



INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION

Report Concerning the Police-Involved Death in
Baltimore County May 18, 2025

December 2, 2025

Public Release: December 9, 2025

Declination Report Concerning the Police-Involved Death of Glenn Pettie, Jr. on May 18, 2025

The Independent Investigations Division of the Maryland Office of the Attorney General (the “IID”) is charged with investigating “police-involved incidents that result in the death of individuals or injuries likely to result in death.”¹ If the Attorney General determines that the investigation provides sufficient grounds for prosecution, then the IID “shall have exclusive authority to prosecute the offense.”²

I. Introduction

On May 18, 2025, at approximately 7:30 p.m., two officers with the Baltimore County Police Department (“BCPD”) responded to a 911 call reporting a mental health crisis in the 8200 block of North Boundary Road in Dundalk. Upon arrival, one of the officers contacted the 911 caller and proceeded to the alley behind the residence while the other officer remained at the front door. The officer in the alley encountered a man matching the description provided, and the man fired a handgun at the officer. During the encounter, the man and the officer in the alley exchanged gunfire until the man ceased fire because he was wounded. Officers rendered medical aid until emergency medical services (“EMS”) arrived on scene and transported the man to an area hospital, where he was pronounced dead a short time later. Neither officer was injured.

After completing its investigation and evaluating all the available evidence, the Office of the Attorney General has determined that the subject officer did not commit a crime under Maryland law. Accordingly, the Attorney General has declined to prosecute any of the subject officers in this case.

The IID’s investigation focused exclusively on potential criminal culpability relating to the subject officers’ conduct. By statute, the IID only has jurisdiction to investigate the actions of police officers, not those of any other individuals involved in the incident. Moreover, the IID’s analysis does not consider issues of civil liability or the department’s administrative review of the subject officers’ conduct. Compelled statements by subject officers may be considered in civil or administrative processes but may not be considered in criminal investigations or prosecutions due to the subject officers’ Fifth Amendment rights. If any compelled statements exist in this case, the IID has not considered them in this investigation.

This report is composed of a factual narrative followed by a legal analysis. Every fact in the narrative is supported by evidence obtained during this investigation, including forensic and autopsy reports, police radio transmissions, dispatch records, police and EMS reports, body-worn camera footage, private surveillance camera footage, photographs, departmental policy, and interviews with civilian and law enforcement witnesses. The subject officers in this case chose not to make statements to the IID, which had no impact on the prosecutorial decision.

The legal analysis explains why the IID will not bring charges under the relevant Maryland statutes.

¹ Md. Ann. Code, State Gov’t § 6-602 (c)(1).

² Md. Ann. Code, State Gov’t § 6-604 (a)(1).

This investigation involved one decedent and one subject officer:

- A. The decedent, Glenn Pettie, Jr., was 43 years old at the time of the incident. He was a White male who lived in Dundalk, Maryland.
- B. Officer Michael Brady has been employed by the BCPD since July 2020. He is a White male and was 26 years old at the time of the incident.

The IID reviewed all available departmental disciplinary records and criminal histories of these involved parties and where they existed, determined that none were relevant to the legal analysis.

II. Factual Summary

On May 18, 2025, at approximately 7:25 p.m., Baltimore County 911 received a call that a White male, later identified as Glenn Pettie, Jr., was experiencing a “psychotic breakdown” in his house in the 8200 block of Boundary Road in Dundalk, Maryland. The caller reported that Mr. Pettie had been violent in the past but was not currently violent, and expressed fear that Mr. Pettie was going to hurt someone or get himself hurt by instigating a conflict. The call was dispatched as a dual EMS/police response to a person with a mental disorder and a history of violence. Two BCPD officers, including Officer Michael Brady, responded and arrived at the house at approximately 7:34 p.m.

Upon arrival, Officer Brady approached the front door, knocked, and identified himself as a police officer while a witness officer stood nearby. A male voice responded from inside Mr. Pettie’s house, but after roughly a minute of conversation, no one came to open the door. At that point, Officer Brady returned to his police cruiser and contacted the 911 caller. The caller told Officer Brady to go to the back of the house. At approximately 7:36 p.m., after directing the witness officer to wait at the front door, Officer Brady walked toward the back door of Mr. Pettie’s house.

Officer Brady arrived at Mr. Pettie’s backyard fence about a minute later and saw Mr. Pettie standing in his open back doorway. Mr. Pettie was having a conversation with an adult relative, who was standing on the porch. Officer Brady greeted them both, and the relative quickly walked away from Mr. Pettie and stood next to a fence near a neighbor’s yard.³

³ In an interview with IID investigators, Mr. Pettie’s relative indicated that he moved away because he saw that Mr. Pettie had a gun and feared a confrontation might occur.



Image 1: A still image from Officer Brady's body-worn camera, capturing the moment that Mr. Pettie (circled in red) fired his handgun at Officer Brady.

A moment later, Mr. Pettie fired a handgun inside of the house and Officer Brady verbally ordered Mr. Pettie to drop the gun. At 7:38 p.m., Mr. Pettie leaned out of the doorway and fired his handgun at Officer Brady. Officer Brady ducked behind a nearby garbage can and fired his departmentally issued handgun at Mr. Pettie, then moved to take cover behind a vehicle in the alleyway. For approximately the next minute, Officer Brady and Mr. Pettie intermittently exchanged gunfire, while Officer Brady communicated with dispatch and repeatedly ordered Mr. Pettie to drop his weapon. The witness officer, who had run to the rear of the house when the shooting started, took cover behind a shed near Officer Brady's

At 7:39 p.m., the shooting stopped. Officer Brady ordered Mr. Pettie to drop the gun and come out of the house. Mr. Pettie, who had been wounded during the gunfight, dropped his weapon and began walking out of the rear doorway with his arms outstretched. Officer Brady holstered his departmentally issued handgun, moved toward Mr. Pettie, then helped Mr. Pettie lay on the ground and handcuffed him with the assistance of the witness officer. Once Mr. Pettie was handcuffed, the witness officer secured Mr. Pettie's handgun, which had a live round in the chamber. The witness officer then worked with Officer Brady to stabilize Mr. Pettie. Approximately two minutes later, Baltimore County Fire Department firefighters arrived on scene, and took over the medical care while Officer Brady briefed them about Mr. Pettie's injuries. The firefighters transported Mr. Pettie to a local hospital, where he was later pronounced dead.



Image 2: A crime scene photo of Mr. Pettie's handgun, which was recovered by a witness officer with a live round in the chamber.

Investigators later recovered two notes written by Mr. Pettie at the crime scene, indicating that Mr. Pettie was experiencing mental health struggles and suicidal thoughts.

III. Supplemental Information

A. Autopsy

On May 19, 2025, the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (the “OCME”) performed an autopsy on Mr. Pettie. The Medical Examiner determined that a gunshot wound to the neck caused Mr. Pettie’s death and determined that the manner of death was “Homicide.”⁴ There was no evidence of soot deposition or gunpowder stippling on the wound, meaning that Mr. Pettie was not shot at close range.

B. Firearms Recovery and Ballistics Information

Maryland State Police forensic technicians responded to the scene, and while processing the scene, recovered Officer Brady’s departmentally issued handgun, a Glock 17 9mm semi-automatic handgun, and Mr. Pettie’s handgun, a FNH .45 caliber semi-automatic handgun. Additionally, eleven fired 9mm cartridge cases and eight fired .45 caliber cartridge cases were recovered from the scene. Forensic testing confirmed that both weapons were operable.

C. Department Policy

The BCPD Field Manual contains written policies and guidelines, including those that address the use of force and the discharge of firearms by its sworn officers.

Under Section 12-1.0, officers must, if reasonable and feasible, try to communicate with a subject and de-escalate a conflict without resorting to using force. Additionally, officers are directed to use “the least amount of force necessary and proportional to safely control a situation” and may not use force against a person unless that force is necessary and proportional to “prevent an imminent threat of physical injury to a person” or to “carry out the duties and responsibilities of a law enforcement officer.” The policy provides that force is “not necessary unless there is no reasonable alternative to using force that, under the totality of the circumstances, would safely and effectively achieve the same legitimate ends.” Further, officers may not use deadly force unless it is necessary and proportional to protect a person from imminent death or serious harm, and all other alternatives have either been exhausted or are unreasonable given the circumstances. After using force, as soon as it is safe and feasible to do so, officers are responsible for rendering “basic first aid to persons injured as a result of police action” that is consistent with their training and promptly requesting appropriate medical assistance. The policy does not elaborate on what metrics officers use to determine the safety or feasibility of rendering aid in any given situation, nor does it provide an overview of the sort of first aid training that officers receive.

⁴ Manner of death is a classification used to define whether a death is from intentional causes, unintentional causes, natural causes, or undetermined causes. The OCME uses five categories of manner of death: natural, accident, suicide, homicide, and undetermined. “Homicide” applies when death results from a volitional act committed by another person to cause fear, harm, or death. This term is not considered a legal determination; rather, they are largely used to assist in the collection of public health statistics. *A Guide for Manner of Death Classification*, First Edition, National Association of Medical Examiners, February 2002.

Field Manual Article 12-4.0 governs the use of firearms, which limits the discharge of firearms to six specific circumstances, including self-defense from death or serious injury and in defense of another person from death or immediate danger of serious physical injury.

IV. Legal Analysis

After a criminal investigation, prosecutors must determine whether to bring criminal charges against a person to hold them accountable pursuant to Maryland law. When making that determination, prosecutors have a legal and ethical duty to charge a person with a crime only when they can meet the State's burden of proof; that is, when the available evidence can prove each element of that crime beyond a reasonable doubt. Prosecutors must also determine whether the accused person could raise an affirmative defense. In those cases, prosecutors not only need to prove the crime, but they also need to determine whether the evidence could disprove the defense beyond a reasonable doubt. Ultimately, the decision to bring any charges rests on whether the available evidence is sufficient for prosecutors to meet those standards.

Based on the evidence, three relevant offenses were considered in this case. First is the violation of Maryland's Use of Force Statute, which makes it a crime for officers to intentionally use excessive force.⁵ The second and third offenses are homicide related charges based on the intentional killing of a person.

There is insufficient evidence to prove that Officer Brady violated the aforementioned statutes. Accordingly, the IID will not pursue criminal charges against him. This report explains in further detail why, based on the evidence, a prosecutor could not prove beyond a reasonable doubt that any officer committed a crime.

A. Maryland Use of Force Statute

Proving a violation of the Use of Force Statute requires a prosecutor to establish beyond a reasonable doubt that a subject officer:

- (1) used force that was not necessary and proportional to prevent an imminent threat of physical injury to themselves or another person, or to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement objective;
- (2) intended to use force that was excessive, *i.e.* not necessary and proportional under the circumstances; and
- (3) the use of excessive force resulted in serious bodily injury or death;⁶

In this case, it is undisputed that Officer Brady caused Mr. Pettie's death, so only the first two elements are at issue. Determining whether an officer's use of force is "necessary and proportional" to prevent an imminent threat of physical injury to someone or accomplish a legitimate law enforcement objective is a fact-specific inquiry. Generally speaking, a use of force is considered "necessary and proportional" when an officer had no reasonable alternative available to the officer under the circumstances, the kind and degree of force was appropriate in light of the

⁵ See Md. Code, Public Safety §3-524(d)(1).

⁶ MPJI-Cr 4:36 (3d ed. 2024).

officer's legitimate law enforcement objective, and it was not likely to result in harm that was out of proportion or too severe in relation to the officer's law enforcement objective, given the context in which it was used.⁷ When a factfinder— either a judge or a jury —conducts this analysis, they must consider the totality of the circumstances, including, but not limited to, the nature of the call for service, what occurred in the moments before force was used, what the subject officers knew at the time force was used, and the time and distances involved.⁸

Based on the totality of the circumstances, there is no evidence that Officer Brady intended to use force that exceeded that which was necessary and proportional to prevent Mr. Pettie from being a danger to himself or others. First, with respect to whether the use of force was necessary, Mr. Pettie's behavior posed a threat to the safety of Officer Brady and civilian bystanders in the area at the time Mr. Pettie discharged his weapon. When Officer Brady approached Mr. Pettie in the backyard, Mr. Pettie quickly retreated into his house and shot his handgun. Mr. Pettie ignored verbal commands to drop the gun, then began firing at Officer Brady. Mr. Pettie continued to shoot at Officer Brady multiple times over the course of nearly a minute, creating an imminent threat of death or injury to Officer Brady and to bystanders. In short, Mr. Pettie initiated a gunfight, leaving Officer Brady with no reasonable alternative to protect himself and third persons other than deadly force.

Second, with respect to whether the kind and degree of force used by Officer Brady was proportional to the imminent threat of harm presented by Mr. Pettie, video evidence shows that the force used by Officer Brady was appropriate. As mentioned above, Mr. Pettie fired the first shot, refused to drop his handgun, and continuously shot at Officer Brady for nearly a minute.

Based on the evidence, a prosecutor could not prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Officer Brady's use of force was not necessary and proportional to prevent an imminent threat of physical injury or death to himself. Accordingly, the Office of the Attorney General will not charge Officer Brady with a violation of the Use of Force Statute.

B. Homicide Offenses

When a person is killed, there are four homicide charges that a prosecutor may consider in the State of Maryland:

- First Degree Murder: the willful, deliberate, and premeditated killing of another.⁹
- Second Degree Murder: when the defendant intended to kill or inflict such serious injury that death would be the likely result and there was no justification or mitigating circumstances.¹⁰

⁷ For a more detailed discussion of the “necessary and proportional” standard, see [this opinion](#) written by the Office of the Attorney General. 107 Op. Atty. Gen. Md. 33.

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ MPJI-Cr. 4:17 (3d ed. 2024).

¹⁰ *Id.*

- Voluntary Manslaughter: an intentional killing that is not murder because the defendant acted in partial self-defense.¹¹
- Involuntary Manslaughter: when the defendant acted with gross negligence and that conduct caused the death of another.¹²

First Degree Murder was not considered in this case because there is no evidence to support that the shooting of Mr. Pettie was premeditated. Premeditation requires a prosecutor to prove that “the design to kill must have preceded the killing by an appreciable length of time, that is, time enough to be deliberate.”¹³ While this inquiry requires a fact-specific evaluation, a factfinder should consider the totality of the circumstances, including whether an individual is defending themselves against deadly force.¹⁴ As the shooting of Mr. Pettie was intentional, but not premeditated, Second-Degree Murder and Voluntary Manslaughter are the homicide offenses that remain for consideration.

If the evidence indicates that there is legal justification or certain mitigating circumstances involved, such as self-defense, then a prosecutor could not prove the remaining homicide offenses against the subject officers.¹⁵ A police officer’s use of deadly force is legally justified if it is in complete self-defense, defense of others, or in furtherance of law enforcement related duties.¹⁶

Complete self-defense and defense of others, also known as perfect self-defense or defense of others, exists when the accused: (1) was not the initial aggressor (or did not raise the level of force to deadly force); (2) had the subjective belief that they or another person were in immediate or imminent danger of serious harm or death; (3) that belief was objectively reasonable; (4) used force that was not more than what was reasonably necessary in light of the threat or actual force; and (5) used force for the purpose of aiding the person that they were defending.¹⁷ Complete self-defense and defense of others are affirmative defenses, which means that a prosecutor must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that one of the elements of either defense is not applicable.

When an officer has sufficient probable cause to believe that a person poses a “threat of serious physical harm,” then the officer may use deadly force,¹⁸ and the reasonableness of that decision must be viewed from “the perspective of a reasonable police officer similarly situated.”¹⁹ In practice, this means that a factfinder must consider that police officers often work under rapidly changing circumstances and that what constitutes a reasonable use of force may change from moment to moment.²⁰

¹¹ MPJI-Cr 4:17.2 (3d ed. 2024).

¹² MPJI-Cr. 4:17.9 (3d ed. 2024).

¹³ *Tichnell v. State*, 287 Md. 695, 717 (1980).

¹⁴ See *Purnell v. State*, 250 Md. App 703, 714-715 (2021).

¹⁵ If a defendant has the requisite *mens rea* to uphold a claim of complete self-defense or defense of others – specifically, a subjective belief that their or another’s life was in imminent danger that was objectively reasonable under the circumstances, then the claims are valid regardless of any unintended consequences. See *Malaska v. State*, 216 Md. App. 492, 517-522 (2014).

¹⁶ *Id.*; MPJI-Cr 4:17.3 (3d ed. 2024).

¹⁷ *Porter v. State*, 455 Md. 220, 234-36 (2017); MPJI-Cr 4:17.2, *supra*.

¹⁸ *Estate of Blair v. Austin*, 469 Md. 1, 24 (2020) (quoting *Tennessee v. Garner*, 471 U.S. 1, 11 (1985)).

¹⁹ *State v. Albrecht*, 336 Md. 475, 501 (1994); *State v. Pagotto*, 361 Md. 528, 555-556 (2000) (quoting *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386, 397 (1989)).

²⁰ *Id.*

The evidence shows that Mr. Pettie was the aggressor because he initiated the gunfight by firing a handgun at Officer Brady and ignoring multiple commands to drop his weapon. Those facts provide a basis for Officer Brady to believe that his life, as well as the lives of the civilians in the immediate vicinity, were in danger, and that such a belief was reasonable. Since Officer Brady faced a threat of death or injury from Mr. Pettie, his use of deadly force against Mr. Pettie was reasonably necessary.

Based on the investigation, Officer Brady's actions do not constitute the crime of Second-Degree Murder because the evidence would not allow a prosecutor to overcome any of the elements of complete self-defense. Moreover, because complete self-defense also applies to Voluntary Manslaughter,²¹ a prosecutor would be unable to prove any homicide offense in this matter. Accordingly, the Office of the Attorney General will not charge Officer Brady with a homicide offense.

VI. Conclusion

This report has presented factual findings, legal analysis, and conclusions relevant to the May 18, 2025, police-involved death of Glenn Pettie Jr. in Dundalk, Maryland. The Office of the Attorney General has declined to pursue charges in this case because, based on the evidence obtained in its investigation, the subject officer did not commit a crime.

²¹ *State v. Faulkner*, 301 Md. 482, 485 (1984).