

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: 12/31/2024

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 alleges the respondent Officer was negligent in failing to conduct a fulsome and thorough investigation and that the Officer took inappropriate action demanding the complete delete of photographic evidence.

The complainant further alleges that the respondent Officer failed to activate his body-worn camera and made insulting statements

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – neglects to do duty section 19
Allegation 2 – insulting language section 12
Allegation 3 – Conduct undermines public trust 10(1)

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 – neglects to do duty section 19

A Police Officer shall not by act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

It is alleged that the Respondent Officer did not complete a thorough and fulsome investigation into the complaint the complainant made.

It has been established that the Respondent Officer spoke to all the involved parties and found that no one had committed a Criminal Act and they had no concerns for the wellbeing of the child involved in this call.

Based on a review and analysis of all the available information, It has been determined that there is insufficient evidence to establish that misconduct occurred during this interaction. As a result, with respect to this allegation, the conclusion is unsubstantiated.

Allegation 2 – insulting language section 12

A Police Officer shall not, in the course of their duties, use abusive language with any person or otherwise treat any person in a manner that is abusive.

It is alleged that the Respondent Officer made insulting statements to the complainant.

It has been established that the Respondent Officer did not make insulting statements towards the complainant and specifically toward the complainants' mental health.

The Respondent Officer wishes the phone lines would have been recording to show that this did not occur. The phone lines not recording is out of the control of the Respondent Officer and they believed that they were recording at time.