

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: 2025-02-17

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 that he has had ongoing disputes with his neighbour and he has sought the assistance of the [REDACTED] Police to assist in resolving these issues. The complainant reported that he did not get assistance from the responding officers and he was unlawfully arrested on two occasions.

The complainant has listed 9 officers in his complaint.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Neglects to do duty - Sec. 19 CSPA.
Unlawful Arrest - Sec. 7 CSPA
Conduct Undermines Public Trust - Sec. 10 CSPA
Neglect of Duty Sec. 2(1)(c) PSA X 6
Unlawful or Unnecessary Exercise of Authority Sec. 2(1)(g) PSA
Discreditable Conduct Sec. 2(1)(a) PSA

Decision and Reasons

All allegations were unsubstantiated

The complainant was lawfully arrested on two occasions, both supported by video evidence. The first arrest followed an incident in which the complainant caused mischief to a neighbour's property. He was subsequently released on conditions, which he later breached, resulting in a second arrest. Both arrests were conducted professionally.

Officers devoted significant time to listening to the complainant's concerns and made repeated efforts to mediate the ongoing conflict with his neighbour. Despite these efforts, the complainant was uncooperative, refused to acknowledge his role in the disputes, and was largely responsible for initiating them. He consistently denied any wrongdoing, even when presented with clear evidence to the contrary, making resolution efforts ineffective.

The complainant also made allegations against officers, which were unsubstantiated. He persisted in presenting misleading accounts of incidents, despite evidence disproving his claims.

Regarding the neighbour's security cameras, the complainant alleged a violation of his privacy. Officers conducted two unannounced visits to the neighbour's property and confirmed that the cameras did not infringe on the complainant's privacy. Despite these findings and explanations that the cameras were legally positioned to monitor the neighbour's own property, the complainant remained dissatisfied and insisted that their mere presence constituted a violation.

The complainant raised concerns about a swale located on his neighbour's property. The Municipality inspected the swale and confirmed it was in compliance with applicable regulations. Despite this, the complainant rejected their findings and submitted multiple complaints to police. As this matter falls under municipal jurisdiction, police were not in a position to assess or intervene further.

All police decisions and actions were clearly communicated to the complainant. However, he consistently disputed any findings that did not align with his views. Despite officers' repeated efforts to address his concerns, the complainant remained dissatisfied and appeared preoccupied with his neighbour's activities, regardless of their relevance or legitimacy.