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: 11/27/2024

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 states that on April 12, 2023, an Officer failed to respond to their request for service and was uncivil in their response.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – neglect of duty O/Reg 123/98 (PSA) Section 2(1)(c)(i)

Any Chief of Police or other Police Officer commits misconduct if he or she engages in, neglect of duty, in that he or she, without lawful excuse, neglects or omits promptly and diligently to perform a duty as a member of the police force.

It is alleged that the Respondent Officer did not investigate the complainant's complaint.

Decision and Reasons

It is alleged that the Respondent Officer did not investigate the complainant's complaint.

It has been established that the Respondent Officer did in fact investigate the call for service from the complainant. The Officer attended the area and was unable to locate anyone. The Officer then spoke to the complainant, and the complainant had nothing further to add. There was nothing further to investigate.

Based on a review and analysis of all the available information, it has been determined that there is insufficient evidence to establish that misconduct occurred during this interaction. As a result, with respect to this allegation, the conclusion is unsubstantiated.