefit of hindsight and shall

account for occasions when officers may be forced to make quick judgments about using force. Penal Code § 835a(a)(4) and (e)(3).

The evidence establishes [REDACTED] initiated the encounter by firing a handgun directly at Earner and Fifer as they approached to investigate a suspected vandalism. The officers were confronted with an immediate and objectively reasonable fear of death or serious bodily injury when [REDACTED] discharged multiple rounds in their direction.

Under these circumstances, the officers were not required to delay their response, retreat, or employ less-lethal options before using deadly force. A reasonable officer in the same situation would have understood [REDACTED]'s actions as presenting an imminent lethal threat requiring an immediate response to stop the attack.

The justification for deadly force did not end the instant the suspects entered the Nissan Rogue. At the time the officers returned fire, there was no indication [REDACTED] ceased to pose a deadly threat. Rather, he was actively escaping from the scene immediately after attempting to shoot police officers. Under these rapidly evolving circumstances, a reasonable officer could conclude [REDACTED] remained armed and dangerous and continued to pose a threat of death or serious bodily injury to officers or members of the public until apprehended.

The available video evidence, physical evidence, and witness statements consistently demonstrate the officers' use of force was reactive, proportional, and limited to the duration of the threat. Both officers returned fire only after [REDACTED] opened fire on them.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, Earner and Fifer could reasonably believe [REDACTED] posed an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to themselves and others and the use of deadly force was necessary to defend against that threat.

CONCLUSION

Based on the available evidence, we conclude Earner and Fifer acted lawfully in self-defense and the defense of others when they fired their service weapons. Additionally, Earner and Fifer acted lawfully by using deadly force to apprehend a fleeing felon who threatened or resulted in death or serious bodily injury unless immediately apprehended.