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: 01/21/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint
On January 17th, 2025, the Complainant was involved in a physical fight with his stepson. The attending officers focused on his wife and stepson's statements and failed to properly investigate the assault. The Complainant was never offered medical services and does not understand the situation.

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:

Allegation #1:

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 the Respondent Officers failed to provide support to the Complainant as he was obviously injured, and further that they were dismissive and aggressive with him.

Respondent Officer #1 (RO1)
Respondent Officer #2 (RO2)
Respondent Officer #3 (RO3)

Allegation #2:
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 Officers conducted a neglectful investigation, focusing on his wife's, neighbour's and stepson's statements other than his. The Respondent Officers took no time to listen to the Complainant's side of the story or to investigate the matter properly.

Respondent Officer #1 (RO1)
Respondent Officer #2 (RO2)
Respondent Officer #3 (RO3)
Respondent Officer #4 (RO4)

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1:

This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities.
The officers attended the Complainant's address and were methodical in their investigation. Each making sure they carried out a proper investigation, interviewing witnesses, and ensuring that any party that requested/was in need of medical help obtained it.

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.

Allegation #2:

This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities.

The officers attended the Complainant's address and were methodical in their investigation. Each making sure they carried out a proper investigation, interviewing witnesses, and going as far as seeking a translator for one of the witnesses.

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.