

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: 2024-07-01

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 that he observed two [REDACTED] Police officers conducting an investigation without the activation of their body worn cameras.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Conduct undermines public trust - Sec. 10 CSPA.

Decision and Reasons

The complainant alleged that Officer 1 and Officer 2 failed to activate their body-worn camera (BWC) when conducting an investigation. The complainant stated that he interacted with the officers and questioned them about the activation of their BWC at 1020hrs on July 1, 2024.

Officer 1 and Officer 2 activated their BWC at 1022hrs on July 1, 2024, when they spoke with a male and cautioned him for theft under \$5000. Officer 1 and Officer 2 were conversing with members of the public and checking on their well-being prior to entering into an investigation into a member of the public that they came upon. The officers were not conducting an investigation and therefore, were not in contravention of the BWC directive. Once the interaction with the public changed to an investigation both officers activated their BWC.

As per the directive, the BWC is not intended for full shift recording but is specific to the interactions officers have with the public when responding to calls for service or when officers are initiating any investigative contact.

The officers were in compliance with the BWC directive and therefore no misconduct was substantiated.