

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: [REDACTED]

Date of Complaint: 07/30/2024

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ☒

Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On June 27, 2024, COMPL contacted the [REDACTED] alleging he had video evidence of [REDACTED] officers planting evidence in relation to a drug investigation which occurred 18 months prior and was unrelated to COMPL himself. COMPL alleged he was being threatened, as members of his family were being stopped by police. Further, COMPL alleged RO1 and Police Witness(PW)1 threatened COMPL's cousin with physical violence if the alleged video was not turned over to police. PSU spoke with COMPL who declined to provide a statement. PSU requested a copy of the alleged video evidence, and it was not provided by COMPL. The LECA complaint process was provided and explained. On July 28, 2024, PSU closed their investigation, as no further evidence was submitted by COMPL. On July 30, 2024, COMPL filed a duplicate complaint with LECA naming RO1 as the respondent officer. COMPL further stated his lawyers Civilian Witness(CW) 6 and CW5 were in possession of the alleged video evidence.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 2(1)(a)(xi) PSA – Ontario Regulation 268/10 Code of Conduct

Decision and Reasons

COMPL alleged RO1 engaged in a pattern of harassment and threatened violence towards him. COMPL further alleged RO1 and other officers conducted multiple traffic stops involving members of COMPL's family outside their residence. RO1 confirmed he only attended the address once, which was 22 months prior to the drug investigation involving CW3. RO1 never spoke to COMPL or any member of his family while at the residence. RMS confirmed there were no traffic stops conducted in front of the address by RO1 or any [REDACTED] member. COMPL confirmed with PSU that he never received calls or messages from RO1 or any [REDACTED] member(s). COMPL was unable to provide any evidence to support the allegation of harassment and threats.

COMPL alleged that he, and his two lawyers, CW6, and CW5 were in possession of video evidence depicting [REDACTED] officer(s) planting evidence to incriminate CW3 during a search warrant execution in February 2022; and that RO1 and PW1 were aware of the video. COMPL further alleged RO1 and PW1 were threatening people with violence if the alleged video was not turned over to them.

COMPL would not provide a copy of the alleged video to PSU when requested. CW6 contradicted COMPL's allegation as he advised he did not represent COMPL and denied any knowledge or the existence of any alleged video. CW5 further contradicted COMPL's allegation as she advised that she was not his legal counsel or "in a position to assist." RO1 and PW1 both stated they were not involved in the warrant execution or investigation; they had never worked together as COMPL alleged; they had no knowledge of the existence of a video; they had not threatened violence in an effort to retrieve the alleged video.

The related RMS occurrences supported RO1's duty report and PW1's statement to PSU. PW1 denied threatening CW1 or discussing the retrieval of the alleged video with CW1. The ICC video from PW1's cruiser further corroborated his statement and confirmed there was no threats made or discussion of a video.

COMPL under oath, admitted to lying to police to benefit himself. COMPL filed the complaint with LECA 18 months after the alleged incident. He was incarcerated awaiting sentencing and aware he would be serving significant time. He admittedly said he was bored. There was no evidence provided by COMPL to support his allegation that officers planted evidence against CW3. There was no evidence provided by COMPL to support his allegation that there was a video depicting the planted evidence. There was no evidence provided by COMPL to support his allegation that RO1 and PW1 were attempting to retrieve the video by way of threats or violence. COMPL's allegations were made with many contradictions, lacking any evidence and credibility.

The allegation that RO1 committed discreditable conduct is unsubstantiated.