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: April 5, 2025

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 alleged that he was involved in a hit-and-run with a vehicle while walking down the street. At the time of the incident he thought he was able to jump out of the way of the vehicle. He fell on the ground while jumping out of the way. This caused injury to his ankle.

At the hospital, he was told his ankle was broken in five places and required surgery. He realized that he must have been struck by the vehicle.

The complainant attended the police station the day after his surgery to see if the vehicle/driver had been located. He was advised that the officer he spoke to had no idea what he was talking about and allegedly laughed at him.

Ontario

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 10 - Undermines public trust in policing
Section 19 - Neglects to do duty

Decision and Reasons

The officer who attended the scene did not have any information that a collision had occurred. The complainant at that time only believed that he had jumped out of the way of a vehicle. The officer investigated at the scene but there were no witnesses and no video available. He concluded that the male was possibly impaired and injured himself as a result of the poor lighting and lack of pedestrian pathways in the area. He cleared the call with clearing remarks and did not complete a report.

There was no obligation to complete a collision report; however he could have completed an injured persons report. This does not meet the threshold of misconduct.

The officer that the complainant allegedly spoke to in the main office could not be identified due to a lack of identifying information and video retention limits.