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: 10/15/2024

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, authored two LECA complaints that were consolidated with LECA approval.
1) A report was made that Complainant was suicidal, police refused to provide him information about who complained, he felt that he was profiled, and the incident was defamatory.
2) An officer spoke to him about an allegation that he gave a 14-year-old boy “a look”, he felt that the contact was not necessary.
3) Because of incidents he has been involved with, an officer prompted a Mental Health Nurse to contact him, therefore he was harassed and profiled by the officers.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Public-Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Duty-Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Charter of Rights-Breach - Sec 6 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

The Respondent Officers were tasked to investigate a harassment investigation in which three youths alleged they were being followed from place to place. They interviewed the youths and Witness who identified the Complainant as the person who had followed the children. They attempted to speak to the Complainant obtain his version of events who refused to speak to them. Section 264(2)(a) of the Criminal Code clearly defines these actions as harassment. Both officers were obliged to investigate the call as outlined under Section 82 of the CSPA and conducted themselves appropriately. Their actions coincide with their training and expectations as an OPP officer.

The Respondent Officer was tasked with a suspicious person call for service where the Complainant alleged he was being followed by a "town worker". The Complainant did not provide a statement. The Respondent Officer spoke to the suspect in the matter and learned that he worked for the town and was at the arena as part of his regular work duties and at no time saw the Complainant. The Respondent Officer noted that the Complainant had 24 calls for service that had an underlying person in crises component and completed the necessary documentation as is necessary.