

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: 05/21/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ☒

Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

The Complainant reported that the Respondent Officers acted conduct undermined public trust in how they spoke to him and in that they failed to identify themselves as required under the circumstances.

The Complainant alleged that Respondent Officers used unnecessary force against him.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Conduct Undermines Public Trust - 10 C (CSPA)

Allegation 2 – Fail to Provide Identifying Information Upon Request - 13(2) CSPA

Allegation 3 – Unnecessary Force - 11 CSPA

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 – Conduct Undermines Public Trust-The investigation revealed that the Respondent Officers were not disrespectful towards the Complainant and did not act in a discriminatory manner. The officers showed restraint in the face of the complaint's behavior. The Investigator concluded that there was insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct occurred.

Allegation 2 – Fail to Provide Identifying Information Upon Request -The investigation revealed that the the Respondent Officers were wearing appropriate uniforms which included their name, badge number and police service. The officers did not fail to identify themselves in a manner reasonable under the circumstances. The Investigator concluded that there was insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct occurred.

Allegation 3 – Unnecessary Force-The investigation revealed that the Respondent Officer did not strike the Complainant with his cruiser as alleged. The Investigator concluded that there was insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct occurred.