[redacted]

Law Enforcement Complaints Agency Ontario

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: 09/22/2024

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 filed a Fraud report on June 5, 2024. The occurrence was assigned to the Respondent Officer on June 11, 2024. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent Officer repeatedly dismissed his verified evidence, which included outstanding bench warrants, documented criminal history, fraudulent credit report, fraudulent document filings with the Landlord and Tenant Board and threats made to the Landlord and Tenant Board Adjudicator.

The Respondent Officer dismissed the evidence as "conjecture" and "irrelevant". He failed to take any meaningful action on the case, despite the Complainant's repeated communications expressing safety concerns and the tenant's attempts to steal the Complainant's property.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 19 Neglect of duty
Section 10 Conduct Undermines Public Trust

Decision and Reasons

The Respondent Officer kept an open and clear line of communication with the Complainant. The Complainant was provided with status updates on his case as per [Redacted]

The Respondent Officer explained to the Complainant, he is the solo fraud investigator and that all cases are investigated based on time reported and urgency of the case. He also explained that he was currently investigating cases that were reported approximately 8 months earlier. The Respondent Officer also explained timelines and fairness to all victims. This is in keeping with the Service's Standards of Conduct Section 1.9 Fairness, Discriminantion and Harassment.

During the first set of emails between the Complainant and the Respondent Officer, the officer advised the Complainant of the relevant information required for the investigation. The Respondent Officer also explained that having the specified information that was requested would help to expedite his case when it came up in the queue.

Although the Complainant sent the Respondent Officer information that was irrelevant to his case, the Respondent Officer with due diligence referenced the information with police databases. The officer contacted an outside service to obtain the warrant for the tenant/subject in question. The Respondent Officer then detailed the Bail Compliance Unit to locate and arrest the subject. The subject /tenant was not located. The Complainant was updated.

The Respondent Officer explained that news articles and past criminal history is irrelevant and has no bearing on the investigation. This is in keeping with Case Law from the Supreme Court of Canada R v Mohan (1994)