[redacted]

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: 03/05/2025

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 that mulitple [Police Service] officers failed to adequately investigate intimate partner violence matters, acted uncivilly when interacting with him, made disparaging remarks about his lawyer and shared his personal and legal information with his former partner.

[redacted]

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1: Performance of Duties - Neglect to do Duty - S.19 CSPA
Allegation #2: Interactions with the Public - Conduct Undermines Public Trust - S.10(1) CSPA
Allegation #3: Performance of Duties - Neglect to do Duty - S.19 CSPA
Allegation #4: Interactions with the Public - Conduct Undermines Public Trust - S.10(1) CSPA
Allegation #5: Performance of Duties - Neglect to do Duty - S.19 CSPA
Allegation #6: Interactions with the Public - Conduct Undermines Public Trust - S.10(1) CSPA
Allegation #7: Performance of Duties - Neglect to do Duty - S.19 CSPA
Allegation #8: Interactions with the Public - Conduct Undermines Public Trust - S.10(1) CSPA
Allegation #9: Performance of Duties - Neglect to do Duty - S.19 CSPA
Allegation #10: Interactions with the Public - Conduct Undermines Public Trust - S.10(1) CSPA
Allegation #11: Performance of Duties - Neglect to do Duty - S.19 CSPA
Allegation #12: Interactions with the Public - Conduct Undermines Public Trust - S.10(1) CSPA
Allegation #13: Performance of Duties - Neglect to do Duty - S.19 CSPA
Allegation #14: Interactions with the Public - Conduct Undermines Public Trust - S.10(1) CSPA
Allegation #15: Interactions with the Public - Conduct Undermines Public Trust - S.10(1) CSPA
Allegation #16: Interactions with the Public - Conduct Undermines Public Trust - S.10(1) CSPA

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1 is unsubstantiated based on analysis of the evidence of the interaction between the complainant and respondent officer. The respondent officer was investigating the offence of Criminal Harassment where the complainant was the subject. The respondent officer advised the complainant to cease harassing behaviour and warned that the subject could charged for the offence, but did not have sufficient grounds to lay a charge at the time. Section 264, Criminal Harassment in the Criminal Code of Canada defines the facts in issue for the behaviour of harassing communications.

Allegation #2 is unsubstantiated based on information provided by a civilian witness. The investigation revealed that the complainant provided their copy of court documents in error to a civilian witness. The court documents contained personal and legal information. Therefore, it has been confirmed that the police did not provide the complainant's personal information to any other person.

Allegations #3, #4, #5 and #6 are unsubstantiated based on the analysis of investigation the respondent officers conducted. The respondent officers established that a civilian witness did not fail to comply with the terms of their undertaking despite an allegation made by the complainant.

Allegations #7 and #8 are unsubstantiated based on the analysis of a document provided to the complainant at the time of creation. The complainant alleged that the respondent officer failed to fairly consider a condition on an undertaking that would limit their ability to move freely near their residence. An analysis of the undertaking found that the respondent officer was compliant of section 501 of the Criminal Code when considering specific conditions of a release. Additionally, there is insufficient evidence to support the allegation that the respondent officer conducted them self in an uncivil manner when dealing with the complainant.

Allegations #8, #9, #10, #11, #12, #13 and #14 are unsubstantiated based on an analysis of the evidence and investigative steps conducted by the involved respondent officers. The complainant alleged that the respondent officers failed to carry out a fulsome investigation into reported breaches of an undertaking committed by civilian witness. The investigation revealed that investigative steps were taken to collect evidence relevant to the reported breaches including video evidence of the events. The evidence confirmed that no criminal offence occurred.

Allegation #15 is unsubstantiated based on insufficient evidence to support the allegation that the respondent officer was uncivil during two telephone conversations.

Allegation #16 is unsubstantiated based on audio/evidence that contradicts the complainant's recollection of an interaction with the respondent officer. The complainant alleged that the respondent officer made disparaging comments about his lawyer while in a police station. An audio recording of the interaction revealed a marked departure from the allegation and demonstrated the officer did not make disparaging comments about his lawyer.