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: 10/20/2024

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 two officers attended his residence in respect a dispute with his neighbours during which he had been threatened. He felt the officers did not take his complaint seriously and favoured his neighbours as he believed they were aquaintances through their employment. The Complainant chose not to participate in this investigative process.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Public-Undermine Public Trust-Sec10 CSP
Public-Duty-Neglect or Omit -Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/29

Decision and Reasons

(1) Public-Undermine Public Trust-Sec10 CSP

There was no evidence to support the neighbours and the Respondent Officers had a pre-existing relationship prior to the Complainants call for service to the police. Therefore a conflict of interest did not exist involving the Respondent Officers and the Complainants neighbours.

(2) Public-Duty-Neglect or Omit -Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/29

The Respondent Officers conducted a proper investigation, speaking to all parties involved and interviewing an independent witness. They concluded there was insufficient evidence to support the Complainant had been threatened by his neighbours and could not proceed further with any charges. The Investigator determined the Respondent Officer's did not conduct a neglectful investigation.