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: 08/10/2024

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 reported a weapons and threat call to police in which the Respondent Officer attended.

It was reported that a man attended the complainant's residence looking for debts owed and restitution. The Complainant was not the subject the suspect was looking for.

After the incident was investigated and closed, the Complainant was upset that the Respondent Officer had not called him after 5 days from the original complaint with an update.

The Complainant also complained that the Respondent Officer never offered any victim restitution for moving out of the province.

The Complainant believed that the Respondent Officer was neglecting his duty to followup the investigation that had been closed and failed to offer financial assistance.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Neglect of Duty - Sec.19 CSPA O/Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

(1) Neglect of Duty -

When the Respondent Officer arrived at the Complainants address, the Complainant advised that a man was there looking for a previous tenant that owed money. The suspect threatened the Complainant not to be home later and then left.

The Respondent Officer, cleared the residence, created a safety plan with the Complainant and told him to keep his apartment secure and to call police if anyone shows up. This was because the Complainant refused to leave the apartment and stay somewhere else that day.

The Complainant could offer the police no identifying traits regarding the suspect or vehicle information other than a black SUV.

Having nothing to go on, the Respondent Officer advised that no further investigation would continue unless the Complainant could offer any further information. The Respondent Officer also advised the Complainant that he would check area buildings CCTV footage for any evidence and that if he found any, he would then let him know. Otherwise, this investigation was closed.

No CCTV footage captured any of the Complainants allegations and therefore the Respondent Officer closed the incident. All of the information above was confirmed through the investigative notes and occurrence reports as well as officer body camera video. The Complainant at no time during the investigation requested financial victim assistance.

Based on all of the evidence, the Investigator determined that the Respondent Officer did not meet the criteria of neglecting his duty as he was found to have conducted this investigation within the criminal investigative policy & procedure and police service's protocols.