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: 01/16/2025

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 alleged that the respondent officer failed to take appropriate enforcement action despite being provided video evidence of an alleged criminal incident. The complainant also alleged that the respondent officer's delayed response time to the call for service is the result of gender preference within the police service.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1 - Performance of Duties - Neglect to do Duty - S.19 CSPA
Allegation #2 - Interactions with the Public - Conduct Undermines Public Trust - S.10(1) CSPA

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1 - The complainant was involved in a verbal dispute with their neighbour over a shared property line. The altercation turned physical when the complainant and their neighbour fought over a stake used to mark the property line. The incident was recorded on video.

The respondent officer spoke to the complainant and viewed video evidence of the incident. The respondent officer also spoke to the complainant's neighbour and viewed additional video evidence from a camera affixed to their property.

The respondent officer appropriately concluded that there was insufficient evidence to lay a criminal charge as the altercation was a consensual verbal fight with both parties holding an object in self defense.

Allegation #2 - The respondent officer arrived on scene approximately 29 hours after the complaint was made to the police. An occurrence report for that time period showed a high call volume of serious incidents which increased the response times.

The respondent officer took the totality of the situation and the evidence available to them to conclude that the matter did not warrant criminal charges. Further, there is no information to support that the complainant's gender played a role in the response time or outcome of the investigation.