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: 02/20/2025

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 stated the respondent officer disclosed unauthorized personal information about him and his family. The complainant's 13-year-old son was involved in an altercation at school involving two other students. The respondent officer was dispatched to investigate. The respondent officer spoke with all parties involved, including school staff.

Shortly after the respondent officer had spoken with everyone the complainant's wife received an email from a party identifying themselves as the mother of a particular child involved the altercation at school. This email was concerning to the complainant because he 1) found it threatening 2) was sent to a rarely used email address belonging to his wife 3) contained specific information that only police were aware of.

The complainant followed up with both the school and the police as to how and why is personal information was shared. The complainant received unsatisfactory responses which heightened his concerned. The complainant felt the privacy of all involved was being protected - except that of his family. The complainant was also concerned that the person that sent him the email may have access to restricted police information.

No permission was given by the complainant or his wife to share her email address.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

CSPA - Section 17(1) - Unauthorized Disclosure

Decision and Reasons

A review of the evidence including Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD), respondent officer's notes and statement, general report and witness statements and the email of concern received by the complainant;s wife. The evidence confirmed the respondent officer was in the lawful execution of his duty when he obtained the personal information of the complainant and his family.

The respondent officer was conducting an assault investigation in which a child suffered an injury. During this investigation the respondent officer collected personal information of all parties involved, including the contact information of the complainant and his wife. The end result of this investigation was there were reasonable grounds to believe the complainant's son had committed an assault. The complainant's son was subsequently entered into the Diversion Program. Of note, there was some initial misunderstanding surrounding the prerequisites required to enter this program between the respondent officer, the complainant and his wife.

The respondent officer acknowledged that he shared the email address of the complainant's wife with the mother of the child that had been assaulted. The respondent officer also stated that he sought permission from the complainant's wife prior to disclosing the email address in question and permission was given. The respondent officer stated he advised the complainant's wife that, with her permission, he would share her email address with mother of the victim, who was looking to make contact to address damages incurred. Further, the respondent officer stated that had permission not been granted, he would not have disclosed the email address. The complainant's wife stated she thought she gave permission for her email address to used in relation to the Diversion Program, not to be provided to anyone else.

The statements of the respondent officer and the complainant's wife were contradictory and no independent corroborative evidence was located that could be relied upon to show one account was more credible than the other. Evidence was obtained that highlighted miscommunication between the respondent officer, the complainant and his wife regarding the assault investigation and the particulars around the Diversion Program.