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:

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 stated there was a marked police vehicle in the intersection blocking traffic, without hazards or any lights. There was a uniformed officer inside and the vehicle running.
The complainant stated multiple drivers honked at the officer with no response.
Multiple drivers had to pull into the opposite lane of traffic to avoid the lane closure.
The complainant then saw two plainclothes officers come out of Starbucks carrying drinks and get into the police vehicle. When the complainant approached them and asked them to use a parking space next time, it's alleged the officers were rude, dismissed the concerns and drove away.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Conduct Undermines Public Trust S.10 CSPA - unsubstantiated.

Decision and Reasons

The involved officers were identified and determined to be on an authorized break in court duties. A comprehensive review of the vehicle GPS logs showed the cruiser did not stop in a live lane of traffic, rather it was parked in a laneway leading to the garbage disposal area at the side of the building. Duty statements received from the respondent officers indicated the complainant was verbally aggressive and the officers politely acknowledged her complaint at the time, however did not engage in further debate and left the area. No one else approached the officers, and no horns were used to get the cruiser to move as it was at the side of the building with no other traffic nearby.

The investigator made multiple attempts to contact the complainant to obtain additional details however the complainant did not return any calls or emails.

Based on a review and analysis of the available information, the investigation has determined that there is insufficient evidence to establish that misconduct occurred.