

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: 07/08/2024

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 submitted a written complaint to the Law Enforcement Complaint Agency (LECA) alleging the Respondent Officer attended their place of employment and interacted and spoke with the Complainant in an inappropriate manner.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Undermine Public Trust, in that he or she,

Section 10 (1) - A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing

Decision and Reasons

The Complainant did not participate in an interview and provided no supporting evidence.

Respondent Officer lives over 120km away from the Complainant's working establishment.

On June 14, 2024 and June 15, 2024, the Respondent Officer worked a day shift (06:00 - 117:00hrs). This was confirmed.

Respondent Officer denies attending the establishment on June 14, 2024 and advised they went home because family was visiting.

Respondent Officer denies knowing and or speaking to the Complainant nor making and disparaging comments.

Based on the distance between the establishment and Respondent Officer's home, the lack of supporting evidence from Complainant. And, the evidence which showed Respondent Officer did work both shifts on time.

The Investigating Officer has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred