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: 04/08/2025

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 being unlawfully evicted from his place of residence, that resulted from the respondent officers completing a negligent investigation.

The complainant further alleged the [redacted] officers failed to ensure his well-being when they facilitated his eviction, leaving him outside in the cold winter conditions with nowhere to live.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1. Performance of Duties (Neglects to do Duty) - sec. 19

2. Interactions with the Public (Conduct Undermines Public Trust) - sec. 10(1)

Decision and Reasons

The respondent officers were equipped with Body Worn Video (BWV) throughout the entirety of this event

Allegation #1:

The eviction of the complainant was a court-imposed injunction to facilitate the sale of the home which forms part of his family's estate. The respondent officers interviewed the counsel representing the estate-trustee and reviewed all of the associated court documentation.

The respondent officers rightly concluded the appropriate eviction steps had been satisfied, only after completing a detailed and fulsome investigation. The complainant was given ample opportunity to source any documentation that would conflict with his eviction, but was unable to do so.

The actions of the officers do not support this allegation of Neglect of Duty.

Allegation #2:

The BWV footage debunked the complainant's claims. When the respondent officers confirmed the eviction of the complainant had been lawful, significant strides were made to secure immediate out of the cold options at local shelters. The complainant declined all of the offers made available to him. The well-being of the complainant was a clear priority for the respondent officers.

The actions of the officers do not support this allegation of incivility.

CONCLUSION: The Chief did not have reasonable grounds to believe that the actions of the respondent officers constituted misconduct.