

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: 08/08/2024

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 that on August 8th, 2024, he had a phone conversation with the Respondent Officer regarding his case. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent officer was neglectful in providing the information he needed, and further that he was uncivil by using insulting language.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1:

Human Rights and the Charter,

Section 5(1) A police officer shall not, in the course of their duties, treat any person in a manner that the officer, at the time, knows or reasonably ought to know would contravene the Human Rights Code.

- It is alleged that whilst on a phone conversation with the Complainant, the Respondent Officer

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Finding: This investigation revealed that there is insufficient evidence to establish on reasonable grounds that a protected ground was a factor in the Respondent Officer's treatment or decision making involving the telephone call with the Complainant.

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

Allegation #2

Finding: This investigation revealed that there is insufficient evidence to establish on reasonable grounds that the Respondent Officer was rude or used abusive language with the Complainant.

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

Allegation #3:

Finding: This investigation revealed that there is insufficient evidence to establish on reasonable grounds that the Respondent Officer refused out of malice to provide the evidence the Complainant requested. The Respondent Officer provided as much information as he felt comfortable providing pertaining to the Complainant's case and advised the Complainant how to obtain further information.

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