DISCLAIMER: In accordance with the *Community Safety and Policing Act* and the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the summary below has been de-identified to remove the personal information of individuals, including public complainants and persons who were the subject of the investigation.

DE-IDENTIFIED SUMMARY UNDER SECTION 167(2) OF THE CSPA

Original Police Service: Date of Complaint: 08/14/2024

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

Incident Dates April 1, 2024, to June 17, 2024.

The Complainant alleges neglect of duty - negligent investigation and discreditable conduct. The Complainant indicates she reported death threats from her son and several incidents pertaining to MH assisting her son in gang activity. Complainant also reported that MH held a gun to her head and sexually assaulted her.

The Complainant stated that the RO told her to reach out for updates and that her son would be charged, however the Complainant alleges that the RO refused to follow up and did not assist her with numerous reports made. The complainant said she reached out to officer last week with no assistance given.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

It is alleged that the Respondent Officer did not conduct a thorough investigation of the Complainant's allegations contrary to Section 19 of the Code of Conduct of Ontario Regulation 407/23 and therefore, contrary to Section 195 (a) of the Community Safety Policing Act, R.S.O. 2019.

It is alleged the Respondent Officer failed to follow up or provide assistance to the Complainant with numerous reports contrary to Section 10 of the Code of Conduct of Ontario Regulation 407/23 and therefore, contrary to Section 195 (a) of the Community Safety Policing Act, R.S.O. 2019, as amended. Ontario Regulation 407/23 and therefore, contrary to Section 195 (a) of the Community Safety Policing Act, R.S.O. 2019.

Decision and Reasons

The Respondent Officer (RO) was the Lead Investigator of a Threaten Person case investigated, as documented by General Occurrence Report [removed], made by the Complainant. Two accused persons were arrested and charged. Both cases were presented in court and concluded on June 17, 2020, and February 1, 2021, respectively. A thorough review of the Threaten Person investigation reveals that the RO investigated, charged suspects and followed the matter through court to its conclusion. He maintained an investigative log documenting that the Complainant was kept informed of the proceedings and was included in a consultation with the Crown Attorney prior to the matters resolving.

In the summary, the Complainant's LECA complaint submission cites an incident period from April 1, 2024 to June 17, 2024, during which she alleges Neglect of Duty – (negligent investigation) and Discreditable Conduct by the RO. The RO was not assigned any occurrence involving the Complainant during this period. The Complainant has not been involved with [redacted] Police since her occurrence with RO in 2019. Based on the available information, the time period of the complaint indicated by the Complainant is when she attempted to contact the RO, requesting an update to her 2019 case. No evidence was located to support that the Complainant contacted the RO during the period she indicated.

There is, however, evidence that shows that following the conclusion of the 2019 matter, the Complainant continued to sporadically contact the Respondent Officer on several occasions up until March 18th, 2024.

The Investigator reviewed the Complainant's statement to LECA, the Respondent Officer's statement, the investigative notes, the general occurrence, and emails. The Investigator has determined the Respondent Officer completed a thorough investigation that addressed the allegation she made to police at the time.

The Investigator reviewed the Complainant's statement to LECA, reviewed the Respondent Officer's statement, investigative notes, general occurrence and emails. The Investigator has determined the Respondent Officer provided the Complainant with reasonable assistance, which included advising her to report the information to [redacted]

Based on all available evidence, the Investigator has concluded insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.