


**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: 22/Jan/25

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 22nd 2025 a complaint was made by the complainant about the conduct of an officer during a Motor Vehicle Collision that cause him additional expense.

The complainant's son was involved in a Motor Vehicle collision in December that caused substantial damage to the vehicle insured by the complainant. After attending the scene, the officer failed to submit the Motor Vehicle Collision form to the Ministry of Transportation. After a significant delay the form was submitted by the officer with guidance from another officer.

In the meantime the complainant reported that the issue caused him additional expense due to insurance costs.

**Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations**

- Neglects to do duty - Oreg 407/23 Section 19

**Decision and Reasons**

The code of conduct allegations with respect to Neglects to do duty proved unsubstantiated for the following reasons:

At the time of the Motor Vehicle the officer had just returned from extended medical leave and was not trained on the new Motor Vehicle Reporting System. As a result, on completion of the form a task was missed and the form not submitted to the Ministry of transportation. The oversight was due to a training issue not the conduct of the individual officer.