



ARE YOU A SITTING DUCK FOR A LAWSUIT?

Cities, agencies, trainers, etc., may be sitting ducks for wrongful death or injury lawsuits brought against them on behalf of police officers and innocent civilians injured or killed in close quarters armed encounters.

Police and civilians are trained in, and tested on current police close quarters shooting methods of applying deadly force.

Most if not all of those methods, employ the use of one or both sights when shooting.

However, a review of videos of shootouts shows that those close quarters shooting methods ARE NOT used in gunfights.

Further, police accuracy is only around 20%

Lastly, police casualty rates are atrocious.

Darrell Mulroy (deceased as of 2003), a training expert, who reviewed hundreds of videos said, "You still ASSUME you will look at the gun in a real shooting. Wish we could find it on REAL videos of such things. We are still looking 900+ videos later."

I have seen several such videos. In them, the shooters do not aim. They point their guns and blast away.

As such, it is no wonder that the police hit rate is less than 20%, that police casualty rates are atrocious, and that tragic accidental shootings occur frequently.

Over the last ten years, per FBI data, police were shot and killed at the rate of 1 every 7 days, and thousands and thousands were wounded. And you can expect the same for the next ten years unless things change.

In addition to the human costs of these tragedies, millions and millions of our tax dollars have been lost to paying for them in the past; and unless changes are made, millions and millions more will be lost to them and the legal actions that flow from them in the future.

Simply put, current training programs and guns are not doing the job. Current training programs do not teach shooting methods that occur in close quarters armed encounters, and current guns do

not have a practical means for aiming them at day or night in those situations.

If there is any fault to be found, I suggest that if you are a mayor, politician, chief, sheriff, representative, trainer, or gun maker, you look in your mirror. Don't look to the trainees.

They are not in charge, you are.

Ask your legal staff if they have any liability concerns about training people to use methods of applying deadly force in their self defense, which based on videos, are not used in real close quarters encounters, and then allowing the trainees to put themselves in close quarters situations where they may be shot and killed.

Also ask them if they have any liability concerns about the fact that four out of five bullets shot by police in close quarters encounters, will most likely miss and may hit or kill someone else.

Ask them those questions as they relate to police and others who have been shot in past, and those who will be shot in the future.

If you are the shooter, be concerned because if you are involved in a close quarters shooting and survive by some quirk of fate, it is YOU who will be sliced up and placed under the microscope of a shooting investigation or a civil trial, or criminal trial, not THEM.

Keep in mind that if the current shooting methods which are being taught, and current guns, are not doing the job for the gun carrying professionals, then the same can be said for the millions and millions of non professionals who have a gun at home for self defense.

Ask any trainer if they have ever seen a video/s that show Sight Reliant Shooting being used in a real close quarters shooting. You would think there would be hundreds if not thousands of them. If they say yes, ask them to show you one or two.

End.