



State Attorney

MONIQUE H. WORRELL

Ninth Judicial Circuit Serving Orange and Osceola Counties

415 N. Orange Avenue
P.O. Box 1673
Orlando, FL 32801
407-836-2400

April 28, 2026

Sheriff John Mina
2500 W. Colonial Drive
Orlando, Florida 32804

RE: Officer-Involved Critical Incident Involving Orange County Sheriff's Office Deputy Matthew Verley, FDLE OR-27-0506, UF26-14

Dear Sheriff Mina,

The Office of the State Attorney for the Ninth Judicial Circuit is responsible for reviewing all investigations into Officer-Involved Critical Incidents (OICI) that occur in Orange and Osceola counties. On April 2, 2026, the Office of the State Attorney received all documents from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement detailing their complete investigation into an OICI by **Orange County Sheriff's Office Deputy Matthew Verley** on December 26, 2025.

I am writing to advise you that our review of this investigation is complete and that the Office of the State Attorney has determined that there has been no violation of Florida Law; and therefore, our office will not be filing criminal charges against **Orange County Sheriff's Office Deputy Matthew Verley** for his use of force against Corey Levon Andrews.

Please find attached the final report from the State Attorney's Office detailing our review of this OICI. Documents and supporting evidence submitted to this agency are public records under Florida Statute 119 once our investigation has been completed and can be obtained via email request to PublicRecords@sao9.org.

Sincerely,

Monique H. Worrell
State Attorney

Cc: DanielleGill@fdle.state.fl.us - FDLE

Enclosed: SAO OICI Report 2026-UF-14

Officer-Involved Critical Incident
Investigation of
Orange County Sheriff's Office Deputy
Matthew Verley
December 26, 2025



State Attorney's Office
Ninth Judicial Circuit of Florida
Orange and Osceola Counties
April 23, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	THE STATE ATTORNEY’S ROLE IN OFFICER-INVOLVED CRITICAL INCIDENTS.....	1
II.	OFFICE POLICY ON OFFICER-INVOLVED CRITICAL INCIDENTS.....	1
III.	APPLICABLE FLORIDA LAW.....	1
IV.	THE FACTS OF THIS OFFICER INVOLVED CRITICAL INCIDENT	2
V.	KEY EVIDENCE REVIEWED.....	3
VI.	LEGAL FINDINGS.....	3
VII.	CONCLUSIONS.....	6

I. STATE ATTORNEY ROLE IN OFFICER-INVOLVED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

The State Attorney's Office ("SAO") has the responsibility of reviewing all investigations of Officer Involved Critical Incidents ("OICI") that occur within the Ninth Judicial Circuit of Orange and Osceola Counties. The Florida Department of Law Enforcement ("FDLE") acts as an independent law enforcement agency which investigates the OICI. The State Attorney's Office receives the investigation packet from FDLE and conducts its own independent review of FDLE's investigation. The SAO will pursue any supplemental investigation that it believes is necessary. The purpose of this independent review is to determine whether there exists any violation of criminal law. In making that determination, the SAO acknowledges and agrees that OICI resulting in the loss of life or great bodily injury must be handled with a high level of attention, diligence, and transparency.

II. OFFICE POLICY ON OFFICER- INVOLVED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

The SAO understands the importance of an independent, thorough, and transparent investigation of all OICI. As such, please find the SAO's policy on all OICI as EXHIBIT "A"

III. APPLICABLE FLORIDA LAW

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 Florida Statute § 776.05, a law enforcement officer, like any other person, can invoke the protections of Florida Statutes §§ 776.012 and 776.032, commonly referred to as Florida's “Stand Your Ground” law. *See State v. Peraza*, 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.

IV. THE FACTS OF THIS OFFICER INVOLVED USE OF FORCE

FDLE was tasked with investigating this officer involved use of force. All reports, audio files, video files, and photographs referenced in their 101-page report were reviewed by the State Attorney's Office. At the time of this officer use of force, there was a policy in place for an Assistant State Attorney and State Attorney Investigator to respond to the scene—Assistant State Attorney Sean Wiggins and State Attorney Investigators Greg Vasturino and Andrew Parkinson responded to the Orange County Sheriff's Office headquarters. The State Attorney's Office received this FDLE investigation on April 2, 2026.

V. KEY EVIDENCE REVIEWED

The key evidence to this officer involved use of force includes:

1. Surveillance video from the apartment complex: CCTV-09...214242
2. Body worn camera footage from Deputies Christopher Marcus (driver), Matthew Verley (front passenger), Adam Villar (rear driver's side), and Jonathan Aldaz (rear passenger's side)
3. Recorded interview of Deputy Eric Rivera
4. Recorded interview of Deputy Adam Villar
5. Recorded interview of Master Deputy Christopher Marcus
6. Recorded interview of Deputy Jonathan Aldaz
7. Recorded interview of Ahmed German Jr.

VI. LEGAL FINDINGS

On December 26, 2025, at 9:43 p.m. members of the Orange County Sheriff's Office ("OCSO") were staging to serve a search warrant for a murder suspect's ("German") DNA samples. German was seen outside of his apartment at 2000 Buchanan Bay Circle with Cory Levon Andrews ("Andrews")—who generally resembled German. German and Andrews separated as Deputies Christopher Marcus (driver), Matthew Verley (front passenger), Adam Villar (rear driver's side) and Jonathan Aldaz (rear passenger's side) approached in an unmarked Jeep Laredo. German walked to the left from the deputies' perspectives while Andrews remained on the sidewalk to their right. Deputy Marcus stopped the car suddenly between German and Andrews. The two deputies on the passenger side of the Jeep opened their doors first, and before they could make any announcements, give any commands (Deputy Aldaz was in the process of giving a command), or stand and display their tactical vests which identified them as law enforcement, Andrews fired two rounds from a .40 caliber pistol in their direction with one round striking the Jeep Laredo's rear passenger quarter panel— inches away from Deputy Aldaz as he was attempting to get out of his seat.



Deputy Aldaz's body worn camera ("BWC")



Deputy Aldaz's BWC as Andrews is firing his .40 caliber pistol



Surveillance video from apartment complex showing Andrews reaching into his right pocket to retrieve his .40 caliber pistol



Andrews' right arm raised and firing at the Jeep Laredo

After Andrews fired two rounds at the deputies, Deputy Aldaz stumbled as he was trying to take cover behind the building (behind the staircase) in the above pictures. Deputy Verley fired his rifle ten times in the direction of Andrews, striking him at least once. FDLE's report does not specify how many times Andrews was struck—he survived, declined to provide a statement, and was arrested for Aggravated Assault on a Law Enforcement Officer with a Firearm and Attempted Shooting into an Occupied Vehicle. As of April 23, 2026, the State Attorney's Office has not made a filing decision on these charges.

Under Florida Statute § 776.012, officers are permitted to defend themselves just as any other citizen is allowed to do. *State v. Peraza*, 259 So.3d 728 (Fla. 2018). The deputies were there to serve a signed search warrant for German's DNA samples. Before any of the deputies could even exit the vehicle, Andrews had fired two rounds from a .40 caliber pistol at them.

Given that, it cannot be proven beyond a reasonable doubt that Andrews did not present a reasonable risk of great bodily harm or death to members of the OSSO and the general public when Deputy Matthew Verley fired his service weapon at Andrews and injured him.

VII. CONCLUSION

The State Attorney's Office's role is to, evaluate, independently review, and pursue criminal charges when the use of force is not justified. After a thorough review of the evidence in this matter and our review of applicable Florida law, it cannot be proven beyond a reasonable doubt that Deputy Matthew Verley's use of force violated any laws of the State of Florida. We will take no further action in this matter.