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: 03/04/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On the 4th of March 2025, a Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) file was referred to the [Police Service] regarding two separate incidents dated the 21st of January 2025 and the second incident dated the 9th of February 2025.

The incidents pertain to the complainant reporting a landlord / tenant dispute over rent that is owed and repair costs that the complainant believes they are entitled to recovering after paying out of pocket for renovations.

The complainant indicates they were threatened by their landlord by stating a family member of the landlord would come to the residence with a gun. The complainant states they reported it to the police out of fear of safety for themselves and their children. The complainant reported the police refused to pursue the threat further. The complainant indicates that since then, the landlord sent harassing messages with threats which they also took to the police, but the police did not agree.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 & 2
O. Reg 470/23 Code of Conduct: Neglect of Duty - 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.

It is alleged that the Respondent Officers failed to perform their duties appropriately specifically in regards to 2 separate investigations involving the complainant. The complainant alleges that by

Decision and Reasons

To date there has been no interview of the complainant in this matter. Multiple phone messages have been left, as well as text messages to the complainant's number on file, also to the complainant's email on file. The complainant indicated that they would come in and meet with investigator, however, they did not attend nor provided any excuse for not attending.

The complainant in this matter alleges that both officers were negligent in their duties, in that they failed to complete a thorough investigation and lay appropriate Criminal Code charges.

1. In summary of the allegation toward the officer on January 21, 2025 at the complainant's residence; It is clear that after reviewing the entirety of the Police Body Warn Camera that the complainant was in agreement that there would be no subsequent Criminal Code investigation into the complainant's report of receiving threats. The officer explained to the complainant that the threats seemed to be of an intimidating nature and not direct or to cause death or bodily harm. The messages provided to the officer were vague and non-specific and were in obvious retaliation to an ongoing Landlord Tenant dispute over rent and monies owed. During the interaction the officer the complainant seemed to be in agreement, and at the end of the interaction requested only that the Landlord be contacted and spoken to regarding the messages. The complainant admitted to the officer that they were not fearful of the messages sent via text messages from the landlord.

2. In summary of the allegation toward the officer's phone conversation and advice they provided to the complainant on February 9, 2025, it again, after reviewing the General Occurrence Report would seem that the complainant in this matter is attempting to gain more evidence of police interactions with his case, in order to present it to a Landlord Tenant Tribunal case. The allegation of criminal harassment by the landlord is clearly unfounded and is clearly continued attempts for the landlord to collect rent and monies owed, which are disputed by the complainant. The officer provides sound advice and a clear translation about the facts in issue of Criminal Harassment. At the time of the report, the complainant seems satisfied with the advice provided and the reasoning behind the lack of grounds for the offence of Criminal Harassment.