



Aramis D. Ayala  
**State Attorney**  
Ninth Judicial Circuit  
Orange and Osceola County, Florida

Deborah Barra  
Chief Assistant State Attorney

Kamilah L. Perry  
Executive Director/General Counsel

December 29, 2020

Sheriff John W. Mina  
Orange County Sheriff's Office  
2500 W. Colonial Drive  
Orlando, FL 32804

RE: FDLE OR-27-0380

Dear Sheriff Mina:

This letter details my review of the May 26, 2020 incident wherein Deputy Nathan Henley and Deputy Joseph O'Neil engaged in a use of force that included the discharge of their agency firearms. This review is limited to determining whether criminal charges should be filed against the deputies involved in the use of force. The standard of proof for filing a criminal case is whether there is sufficient evidence to prove any violations of the criminal laws beyond a reasonable doubt to a jury. The prosecution also bears the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the use of force was **not** justified pursuant to Florida law. This review does not evaluate the appropriateness of the actions of the involved officers, whether sheriff department policies were followed, or whether the policies, practices, or training of the agency involved were sufficient. That evaluation is left to the administrative review mechanism of the agency.

Generally speaking, criminal liability is established when the evidence is sufficient to prove all the elements of a crime beyond a reasonable doubt. In addition to proving the elements of a crime, the prosecution must disprove any statutorily recognized justification or defense beyond a reasonable doubt.

The use of physical force by law enforcement officers is governed by Florida Statute § 776.05 and provides an affirmative defense to criminal liability as follows:

A law enforcement officer...need not retreat or desist from efforts to make a lawful arrest because of resistance or threatened resistance to the arrest. The officer is justified in the use of any force:

- (1) Which he or she reasonably believes to be necessary to defend himself or herself or another from bodily harm while making the arrest;
- (2) When necessarily committed in retaking felons who have escaped; or
- (3) When necessarily committed in arresting felons fleeing from justice.

However, this subsection shall not constitute a defense in any civil action for damages brought for the wrongful use of deadly force unless the use of deadly

force was necessary to prevent the arrest from being defeated by such flight and, when feasible, some warning had been given, and:

- (a) The officer reasonably believes that the fleeing felon poses a threat of death or serious physical harm to the officer or others; or
- (b) The officer reasonably believes that the fleeing felon has committed a crime involving the infliction or threatened infliction of serious physical harm to another person.

The United States Supreme Court provides the following instruction in assessing the reasonableness of an officer's belief when using physical force:

The "reasonableness" of a particular use of force must be made from the perspective of the law enforcement officer on the scene, rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight... The calculus of reasonableness must embody allowance for the fact that police officers are often forced to make split-second judgments---in circumstances that are tense, uncertain, and rapidly evolving---about the amount of force that is necessary in a particular situation. *Graham v. Conner*, 490 U.S. 386 (1989).

In addition to the affirmative defense provided by F.S. 776.05, law enforcement officers, like any other person, can invoke the protections of Florida Statute 776.012 and 776.032, commonly referred to as Florida's *Stand Your Ground* law. See *State v. Perez*, 259 So.3d 728 (Fla. 2018).

In charging any individual with a crime, it is important to remember that the defendant does not have to present evidence or prove anything. Instead, at a pre-trial Stand Your Ground hearing, the State of Florida is required to prove by clear and convincing evidence that the person is not entitled to self-defense immunity. If the prosecution is successful at the hearing, the State still must prove, beyond a reasonable doubt to a unanimous jury, that the force was **not** justified.

A comprehensive look at the facts of this incident results in the conclusion that the individual and collective use of force by Deputy Henley and Deputy O'Neil was justified and appropriate in this instance.

On May 26, 2020 at approximately 4:39pm, the Orange County Sheriff's Office received a 911 call from Andrew Santisteban complaining that he was battered by his neighbor Tracy Ann Drowne. Deputies responded to 1114 Fountain Coin Loop in the Avalon Park area to speak with Santisteban. While there, Santisteban showed the deputies video shot by his wife and agreed to provide a sworn statement documenting the incident. Santisteban advised that he believed Drowne had a military background, but he did not know if she possessed any weapons.

Deputies Nathan Henley and Joseph O'Neil along with Cpl. Brian Meadows approached the front of Drowne's residence at 1077 Fountain Coin Loop, knocked first and then rang the doorbell. Drowne opened the door forcefully and stepped out onto the porch holding a gun down to her side in her right hand. She ignored commands to "put the gun down, drop it now" and raised and pointed the gun at Deputy Henley. In response, both Deputy Henley and Deputy

O'Neal fired their weapons striking Drowne in the torso three times. Ms. Drowne did not survive her injuries.

The entire incident was captured by the body worn cameras of Deputy Henley and Deputy O'Neil and was observed by neighbors inside their residences. The sworn testimony of both Deputy Henley and Deputy O'Neil is consistent with the sworn testimony of the other law enforcement officers and civilian witnesses on the scene, the crime scene photos and video evidence provided, and the forensic evidence collected from the scene following the incident.

It is instructive here to note the words of our appellate court when reviewing law enforcement uses of force:

As an observation, we question whether a law enforcement officer should ever be, in the absence of intentional misconduct or some degree of malice, criminally responsible for using poor judgment. A police officer, under the circumstances here, is ordered into a life threatening situation. The call usually comes without warning. He does not ask for the assignment, but he is bound to protect society against the violent acts of the unlawful or mentally deranged. Now that same society seeks to punish him for using poor judgment. An officer, in such circumstances, should not be burdened with the knowledge that if he overreacts to the real or imagined dangers he may be committing a crime, especially when those who judge his actions do so with the benefit of perfect hindsight and from a position of safety. *State v. Kadet*, 455 So.2d 389 (Fla. 5<sup>th</sup> DCA 1984)

There is no evidence in this instance that Deputy Henley and Deputy O'Neil exercised poor judgment, committed intentional misconduct or acted with any degree of malice or prejudice. To the contrary, the evidence suggested they each acted in self-defense with force each believed reasonably necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm to himself or his fellow officers. Therefore, a complete review of the investigation leads me to conclude that criminal charges against Deputy Nathan Henley and Deputy Joseph O'Neil are not warranted, and the Office of the State Attorney's review of this incident is complete.

Sincerely,



Linda Drane Burdick  
Assistant State Attorney

Cc: Lee Massey, Special Agent in Charge,  
Florida Department of Law Enforcement,  
Orlando Regional Operations Bureau