

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: 02/21/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ☒

Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

It was alleged that in December 2024, the Respondent Officers (RO) was neglectful in his duties by not conducting a thorough and complete uttering threats investigation when the Complainant (CO) reported CW3 threatened to kill her son (CW1).

The incident involved the CO and CW3 and CW4 children who had an altercation on the school bus. The school authorities (CW5) and bus driver had dealt with the matter the day of the event. CW3 and CW4 had attended the CO's residence to see if there was a resolution for both kids while traveling on the bus. The CO became upset with CW3 and CW4 who, rather than escalate the matter left the CO's property. The CO contacted police to report CW3 had threatened to kill the CO son.

The RO completed an investigation that included follow up involving CW3, CW4 and CW5. As a result of the investigation, the RO did not have RPG to believe the offence of uttering threats had been committed therefore, did not lay criminal charges against CW1.

As a result of criminal charges not being filed by Police, the CO filed a complaint with LECA, E-202501181148051280, citing neglect of duty.

The PSU investigated the misconduct allegation which resulted in an unsubstantiated findings outlined in a report filed back to LECA.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Duty - Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

The complaint of Neglect of Duty was deemed unsubstantiated.

The PSU Investigator obtained and reviewed the reports, including witness information associated to the incident reported by the CO and found the officer had conducted an investigation and agreed with the findings that there was no RPG to lay a criminal charge in the matter.

The evidence of the RO was consistent with his notes and duty report absent evidence he was neglectful in his duties.