

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: 11/24/2024

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ☒

Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

The Complainant alleged that she reported harassing actions from her ex-boyfriend to [REDACTED] Police Service. She alleged Respondent Officer #1 neglected his duties by not contacting her ex-boyfriend, not submitting a report and not following up with her.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Performance of Duties - O.Reg. 407/23 - Sec. 19
Undermines Public Trust - O.Reg. 407/23 - Sec. 10(1)

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 - Performance of Duties - O.Reg. 407/23 - Sec.19: The Complainant alleges that Respondent Officer #1 did not contact her after speaking with her ex-boyfriend regarding harassing actions. She called into the Police Station and was told no follow up was documented. She was later told that a report was submitted; it was her belief that this was not true.

Conclusion: Respondent Officer #1 did submit an initial report, he notes that further efforts will be made to contact the Complainant's ex-boyfriend. Hours later, Respondent Officer #1 authored a separate Supplementary Report, documenting that he spoke with the Complainant's ex-boyfriend and called the Complainant afterwards (and discussed allegations the ex-boyfriend made). The reports are digitally time stamped. The follow up had been documented, the Complainant elected to not participate in the investigation - it is unknown why she was unaware of the investigation's conclusion.

Allegation 2 - Undermines Public Trust - O.Reg. 407/23 - Sec. 10(1): It was alleged that by neglecting a domestic related investigation, Respondent Officer #1's actions may undermine public trust in policing.

Conclusion: It was determined that Respondent Officer #1 did follow through with his investigation. Digitally time stamped reports provide the requisite proof that he was performing his duties in good faith.