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: 03/01/2025

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 her daughter was coerced by her father to possess animal deterrent spray and instructed her to take it to school.

The Complainant alleged that the Respondent Officer failed to conduct a thorough investigation into her matter and alleged that the Respondent Officer was rude, condescending and dismissive of her concerns.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Undermine Public Trust - Section 10(1) – A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

Performance of Duties - 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.

Decision and Reasons

The Respondent Officer received information from the Complainant regarding her child being in possession of pepper spray that was provided to the child by her father. The Complainant believed that the actions of the father constituted a criminal offence and requested for a criminal investigation.

The Respondent Officer inspected the canister and confirmed that the spray was dog/coyote deterrent spray that is commonly purchased at most hunting and hardware stores.

The Complainant expressed dissatisfaction when the Respondent Officer explained the elements of facts that constitute an offence for a criminal charge under Section 88 of the Criminal Code and that he did not formulate grounds to believe an offence was committed.

There is no evidence the Respondent Officer acted unprofessionally or failed to fulfill his duties. His actions were consistent with Service policies and the legal requirements of Service procedures and the Criminal Code.

There is no evidence the Respondent Officer failed to take reasonable steps to investigate the matter or ensure the safety of the child. The Respondent Officer fulfilled his duties by responding to the complaint, assessing the legal requirements, documenting the incident and referring the matter to the appropriate agency.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Therefore, the allegations were unsubstantiated