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: 07/06/2024

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 alleged the Respondent Officer (RO1) called his residence after midnight and threatened to arrest him for harassment. A short time later the RO1 attended the Complainant's residence and again threatened to arrest him for harassment. An investigation into the allegation determined RO1 received direction from a supervisor and that officer was subsequently named Respondent Officer (RO2). The Complainant further alleged he was involved in a previous encounter with RO1 and during that encounter RO1 breached his privacy.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Public-Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

Public-Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23

RO1 was informed by a Witness Officer (WO) that the Complainant was following them in the course of their duties and recording their actions. RO1 conducted a criminal harassment investigation and notified RO2 of the incident.

The Investigator reviewed officer's reports, notes, In Car Camera video footage, video footage provided by the Complainant, Sec 264(1) of the Criminal Code, Sec 264.1 of the Criminal Code, and policy on Professionalism.

The Investigator concluded RO1 was lawfully engaged in a criminal investigation when he contacted the Complainant and attended his residence to caution him regarding his actions and there was no evidence to support RO1 threatened the Complainant. The actions of RO1 and RO2 did not undermine the public trust.

The Investigator further concluded RO1 had no prior contact with the Complainant and was not the member the Complainant encountered who he alleged breached his privacy.