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: 10/02/2024

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 alleges the Respondent Officer did not conduct a proper investigation into a complaint. The Complainant alleges the Respondent Officer blamed them for being a victim because the Complainant wouldn't delete their social media account. The Complainant alleges the Respondent officer coerced them into providing medical information contrary to the provisions of the Human Rights Code.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Section 5 CSPA.
Allegation 2 – Section 10 CSPA
Allegation 3 – Section 19 CSPA

Decision and Reasons

The Complainant alleged they were being harassed by a former partner via a social media platform. The Respondent officer conducted an investigation, concluding that there were no grounds to believe the offence of criminal harassment had occurred. The evidence the complainant relied on were social media posts on a public Reddit thread which were not threatening in nature and not directed at the complainant.

The Respondent Officer suggested that the Complainant avoid the use of the Reddit social media platform as she was interpreting public posts as being directed towards them. At no time did the Respondent officer blame the Complainant for being victimized.

During the course of the investigation, the Respondent Officer received information from an involved party which may have impacted the credibility of the Complainant. This led to a line of questioning that was insensitive, but did not amount to misconduct. To answer to the line of questioning, the complainant provided medical information of their own volition to the Respondent officer.