



**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: 02/02/2025 |                   |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 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 in a dispute with a social services agency over an unpaid bill due to questionable billing practices by the agency.   |                               |                   |
| The Complainant alleged that the Respondent Officers attended her address to demand payment for her outstanding balance. The Complainant alleged that the Respondent Officers were biased against her because the business owner is a "white woman" and that their attendance to the Complainant's address was used to intimidate her and a misuse of power. |                               |                   |
| The Complainant alleged the Respondent Officers refused to respond to her email when she requested for assistance to protect the privacy of her children.  |                               |                   |
|  |                               |                   |
|  |                               |                   |
|  |                               |                   |
|  |                               |                   |
|  |                               |                   |
|  |                               |                   |
|  |                               |                   |

LECA 2024 Page 1 of 2



## **Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations**

Undermine Public Trust - Section 10(1) – A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

Treat Person in Contravention of the 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.

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.

## **Decision and Reasons**

The Respondent Officers responded to a radio call where it was alleged that the Complainant was harassing and threatening a business owner. During the investigation, the Respondent Officers determined that the matter was not a criminal matter, but rather a civil dispute over unpaid fees for services rendered. The Respondent Officers informed the business owner that her matter had to be disputed in a civil court and cautioned her to stop communicating with the Complainant.

The Respondent Officers attended the Complainant's address and informed her of the information they received and allowed her to provide her side of the story. At no time, did the Respondent Officers request or demand payment from the Complainant during their interaction. The Respondent Officers agreed with the Complainant that the matter was a civil matter and cautioned her to stop communicating with the business owner.

There was no evidence that the Complainant was intimidated by the Respondent Officers. During their interaction, the Complainant questioned if the Respondent Officers were cold and invited the Respondent Officers into her home to conclude their interaction. The Complainant engaged in conversation and appeared understanding of the situation.

The Complainant send the Respondent Officers an email the following day, however, the Respondent Officers were on a scheduled day off. The Respondent Officers received the emails when they returned for regular duties and provided a reasonable explanation for not responding. The Respondent Officers extended an apology to the Complainant. The Investigator does not believe that the Respondent Officers refused to respond to the Complainant's email. It was confirmed that the Respondent Officers were engaged in various priority calls and an oversight occurred on their part.

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.