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:

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 she made a report to police as she was assaulted by her intimate partner on July 30th, 2024. Further alleges that police refused to lay charges against her intimate partner and that the Respondent Officer was unprofessional with her by saying “this is going to sound terrible but unfortunately, you didn’t die”.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, S.O. 2019, c. 1, Schedule 1 Code of Conduct for Police Officer: Ontario Regulation 407/23.
This regulation sets out the code of conduct with which every police officer must comply.

Allegation #1

Performance of Duties,
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 refused to lay charges against the Complainant's intimate partner.

Allegation #2
Interactions with the public,
Section 10 A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermines, public trust in policing.

• It is alleged that during a phone conversation the Respondent Officer made a comment to the Complainant that was rude and insensitive in nature.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Performance of Duties,
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 refused to lay charges against the Complainant's intimate partner.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of her duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities.

The Respondent Officer did not lay any charges in regards to her investigation as she had no evidence of a criminal offence having been committed.
The Complainant seems to have the cases mixed up as such the charges she's referring to had already been laid by the Witness Officer. This was explained by the Witness Officer to the Complainant on a previous communication.

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

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.