[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: 11/04/2024

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint
This is a Third-Party complaint submitted by the Affected Person's Community Support Worker. Alleging the Respondent Officers ignored and shrugged off the Affected Person's assault complaint because he was deaf. And that, Respondent Officers refused to provide the Affected Person with an interpreter.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1.) Human Rights and the Charter,

Section 5(1) A police officer shall not, in the course of their duties, treat any person in a manner that the officer, at the time, knows or reasonably ought to know would contravene the Human Rights Code

- It is alleged the Respondent Officers ignored and shrugged off the Affected Person's assault complaint because he was deaf.

Decision and Reasons

Affected Person did not participate in an interview - no additional details or context to written complaint.

****Allegation #1**** Unsubstantiated

The Affected Person was not ignored nor was his complaint shrugged off because he was deaf. - The Affected Person was interview by Respondent Officers via written communication and a police report submitted.
The Respondent Officers took great length to communicate with the Affected Person without an ASL interrupter. Using written communication and gestures to obtain the necessary information.
The Respondent Officers were professional and treated the Affected Person with respect, courtesy and consideration.
The Respondent Officers provided services to the Affected Person in accordance with the code.

****Allegation #2****Unsubstantiated

Respondent Officers did not refuse to provide the Affected Person with an ASL interrupter.
No ASL interrupter available. Respondent Officers followed procedures.
Although the Affected Person preferred method on communication was ASL . He also communicates via written communication. This was supported by his ASL card which he handed Respondent Officers.

Affected Person was advised by Respondent Officers if needed a formal interview would be arranged later using an ASL interrupter. The Affected Person acknowledge this.
The Respondent Officers were professional and treated the Affected Person with respect, courtesy and consideration.