

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: 01/19/2025

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 is unhappy with the service provided by [REDACTED] Police Service [REDACTED] where the named Respondent Officer works. The Complainant makes reference to an incident that took place on August 25th, 2024, and possibly a neglectful investigation by the Respondent Officer.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

CSPA OREGS:

Allegation #1:

Performance of Duties,

Section 19 A police officer shall not, by act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

- It is alleged the Respondent Officers conducted a neglectful investigation when the Complainant reported being assaulted, resulting in no charges being laid.

Allegation #2:

Interactions with the Public,

Section 12 (1) A police officer shall not, in the course of their duties, use abusive language with any person or otherwise treat any person in a manner that is abusive.

- It is alleged the Respondent Officer mocked the Complainant and treated her badly and that he asked inappropriate questions about the Complainant's mental health and acuity, and if she was on drugs

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1:

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of his duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities.

The Respondent Officer made every attempt possible at contacting the Complainant to obtain further evidence with the Complainant refusing to talk to him. The last communication is an email from the Complainant's email address advising she is still waiting for legal advice.

The Respondent Officer's investigation was thorough and was only categorized as "Pending further Information" when the Complainant refused to communicate with him.

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.

Allegation #2:

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of his duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities.

The Complainant and the Respondent Officer never spoke to each other. Emails from the Respondent Officer were professional and respectful. There is no evidence to support the Complainant's claim that the Respondent Officer asked her inappropriate questions; mocked her, or made any comments about the Complainant's mental health or acuity, about drug consumption, or was otherwise abusive.

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.