Gordon P. McLaughlin
District Attorney

201 LaPorte Avenue, Suite 200
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521-2763

Phone: (970) 498-7200
Fax: (970) 498-7250

November 16, 2026

RE: October 12th, 2026, Critical Incident Response Team investigation of the officer-involved shooting on Colorado State University Campus, incident numbers FCPD FC26- 0015809, LCSO SO26-0009318, LPD LP26-0008324, CSUPD CS26-0001478, and EPPD EP26-0000681.

Chief Stacey Clement,

Pursuant to the 8th Judicial District Critical Incident Protocol, the District Attorney's Office reviewed the October 12, 2026, incident in which a law enforcement officer (specifically, Colorado State Police Department Sergeant Wil Nichols) fired his handgun at a citizen, which occurred on Colorado State University Campus, in Larimer County. This review is required by C.R.S. §16-2.5-301, § 20-1-114 and the 8th Judicial District CIRT protocol.

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Applying the law to the facts of this incident, as described in greater detail below, I conclude Sergeant Nichols was legally justified in his use of physical force to protect his life, the lives of others in the immediate vicinity, and to affect the arrest of Brooks Bottenhorn on October 12, 2026. Having concluded that the peace officer was justified in his use of physical force, no criminal charges can or will be filed against him by the District Attorney.

II. THE STATUTORY FRAMEWORK FOR OFFICER-INVOLVED SHOOTING INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEW

C.R.S. § 16-2.5-301 governs investigations into peace officer-involved actions leading to injury or death. It provides, in relevant part:

> Each police department, sheriff's office, and district attorney within the state shall develop protocols for participating in a multi-agency team, which shall include at least one other police department or sheriff's office, or the Colorado Bureau of Investigation, in conducting any investigation, evaluation, and review of an incident involving the discharge of a firearm by a peace officer that resulted in injury or death, or other use of force by a peace officer that resulted in death. The law enforcement agencies participating need not be from the same judicial district.

The process for this investigation is further outlined in the 8th JD Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT) Protocol and is governed by the rigorous procedures of our multi-agency team consisting of personnel from agencies within the jurisdiction who are members of the district's CIRT. In this investigation, Fort Collins Police Services was the lead agency, and it was assisted by other

agencies, including Loveland Police Department, the 8th Judicial District Attorney's Office, Colorado State University Police Department, Estes Park Police Department, and the Larimer County Sheriff's Office.

C.R.S. § 20-1-114 provides:

> The district attorney shall, if no criminal charges are filed following the completion of an investigation pursuant to section 16-2.5-301, C.R.S., release a report and publicly disclose the report explaining the district attorney's findings, including the basis for the decision not to charge the officer with any criminal conduct. The district attorney shall post the written report on its website or, if it does not have a website, make it publicly available upon request.

As Brooks Bottenhorn has been criminally charged for his conduct*, the District Attorney must abide by Colorado's ethical and procedural rules to protect the Constitutional rights of the defendant and the integrity of the criminal case. Specifically, Rule 3.8. (Special Responsibilities of a Prosecutor) provides in relevant part:

> The prosecutor in a criminal case shall:
>
> (f) except for statements that are necessary to inform the public of the nature and extent of the prosecutor's action and that serve a legitimate law enforcement purpose, refrain from making extrajudicial comments that have a substantial likelihood of heightening public condemnation of the accused unless such comments are permitted under Rule 3.6(b) or 3.6(c) and exercise reasonable care to prevent investigators, law enforcement personnel, employees or other persons assisting or associated with the prosecutor in a criminal case from making an extrajudicial statement that the prosecutor would be prohibited from making under Rule 3.6 or this Rule.

Therefore, the details in this report will be curtailed to comply with the letter and spirit of the ethical rules and to protect the integrity of the ongoing case, while providing sufficient information to satisfy the intent of C.R.S. § 16-2.5-301, § 20-1-114, the 8th JD CIRT Protocol, and the community's right to understand the actions of law enforcement in critical incidents.

**All charges against Brooks Bottenhorn are merely allegations and he is presumed innocent of all charges filed against him unless and until he is proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.*

III. MATERIALS REVIEWED

I have been provided with materials produced during the CIRT investigation to review in making these conclusions. The information I have considered in this review includes:

- Relevant body-worn camera footage of the involved officer
- Reports/summaries of the CIRT investigators
- Recorded interview of the officer involved

- Recorded and summarized interviews of lay witnesses
- Photographic and video evidence, including comprehensive scene documentation
- Physical evidence and analysis (*e.g.*, scene measurements and CBI ballistics testing)
- Background and contextual evidence

IV. APPLICABLE LAW

Colorado's relevant use of force statutes and legal definitions:

§18-1-901 (3)(d), C.R.S. "Deadly physical force" means force, the intended, natural, and probable consequence of which is to produce death, and which does, in fact, produce death.

§18-1-707, C.R.S. (Use of force by peace officers—definitions), states in relevant part:

> (1) Peace officers, in carrying out their duties, shall apply nonviolent means, when possible, before resorting to the use of physical force. A peace officer may use physical force only if nonviolent means would be ineffective in effecting an arrest, preventing an escape, or preventing an imminent threat of injury to the peace officer or another person.
> (2) When physical force is used, a peace officer shall:
> (a) Not use deadly force to apprehend a person who is suspected of only a minor or nonviolent offense;
> (b) Use only a degree of force consistent with the minimization of injury to others;
> (c) Ensure that assistance and medical aid are rendered to any injured or affected persons as soon as practicable; and
> (d) Ensure that any identified relatives or next of kin of persons who have sustained serious bodily injury or death are notified as soon as practicable.
> (4) A peace officer shall identify himself or herself as a peace officer and give a clear verbal warning of his or her intent to use firearms or other deadly physical force, with sufficient time for the warning to be observed, unless to do so would unduly place peace officers at risk of injury or would create a risk of death or injury to other persons.

§18-1-704, C.R.S., Colorado's general self-defense statute states in relevant part:

> (1) [A] person is justified in using physical force upon another person in order to defend himself or a third person from what he reasonably believes to be the use or imminent use of unlawful physical force by that other person, and he may use a degree of force which he reasonably believes to be necessary for that purpose.

Under Colorado law, a person acts legally to defend themselves or others when both a "reasonable belief and actual belief" exist on behalf of the actor. *See Sanchez v. People*, 820 P.2d 1103, 1108 (Colo. 1991). The law requires the fact finder to "weigh all relevant circumstances to determine whether a person asserting the defense of self-defense has acted as a reasonable person would act in similar circumstances." *Id.*

V. SUMMARY OF LEGAL STANDARD AS APPLIED TO THIS EVENT

As a threshold legal matter, the level of force used by Sergeant Nichols in this case was not "deadly force" as defined by Colorado law, as no death occurred. Colorado law necessitates both the intent to cause death and the result of death for a deadly force analysis to be applicable. So, while Sergeant Nichols' action in firing his handgun at Mr. Bottenhorn carried the obvious risk of death, his actions must be reviewed under the general use of force standard as required by Colorado law.

When condensing the legal authority down to an applicable standard to apply to this event, and since deadly physical force was not used, we must determine:

1) Whether Sergeant Nichols attempted to utilize nonviolent means prior to resorting to use of force against Mr. Bottenhorn and whether nonviolent means would have been ineffective in effecting an arrest or preventing the escape of Mr. Bottenhorn or preventing an imminent threat of injury to Sergeant Nichols or others.

2) Whether Sergeant Nichols used only a degree of force consistent with the minimization of injury to others.

3) Whether Sergeant Nichols or his fellow officers ensured that assistance and medical aid were rendered to Mr. Bottenhorn as soon as it was practicable after the shooting and notified his next of kin about the injuries.

4) Whether Sergeant Nichols identified himself as a police officer and gave warnings with sufficient time for the warnings to be observed, unless doing so would create unreasonable risk.

VI. SUMMARY OF RELEVANT FACTS.

Because there has been a criminal case filed against Mr. Bottenhorn, the facts, and at times the specific attribution, herein are intentionally limited primarily to those which are, or are likely to be prior to a jury trial, available in the public record and which have also been corroborated by the review of additional evidence gathered in the CIRT investigation. Additional facts, if any, are provided only as necessary to explain the findings in accordance with C.R.S. § 20-1-114 and the public's rightful interest in transparency.

All references to Mr. Bottenhorn's conduct remain merely allegations and he retains the presumption of innocence unless and until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Call for Service

On October 12, 2016, at approximately 5:35pm, Colorado State University Police Department received multiple calls for service regarding suspicious circumstance near the Microbiology Building, located at 401 W Pitkin Street in the City of Fort Collins, County of Larimer, State of

Colorado. The callers indicated a male was screaming and acting erratic outside, circling the building, and punching a window. He was described as a white male, 20-21 years old, wearing a hat, gray shirt, and a gray backpack. Sergeant Wil Nichols responded to the scene, arriving at approximately 5:49pm. Sergeant Nichols responded on his own due to a separate ongoing, high-priority law enforcement need on campus and the fact that no report indicated any weapons were involved at that time.

Review of Body Worn Camera

Sergeant Nichols' body worn camera was active and reviewed by the CIRT. It shows an individual consistent with the reports to dispatch, later identified as Brooks Bottenhorn, striking the entry door to the Microbiology building. Several loud bangs can be heard consistent with strong pounding against the glass door. A subsequent, distinct, loud bang can be heard, consistent with a gunshot, emanating from Mr. Bottenhorn. The gunshot occurs approximately nine seconds after Sergeant Nichols exits his vehicle, as he is still walking towards the building to speak with Mr. Bottenhorn.

Mr. Bottenhorn then turns away from the building and begins walking toward Sergeant Nichols. At that time, you can see Mr. Bottenhorn holding an object in his hands, later determined to be a handgun. Sergeant Nichols draws his firearm and yells, "police, put it down, hands up!" Mr. Bottenhorn continues to advance toward Sgt. Nichols, screaming loudly and unintelligibly at Sergeant Nichols. Mr. Bottenhorn's right hand rises from his waist with the handgun and begins to angle upward. The angle of the handgun as it was raised was pointed towards, or very close to, the direction of Sergeant Nichols. Sergeant Nichols fires his weapon four times in immediate succession, striking Mr. Bottenhorn in his right arm. Investigators later determined he was approximately 28 feet from Mr. Bottenhorn when he fired. As the shots are fired, the handgun leaves Mr. Bottenhorn's hand and falls to the ground as Mr. Bottenhorn himself then falls to the ground. The firearm landed near the corner of the building and remained in that position until Forensic Investigators collected it. As Mr. Bottenhorn begins to fall, Sergeant Nichols stops firing. It is unclear if Mr. Bottenhorn intentionally discarded the firearm based on Sergeant Nichols' commands; or if the upward motion of raising his arm, combined with the impact of the bullet, dislodged the firearm from his grip.

The images below are screen captures from Sergeant Nichol's body-worn camera showing Mr. Bottenhorn holding the firearm at waist level, then raising it and, lastly, the firearm as it fell to the ground immediately after he is shot.



Sergeant Nichols approaches Mr. Bottenhorn and gives him commands to lay on his stomach. Sergeant Nichols then holsters his firearm, alerts dispatch that shots were fired and the suspect is down, within approximately 15 seconds of the shooting. With Mr. Bottenhorn incapacitated, it was apparent at that time there was no remaining or ongoing threat to the campus community.

Sergeant Nichols began medical aid within approximately 30 seconds of the shooting, applying two tourniquets to Mr. Bottenhorn's right arm to stop significant bleeding. Other officers began to arrive within approximately three minutes and paramedics arrived within approximately seven minutes and relieved Sergeant Nichols of medical responsibilities. Ultimately, Mr. Bottenhorn was transported to the hospital for further treatment and he survived his injuries.

Crime Scene Investigation

Detectives from Fort Collins Police Services and the Larimer County Sheriff's Office responded to take control of scene security and interviewed multiple witnesses to the events before and during the exchange between Mr. Bottenhorn and Sergeant Nichols. Witness accounts of Mr. Bottenhorn's actions before the shooting were consistent with the 911 calls, including erratic behavior and pounding against the building. No witnesses were aware that Mr. Bottenhorn possessed a weapon until he fired the first shot.

Forensic Investigators from Loveland Police Department and Fort Collins Police Services conducted a crime scene investigation. A black Taurus handgun was located on scene at the corner of the Microbiology building, near where Mr. Bottenhorn had fallen to the ground. The location is consistent with body-worn camera footage showing Mr. Bottenhorn's firearm landing there after he released it. The handgun was loaded with a round in the chamber and six rounds of ammunition, all with the identifying marks S&B 9x19 24. A bullet casing with the same markings was located outside the front entrance of the Microbiology building. An ATF trace showed the Taurus was legally purchased by Mr. Bottenhorn in 2025.

Through the investigation, a defect was identified in the entry door to the Microbiology building consistent with a bullet hole. The hole was on the same door where Bottenhorn was seen at the time of the first gunshot, as observed on body worn camera. Bullet fragments were later identified in the ceiling inside the entrance of the building. Analysis by the Colorado Bureau of Investigation confirmed that the casing and the bullet fragments were consistent with having been fired from Mr. Bottenhorn's Taurus handgun. It is unknown why Mr. Bottenhorn fired into the building.

Four additional casings with the identifying marks, Speer 9mm Luger, were located in the direct vicinity of where Sergeant Nichols was standing at the time he fired his duty weapon. These casings matched the duty ammunition carried by Sergeant Nichols and a round count by CIRT investigators confirmed four missing rounds. It is believed that two rounds struck Mr. Bottenhorn in the arm and two additional rounds hit the building behind him. No one in the building or outside was injured except for Mr. Bottenhorn.

Review of Additional Video Footage

While Colorado State University has cameras in the area, no cameras directly captured the incident. However, cameras in the near vicinity of the Microbiology building show a busy campus environment at the time of the shooting. The intersection to the south of the incident, Center Ave Mall and West Lake Street, from where Mr. Bottenhorn had entered campus, was teeming with students traveling in all directions through campus. Cameras also observed Mr. Bottenhorn circling the building multiple times and provided other evidence consistent with witness reports. The roundabout at Newton's Plaza just north of the incident, and within range of fire from Mr. Bottenhorn's location, had approximately 10 students walking through at the exact time of the shooting. While not all areas can be directly observed, it is likely dozens of students were in the immediate vicinity and would have been at risk at the time Sergeant Nichols made the decision to use force to stop Mr. Bottenhorn.

One witness was very close to the incident and directly down range of the direction Mr. Bottenhorn was advancing in and in the general direction where he was pointing his firearm. The image below shows a screen capture of body-worn camera footage at the moment Sergeant Nichols exited his vehicle. He proceeded up the sidewalk past the student and seconds later the shooting occurred. The student was approximately 46 feet from Mr. Bottenhorn and reported to CIRT investigators they fell behind the wall to take cover after hearing the shot.



Sergeant Nichols' Interview

Sergeant Nichols was interviewed by CIRT investigators on October 15th, 2026. This interview timeframe fell outside of the parameters set forth by the 8th Judicial District Critical Incident protocol, which specify interviews should be conducted no later than two sleep cycles, up to 48 hours, from the incident (8th JD CIRT Protocol, Managing the Investigation, "4. Involved Police Employee Interview," p. 33). Like any other person, law enforcement officers maintain all their Constitutional rights (including their right to remain silent in a criminal investigation) and the CIRT cannot force officers to interview but instead relies on voluntary cooperation and adherence to agreed upon CIRT protocols. It is the belief of this District Attorney's Office that delayed interviews in any serious incident, such as an officer-involved shooting, can negatively impact the investigation. In this incident in particular, significant media coverage occurred given its location on a college campus and the multiple witnesses who shared their accounts publicly. The closer in time to an incident that an interview occurs, the more likely memories will be fresh and unimpacted by outside accounts.

Sergeant Nichols reported he had been told prior to his interview by a third party, not in law enforcement, that media reports said Mr. Bottenhorn shot first. He stated he had not reviewed any other reports. In some investigations that critical fact could taint recollections and the investigation. However, in this incident it is clear from body-worn camera video that Mr. Bottenhorn did shoot first and the remainder of Sergeant Nichols' recollection was also consistent with body-worn camera footage (which, per CIRT policy, officers do not review prior to their interview). Sergeant Nichols fully cooperated with all investigative questions and gave a thorough accounting of his actions, which were corroborated by the full investigation. Therefore, while a violation of the protocol did occur, it did not impact the investigation nor did it impact our final legal decision on the use of force.

Sergeant Nichols reported that when he arrived, he immediately identified Mr. Bottenhorn as the suspect who was reported and was surprised by how hard Mr. Bottenhorn was hitting the door of the building. He felt he needed to intervene quickly before the window in the door was broken. He

then witnessed Mr. Bottenhorn turn towards him with a handgun pointed at an upward angle and fire a single shot. At the time, Sergeant Nichols did not know exactly where the fired round went. He reported that he was scared because he had no place to take cover, had no backup and Mr. Bottenhorn had showed clear willingness to use the firearm despite police presence by firing right in front of him, stating "he demonstrated 'I have a gun and I'm willing to use it.'" Sergeant Nichols went on to state, "I didn't know why he was shooting, is he going to shoot me next or the other bystanders next?" Sergeant Nichols believed the only way to stop Mr. Bottenhorn was to use his weapon and fire at him, stating he had "no other option but to return fire…I think if I hadn't shot him, he would have shot me." He reported firing four or five shots and stopped as soon as he saw Mr. Bottenhorn begin to fall to the ground.

Sergeant Nichols reported that he does not carry a taser but did not believe a taser would be within range at the distance or be a safe option given Mr. Bottenhorn was brandishing a firearm. He reported no other less-lethal options, such as physical confrontation, would have been effective at that point either. Sergeant Nichols identified the significant student presence in the area as a serious concern in his decision to stop Mr. Bottenhorn and said he believed Mr. Bottenhorn would have shot him (Sergeant Nichols) if he wasn't stopped. He reported he did not see the gun released from Mr. Bottenhorn's hand during the exchange and only spotted the gun on the ground as he approached Mr. Bottenhorn to render aid.

CRIMINAL CHARGES

Brooks Bottenhorn is currently charged with the following offenses:

1. **Felony Menacing – Real Weapon** (C.R.S. 18-3-206, Class 5 Felony),
2. **Illegal Discharge of a Firearm** (C.R.S. 18-12-107.5, Class 5 Felony),
3. **Possession of a Weapon on a Schoolground** (C.R.S. 18-12-105.5, Class 1 Misdemeanor),
4. **Prohibited Use of a Weapon - Intoxication** (C.R.S. 18-12-106), Class 1 Misdemeanor),
5. **Reckless Endangerment** (C.R.S. 18-3-208, Class 2 Misdemeanor), and
6. **Criminal Mischief** (C.R.S. 18-4-501, Class 6 Felony).

These charges are merely allegations, and Mr. Bottenhorn is presumed innocent unless and until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

VII. CONCLUSION.

The District Attorney's Office makes the following findings regarding the relevant questions posed by this CIRT investigation:

1) Whether Sergeant Nichols attempted to utilize nonviolent means prior to resorting to use of force against Mr. Bottenhorn and whether nonviolent means would have been ineffective in

preventing an arrest or preventing the escape of Mr. Bottenhorn or preventing an imminent threat of injury to Sergeant Nichols or others.

Sergeant Nichols arrived at Mr. Bottenhorn's location only moments before Mr. Bottenhorn fired his handgun. Sergeant Nichols was responding alone, with no backup in the immediate vicinity. He had observed multiple people in the area, which is a busy thoroughfare on campus. Body worn camera video shows one student sitting on a wall just adjacent to Sergeant Nichols' initial location. Sergeant Nichols was aware from dispatch reports and brief personal observation that Mr. Bottenhorn was highly agitated and acting erratically. Sergeant Nichols observed Mr. Bottenhorn fire his handgun. The trajectory was not specifically known to Sergeant Nichols at the time. Later investigation revealed Mr. Bottenhorn fired into the building. However, given the location of Sergeant Nichols himself and others in the vicinity, it was clear Mr. Bottenhorn firing his handgun presented an obvious and immediate danger to human life.

Sergeant Nichols gave commands to Mr. Bottenhorn, "police, put it down, hands up!" but the incident was unfolding quickly, and Mr. Bottenhorn had already turned toward Sergeant Nichols and was approaching him, closing the distance and screaming loudly after Sergeant Nichols gave him commands. As Mr. Bottenhorn turned toward Sergeant Nichols, the handgun in Mr. Bottenhorn's right hand was pointed in the general direction of Sergeant Nichols and the student on the wall and Mr. Bottenhorn then began to raise the firearm.

As Sergeant Nichols explained in his interview, his understanding of the situation was Mr. Bottenhorn demonstrating, "I have a gun and I'm willing to use it." While careful review of the body worn camera video and the totality of the evidence cannot definitively determine Mr. Bottenhorn's intentions in raising his gun – whether to comply with commands by tossing it away or raising it in order to fire – that intent could not have been known to Sergeant Nichols as the firearm was raised towards him, an action which does form the basis of the allegation of Felony Menacing. Regardless of Mr. Bottenhorn's unknown intent, the sequence of events supports Sergeant Nichols' having a clear and reasonable fear that his life was in danger at the moment he fired.

It was also apparent that Mr. Bottenhorn was not only firing and brandishing his weapon near Sergeant Nichols but was also doing so in the direct vicinity of many students on the busy campus thoroughfare. Mr. Bottenhorn's erratic behavior, demonstrated willingness to fire his gun, his continued possession of the gun, his advance toward where defenseless students were seated and walking, led to an objective and reasonable fear for the safety and lives of those students which required Sergeant Nichols to act. While it is unknown what would have occurred if not for Sergeant Nichols' intervention, it is possible he saved the lives of students on campus.

2) Whether Sergeant Nichols used only a degree of force consistent with the minimization of injury to others.

Sergeant Nichols was not carrying a taser and therefore had fewer less-lethal options to deploy. While not required by CSUPD department policy, it is unusual for an officer in Larimer County to decline the full breadth of less-lethal options. However, given the totality of circumstances presented here, use of a taser would have been an ineffective option. Among the factors which

would have prevented less lethal response from being prudent were the lack of cover officers to serve as lethal or less-lethal backup, Mr. Bottenhorn's demonstrated willingness to fire his handgun, Mr. Bottenhorn beginning to approach Sergeant Nichols, the rapidly unfolding events, and the ongoing danger presented by Bottenhorn's continued brandishing of the firearm in the general direction of multiple people.

Sergeant Nichols fired four rounds, all directed at Mr. Bottenhorn, in a direction with no obvious downrange danger to human life. Upon seeing Mr. Bottenhorn fall to the ground, Sergeant Nichols ceased firing.

3) Whether Sergeant Nichols or his fellow officers ensured that assistance and medical aid were rendered as soon as was practicable after the vehicle intervention and notified next of kin about the injuries.

Sergeant Nichols immediately approached Mr. Bottenhorn after he fell to the ground. Sergeant Nichols had not seen Mr. Bottenhorn discard the firearm, but upon approach saw that it landed far enough away to prevent him from easily obtaining it. Sergeant Nichols then holstered his own firearm and immediately began rendering aid, including applying multiple torniquets to stop significant blood loss and verbally reassuring Mr. Bottenhorn they would attempt to save his life. Recognizing the severity of the situation, Sergeant Nichols conducted these lifesaving efforts prior to even conducting a pat-down or weapons check on Mr. Bottenhorn. Medical aid was turned over to fellow officers and EMTs upon their arrival and Mr. Bottenhorn was transferred to a hospital soon thereafter. Mr. Bottenhorn survived his injuries.

Later that same night, CIRT investigators traveled outside of Larimer County to personally notify and interview the parents of Mr. Bottenhorn.

4) Whether Sergeant Nichols identified himself as a police officer and gave warnings with sufficient time for the warnings to be observed, unless doing so would create unreasonable risk.

Sergeant Nichols arrived in a fully marked CSUPD vehicle which was parked directly in front of Mr. Bottenhorn's location. Sergeant Nichols was in a standard, clearly visible CSUPD uniform. Sergeant Nichols announced to Mr. Bottenhorn, "police, put it down, hands up!" while he had his gun drawn and pointed at Mr. Bottenhorn in a manner Mr. Bottenhorn could see. The requirement to identify himself as a police officer was thereby complied with and the requirement to give a use of force warning was implied by the circumstances. Mr. Bottenhorn did not have sufficient time between that warning and the shots to comply. However, in the totality of circumstances, waiting longer while Mr. Bottenhorn had the gun out, and pointed in the general direction of Sergeant Nichols and/or the student on the wall, would have created unreasonable risk. Therefore, this requirement was complied with to the extent it reasonably could be and is satisfied.

The totality of the evidence presented through the CIRT investigation reveals Sergeant Nichols was legally justified in his use of force on October 12, 2026, as an act of self-defense and defense

of others. As a result, the District Attorney's Office concludes that no charges can or will be brought against Sergeant Nichols.

The District Attorney's Office would like to thank the members of the Eighth Judicial District Critical Incident Response Team for their work on this investigation.

Respectfully,

Gordon McLaughlin
District Attorney
8th Judicial District