

**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: 10/26/2024

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 states she called the non-emergency police line to report she had been harassed by two men while out walking. The Complainant received a call back from the Respondent Officer who, she states was rude and dismissive and would not provide his name.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

CSPA O. REG 407/23 Code of Conduct for Police Officers

Interaction with Public Section 10(1) Undermine Public Trust ; Section 13(2) Fail to Provide Identification

Performance of Duties - Section 19 Neglect Duty

Decision and Reasons

The Complainant alleges the Respondent Officer was rude and dismissive. Both the Complainant and Respondent Officer describe a lengthy conversation that was frustrating for both. Without any evidence of what transpired between the Complainant and Respondent Officer the Investigator is unable to determine if misconduct occurred.

The Complainant alleges the Respondent Officer refused to provide his name. Both state he provided his badge number. There is no evidence to show he did not provide his name.

The Respondent Officer determined there was no criminality and a report was not required. The Investigator agreed with the Respondent Officer's determination and noted the Complainant did not want police to investigate the harassment she had initially reported.