

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: 08/21/2024

Type of Investigation: [REDACTED]

Referred to Same Service: ☒

Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent Officer almost hit him with his police vehicle while the Complainant was cycling on [REDACTED]. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent Officer was operating his cell phone at the time and yelled, in an angry manner, that he is exempt under the Highway Traffic Act and yelled at the Complainant that he probably runs red lights.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations**Section 10(1) Undermine Public Trust****Decision and Reasons****Undermine Public Trust**

This investigation has revealed the Respondent Officer was in the lawful performance of his duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent Officer almost hit the Complainant with his police vehicle while the Complainant was riding on his bicycle. The Respondent Officer was lawfully operating his Bluetooth cellphone in accordance with Highway Traffic Act, Section 78.1(4)(a), where Police Officers are permitted to use a handheld wireless communication device while operating a police vehicle. The Respondent Officer was on a work-related call as he proceeded to a potential protest.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.