

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: 01/27/2025	
Type of Investigation:		
Referred to Same Service:	Referred to Other Service:	Retained by LECA:
Service Investigations Referred to:		
De-identified Summary of Complaint		
On January 23, 2025 at approximate for service from a supervisor at the kyoung people) indicating that a youth step dad grabbed her and threw her currently screaming at her through the youth was in possession of knives a Upon the arrival of police the complamuddy foot prints on the floor, and the them to a local hospital where they was a local hosp	Kids Help Phone (Kids Help Phone has experiencing physical abuse) to the floor, leaving marks on her he door. Information was also proving suicidal. Alianant states that the officer failed the officer traumatized the youth whould not be released for 2 weeks.	The youth reported that her and that her mother was yided that suggested the to take his boots off, leaving hen he said he would take

Page 1 of 2

LECA 2024



Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

undermined, or was likely to undermine, public trust in policing contrary to Section 195(a) of the Community Safety Policing Act,

Decision and Reasons

Upon review of the incident there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent officer conducted himself in a manner that undermined, or was likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

The Respondent officer adhered to General Orders and the Child Abuse Protocol for the and the Child and Family Services Act which states, "Under the provisions of the Child, Youth and Family Services Act, there is a legal duty for all peace officers to report any suspected or actual incidents of child sexual abuse, child physical abuse and neglect to Family and Children's Services as soon as practical. This duty cannot be delegated".

The Respondent officer's primary objective was to ensure the safety of the youth. Once this was accomplished the Respondent made efforts to assist the youth and the parents with possible options and resources to move forward.

A witness officer stated that the Respondent Officer showed nothing but compassion and empathy for the youth and was truly attempting to assist the youth in a time of crisis.

The Respondent Officer denies making the statement that he would be taking the youth to the hospital or stating that the youth would be held against their will for 2 weeks and there is no physical evidence to suggest he did make such a statement.

Additionally, during a call for service of this magnitude it is determined that an officer removing his boots is not feasible as exigent circumstance presented and this action does not constitute misconduct as defined under the Community Safety and Policing Act.

The allegation is unsubstantiated.

LECA Page 2 of 2