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: 01/21/2025

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 alleged the Respondent Officers exasperated a preexisting injury to his shoulder when they arrested him and mocked his mental health. The Complainant further alleged the Respondent Officers failed to protect him by securing him in a seatbelt when he was transported.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Unnecessary Force - Sec 11 CSPA Reg. 407/23
Fail to Care for Prisoner - Sec 9 CSPA Reg 407/23
Uncivil - Sec 12 CSPA Reg 407/23

Decision and Reasons

(1) Unnecessary Force - Sec 11 CSPA Reg. 407/23

The officers responded to a report of a family dispute. Upon arrival the officers learned the Complainant failed to comply with the conditions of his release regarding an Intimate Partner Violence occurrence. The officers located and arrested the Complainant.

The Investigator reviewed officer reports, notes, In-Car camera footage, and Sec 266 of the Criminal Code.

The Investigator concluded there was no evidence to support the Respondent Officer's unnecessarily used force and caused injury to the Complainant.

(2) Fail to Care for Prisoner - Sec 9 CSPA Reg 407/23

Upon the Complainants arrest he was transported to the police detachment by way of police motor vehicle.

The Investigator reviewed officer reports, notes, In-Car camera footage, and Sec 106(3) and Regulation 613 Sec 3 of the Highway Traffic Act.

The Investigator concluded the Respondent Officer was not required under the authority of the Highway Traffic Act to secure the Complainant in a seatbelt and there was not evidence to support the Complainant's safety was at risk.

(3) Uncivil - Sec 12 CSPA Reg 407/23

The Complainant alleged the Respondent Officers mocked his mental health.

The Investigator reviewed officer reports, notes, In-Car camera footage,