



INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION

Report Concerning the Police-Involved Death in
Baltimore on March 10, 2026

May 19, 2026

Public Release: May 26, 2026

Declination Report Concerning the Officer-Involved Death of Jonathan Ingram on March 10, 2026

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 the death of an individual.”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 March 10, 2026, at 11:45 a.m., officers with the Baltimore Police Department (BPD) responded to a 911 call for a burglary in progress at a house in the 6200 block of Park Heights Avenue in Baltimore, Maryland. One man and two adult women were inside the house. After officers arrived on scene, the man began firing a handgun at officers. The man also verbally threatened the lives of the women inside the residence. The BPD Special Weapons and Tactics (“SWAT”) Team was called to the scene. One woman inside the house jumped off a balcony into the backyard, where she was safely removed by officers. The man fired additional shots toward the officers afterward, injuring one officer. Later, a SWAT officer fired a single shot that struck the man inside of the house. Other SWAT officers entered the house and secured the woman. Medical aid was provided to the man, who was pronounced dead on scene. A handgun was recovered near the man. The injured officer and the two women were treated for their injuries at a local hospital.

After completing its investigation and evaluating all available evidence, the IID has determined that there is insufficient evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the subject officer committed a crime under Maryland law. Accordingly, the Attorney General has declined to prosecute the subject officer in this case.

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

This report is composed of a factual narrative followed by a legal analysis. Every fact in the narrative is supported by the evidence obtained in this investigation, including forensic and autopsy reports, police radio transmissions, dispatch records, police and EMS reports, police body-worn camera footage, footage from a helicopter mounted camera, photographs, department policy, and interviews with civilian and law enforcement witnesses. The subject officer did not make a statement in this case, which had no impact on the prosecutorial decision. The legal analysis explains why the IID will not bring criminal charges.

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

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

This investigation involved one decedent and one subject officer.

- A. The decedent, Jonathan Ingram, was 33 years old at the time of the incident. He was a Black male who lived in Baltimore, Maryland.
- B. Officer Brian Loiero has been employed by BPD since April 2010. He is a White male who was 40 years old at the time of the incident.

The IID reviewed all available departmental disciplinary records and criminal histories for these parties and, where records existed, determined none were relevant to this investigation.

II. Factual Summary

On Tuesday, March 10, 2026, at 11:45 a.m., BPD received a 911 call reporting that a man identified as Jonathan Ingram was breaking into a house in the 6200 block of Park Heights Avenue in Baltimore. The caller, Jane Doe³, stated that she and another woman, Sue Doe⁴, were inside the house and that Ingram was threatening to kill them. A short time later, Jane fled onto a second-floor balcony on the outside of the house. Sue remained inside, where Ingram used a handgun to threaten and strike her.

Multiple BPD officers were dispatched to the scene. The first two officers on scene, a patrol officer and a sergeant, arrived at the house in marked cruisers at 11:52 a.m. Ingram appeared in a second-floor window at the front of the house, holding a handgun. Ingram yelled at the officers, “Back the fuck up or I’m gonna blow her fucking head off! I don’t give a fuck!” Ingram then fired a handgun at the patrol officer. The patrol officer retreated for cover behind a tree, radioed that shots had been fired, and requested that BPD SWAT respond to the scene. At 11:55 a.m., Ingram fired two more shots toward the patrol officer, striking the officer’s cruiser.

Additional officers arrived on the scene over the next few minutes. They used a ballistic shield for protection as they escorted the patrol officer from the tree to a safer location. Jane Doe jumped from the second-floor balcony into the backyard. She was injured during the landing and could not move. A sergeant led four patrol officers to safely remove Jane from the backyard.

At 12:03 p.m., the removal team of five officers reached Jane in the backyard. During the next two minutes, three officers carried Jane out of the backyard while the sergeant and a fourth officer used a rifle and a ballistic shield to guard the group. At 12:06 p.m., Jane was transported to a local hospital for treatment.

During the next three minutes, the removal team took cover behind a vehicle as more officers arrived on the scene. The removal sergeant attempted to communicate with Ingram. From a second-floor window at the rear of the house, Ingram repeatedly demanded that the officers put their guns down and he threatened to “blow [Sue’s] head off” if they did not comply. Ingram

³ To protect the privacy of the 911 caller, she will be referred to as Jane Doe throughout this report.

⁴ To protect the privacy of the woman held hostage during the incident, she will be referred to as Sue Doe.

appeared at the window while holding a gun to the side of Sue’s head.⁵ The removal team sergeant radioed dispatch that the incident had become a hostage situation.

At 12:10 p.m., Ingram fired his handgun at the removal team. The round entered through a nearby SUV windshield and exited out of the rear cargo compartment, striking one officer in the thigh. The removal team members escorted the wounded officer behind a nearby garage. Ingram fired another shot toward them. Officers provided medical aid to the wounded officer, then escorted him away from the scene. Nine minutes after Ingram shot one of the officers, the removal team sergeant reported that Ingram said both that he was “not going back” and that he knew the police would not let him go.



At 12:23 p.m., several SWAT officers joined the officers behind the garage. At the same time, multiple SWAT counter-snipers, including Officer Brian Loiero, moved into position. For the next five minutes, Ingram paced within a second-floor room but stayed away from the window. At 12:28 p.m., Ingram approached the room’s window, and according to one of the counter-snipers, appeared to be looking to fire at officers. Officer Loiero fired one round from his department-issued rifle that struck Ingram in the head, causing him to fall to the floor.



Image 1: Crime scene photographs of the SUV that Ingram’s shot damaged before it struck one of the removal team officers. The damage from the bullet’s entry through the windshield and exit through the cargo area are circled in green.

SWAT officers forced entry to the house to rescue Sue. Less than a minute after Officer Loiero fired his rifle, SWAT officers radioed that they had secured Sue and that Ingram was deceased. Sue was transported to a local hospital for injuries inflicted by Ingram. After SWAT officers secured the house, Ingram was pronounced deceased by a medic at the scene. Officers recovered a loaded Glock 9mm handgun and two magazines near Ingram’s body.



Image 2: A photograph of Ingram’s 9mm handgun, extended magazine, and the ammunition it contained after crime scene technicians recovered it.

⁵ Sue was interviewed as part of the IID’s investigation, and her account of the incident was largely consistent with the accounts of law enforcement witnesses and body-worn camera footage.

III. Supplemental Information

A. Autopsy

The Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (the “OCME”) performed an autopsy on Ingram on March 11, 2026. The Medical Examiner determined that Ingram died from a single gunshot wound to his head and neck. The manner of death was ruled a “Homicide.”⁶

B. Ballistics

BPD Crime Scene Unit technicians responded to the scene and recovered Officer Loiero’s department-issued Accuracy International .308 rifle and Ingram’s Glock 9mm handgun.

Ingram’s handgun was loaded with one round in the chamber and eleven rounds in a thirty-three round extended capacity magazine. An empty standard capacity magazine was also recovered near the handgun. Technicians recovered one fired .308 caliber cartridge case and six fired 9mm cartridge cases.

The BPD Forensic Laboratory Section conducted a firearms analysis on the weapons and cartridge cases recovered from the scene. Forensic testing confirmed that both the subject officer’s department-issued rifle and Ingram’s handgun were operable.

C. Department Policy

BPD has policies on the use of force, including the use of deadly force (Policy 1115) and the use of firearms (Policy 409). These two policies state an officer “shall use only the force Reasonable, Necessary, and Proportional to respond to the threat or resistance to effectively and safely resolve an incident and will immediately reduce the level of force as the threat or resistance diminishes.” The policies define those terms as follows:

- Reasonable: “A member uses Reasonable Force when the member uses no more force than required to perform a lawful purpose.”
- Necessary: “Force is necessary only when no reasonably effective alternative exists.”
- Proportional: “Proportionality measures whether the force used by the member is rationally related to the level of resistance or aggression confronting the member.”

The use of force policy specifies that “[t]he use of Deadly Force/Lethal Force shall always be the last resort,” and shall occur only when officers “reasonably believe such action is

⁶ Manner of death is a classification used to define whether a death is from intentional causes, unintentional causes, natural causes, or undetermined causes. The Maryland Office of Chief Medical Examiner 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. These terms are 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.

immediately necessary to protect a member or another person from an Imminent Threat of death or Serious Physical Injury.”

BPD also has a policy for officers who respond to hostage, barricade, and sniper incidents (Policy 702), which are defined respectively as: (1) any incident in which an armed or unarmed person is unlawfully holding any number of persons against their will by force or threat of force; (2) any incident in which a person subject to arrest or apprehension is attempting to evade capture or avoid police contact by occupying a position from which they refuse to exit; and (3) an incident where an assailant is believed to be armed and intends to or has shot at targets of opportunity. In those circumstances, BPD SWAT may be called to respond to the scene due to their unique capabilities, including the use of counter-sniper teams. Counter-sniper teams utilize specialized training and equipment to provide real-time information to on-scene SWAT personnel, and if necessary and proportional, use deadly force.

All BPD SWAT officers, including counter-sniper teams, are bound by BPD use of force policies. Unless otherwise specified during a mission, the officers have reactionary authority to utilize force, meaning that they are responsible for their own use of force decisions. SWAT officers are expected to use sound tactical judgment, keep the safety of innocent victims paramount, and react to deadly threats according to agency policy.

IV. Legal Analysis

After a criminal investigation, the IID must determine whether to bring criminal charges against a person to hold them accountable pursuant to Maryland law. When making that determination, we have a legal and ethical duty to charge a person with a crime only when we 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. We must also determine whether the accused person could raise an affirmative defense. In those cases, the IID not only needs to prove the crime, but also must disprove the defense beyond a reasonable doubt. Ultimately, the decision to bring any charges rests on whether the available evidence is sufficient 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.⁷ The second and third offenses are homicide related charges based on the intentional killing of another person.⁸

There is insufficient evidence to prove that Officer Loiero 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, we cannot prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Officer Loiero committed a crime.

⁷ See Md. Code, Public Safety § 3-524(i)(1 & 2).

⁸ MPJI-Cr 4:17; MPJI-Cr 4:17.2.

A. Maryland Use of Force Statute

Proving a violation of the Use of Force Statute requires the IID 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.⁹

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 under the circumstances, the kind and degree of force was appropriate in light of the 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.¹⁰ 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 officer knew at the time force was used, the time and distances involved, and whether the officer unnecessarily escalated the situation or created the moment that required the use of force.¹¹

Based on the totality of the circumstances, we cannot prove that Officer Loiero used force that exceeded that which was necessary and proportional to prevent an imminent threat of physical injury to another person. The evidence shows that Officer Loiero responded to the scene after Ingram had: (1) broken into a house and barricaded himself inside; (2) pistol-whipped Sue and repeatedly held a gun to her head to keep her from leaving; and (3) fired multiple rounds at police officers, striking one of them. In other words, Officer Loiero responded as a SWAT counter-sniper to a combined barricade, hostage, and sniper incident. Throughout the roughly forty-five-minute incident, Ingram used a handgun to repeatedly place his hostage, nearby civilians, and responding police officers in imminent danger of serious bodily injury or death.

In sum, given the available evidence, the IID could not prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Officer Loiero violated the Use of Force Statute. Accordingly, the Office of the Attorney General will not charge him with a violation of the Use of Force Statute.

⁹ MPJI-Cr 4:36.

¹⁰ 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 (2022).

¹¹ *Id.*; see also *Barnes v. Felix*, 605 U.S. 73, 80 (2025) ("[T]he 'totality of the circumstances' inquiry into a use of force has no time limit... earlier facts and circumstances may bear on how a reasonable officer would have understood and responded to later ones.").

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.¹²
- 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.¹³
- Voluntary Manslaughter: an intentional killing that is not murder because the defendant acted in partial self-defense.¹⁴
- Involuntary Manslaughter: when the defendant acted with gross negligence and that conduct caused the death of another.¹⁵

First Degree Murder was not considered in this case because it requires proof that the shooting of Ingram was premeditated. To prove premeditation, “the design to kill must have preceded the killing by an appreciable length of time, that is, time enough to be deliberate.”¹⁶ While this inquiry requires a fact-specific evaluation, a factfinder should consider the totality of the circumstances, including whether an individual is defending themselves or another against deadly force.¹⁷ There is no evidence to suggest that this shooting was premeditated.

Involuntary manslaughter, meanwhile, only applies to grossly negligent or reckless acts that result in death, as opposed to the intentional act of killing another; as such, the offense is inapplicable in this case. As the shooting of Ingram was intentional, but not premeditated, Second-Degree Murder and Voluntary Manslaughter are the homicide offenses that remain for consideration.

Here, the assertion of legal justification for the defense of others would preclude a prosecution of the remaining homicide offenses.¹⁸ Complete self-defense and defense of others exist 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 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; and (5) used force for the purpose of aiding

¹² MPJI-Cr 4:17.

¹³ MPJI-Cr 4:17.2.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ MPJI-Cr 4:17.8.

¹⁶ *See Tichnell v. State*, 287 Md. 695, 717 (1980); *see also See Purnell v. State*, 250 Md. App. 703, 714-715 (2021).

¹⁷ *See, e.g., Randall v. Peaco*, 175 Md. App. 320, 331 (2007) (citing *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386, 396 (1989)) (“The test of reasonableness under the Fourth Amendment [...] requires careful attention to the facts and circumstances of each particular case, including the severity of the crime at issue, whether the suspect poses an immediate threat to the safety of the officers or others, and whether he is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight.”).

¹⁸ *See Porter v. State*, 455 Md. 220, 234-36 (2017); MPJI-Cr 4:17.2; MPJI-Cr 4:17.3.

the person that they were defending.¹⁹ Complete self-defense and defense of others are affirmative defenses, which means that the IID must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that one of the elements of the defense is not applicable.

When an officer has sufficient probable cause to believe that a person poses a “threat of serious physical harm,” the officer may use deadly force,²⁰ and the reasonableness of that decision must be viewed from “the perspective of a reasonable police officer similarly situated.”²¹ 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.²²

Given the evidence presented here, the IID could not disprove all the elements of defense of others. Officer Loiero was not the aggressor; instead, he had responded to a scene where Ingram had used a handgun to threaten a hostage and shoot at responding officers. Ingram’s actions—repeatedly holding a gun to his hostage’s head, shooting multiple rounds at officers, and wounding one officer—provided Officer Loiero with a reasonable basis to believe that the lives of a hostage, police officers, and civilian bystanders in the area were in danger. Given the deadly threat that Ingram presented, we cannot disprove an assertion that Officer Loiero’s use of deadly force was reasonably necessary and for the purpose of defending officers and citizens in the area.

Against this backdrop, Officer Loiero’s actions do not constitute the crime of second-degree murder or voluntary manslaughter. We cannot overcome the elements of defense of others. Accordingly, the Office of the Attorney General will not charge Officer Loiero with a homicide offense.

VI. Conclusion

This report has presented factual findings, legal analysis, and conclusions relevant to the March 10, 2026, police-involved death of Jonathan Ingram in Baltimore, Maryland. The Office of the Attorney General has declined to pursue charges in this case because, based on the evidence obtained in its investigation, there is insufficient evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Officer Brian Loiero committed a crime.

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Estate of Blair by Blair v. Austin*, 469 Md. 1, 23-24 (2020) (quoting *Tennessee v. Garner*, 471 U.S. 1, 11 (1985)).

²¹ *State v. Albrecht*, 336 Md. 475, 501 (1994); *State v. Pagotto*, 361 Md. 528, 555 (2000).

²² *Id.*