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: 03/11/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

Complainant alleged that on Thursday, November 28, 2024, at approximately 1100 hours, a person attended her home. Complainant was unable to answer the door because they were in the shower, but an unnamed Personal Support Worker (PSW) spoke to the person at the door. The person, later believed to be the Respondent Officer (R/O) provide a business card and told the PSW that they would return to the residence shortly.

Approximately 1200 hours, complainant observed a person at the front of their house. The complainant assumed it was the same person who attended their house earlier and spoke to the PSW. The complainant alleged the person was not easily identifiable as a police officer because they were dressed in plain clothes, were not driving a marked police cruiser, did not provide a second business card, and did not provide their name.

The complainant allowed the person, later verified to be the R/O, into their residence and they spoke. The complainant alleged that the R/O then threatened them with criminal charges and jail because they were not providing their mother with the necessities of life and money.

The complainant felt that the R/O attempted to coerce them into surrendering their mother's Power of Attorney rights, by threatening to charge them with theft. The complainant refused to sign the surrender of Power of Attorney papers because they believed that there were no grounds for these charges.

The complainant believed the theft charges were completely unfounded, and that the R/O was now fabricating charges to force them to comply and surrender their mother's Power of Attorney. The R/O appeared frustrated and abruptly left the complainant's residence.

The complainant was able to acquire a copy of the R/O's police report and noted significant differences from the report compared to their memory of that day's events.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Conduct Undermines Public Trust – Section 10 Community Safety and Policing Act:
"A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing."

Neglects to do Duty – Section 19 Community Safety and Policing Act:
"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

Regarding the allegation that the R/O neglected to do their duty, by not completing a full investigation into this matter, the Professional Standards Investigator must ask themselves, "Who is the victim in this investigation?" "What was done to better the situation as a result of police involvement?" and "Did the R/O properly use their discretion to best serve all the involved parties in this investigation?"

* VICTIM IDENTIFICATION: the Professional Standards Investigator was able to quickly determine the elderly, mobility challenged and resource (food and toiletries) dependent mother was the true victim. If the police did not intervene, there could have been a dramatic and negative outcome. Therefore, the Professional Standards Investigator determined if the R/O had done nothing, this inaction would fit the definition of Neglect of Duty.

* ACTIONS TO BETTER THE SITUATION: the Professional Standards Investigator determined that the R/O interviewed the victim, spoke to independent witness, at the bank and apartment complex and acquired a good understanding of the situation. The R/O was able to provide options that would empower the elderly mother to acquire the necessities of life, such as food and toiletries.

* OFFICER DISCRETION: Upon review of the investigation, the Professional Standards Investigator determined there were sufficient grounds to lay criminal charges against the complainant for their non-actions to assist their elderly and dependent mother. During the telephone interview with the Professional Standards Investigator, the complainant agreed that their mother has become "child-like" due to her level of dependence upon them. Also, the complainant admitted to the Professional Standards Investigator that they do not have anyone to help them, that this PoA responsibility is very draining for them and they have not had a vacation in an exceedingly long time.

Members of the Criminal Investigations Branch were able to follow up this investigation and determine that since the R/O's involvement in the complainat's lives, conditions have improved.