

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: 03/21/2025

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 that multiple officers failed to thoroughly investigate reports made about persistent unwanted contact from their ex-partner. The complainant also alleged that officers failed to take appropriate enforcement action despite being provided with adequate evidence that they were the victim of intimate partner violence.

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
--

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1 is unsubstantiated based on the analysis of the evidence and totality of the circumstances. The respondent officer's investigation revealed that the complainant's ex-partner sent emails to the complainant that were innocuous and not offensive in nature. Furthermore, the complainant's ex-partner did not know their communication was harassing or reckless towards the complainant. The ex-partner was directed by the officer to cease contact. Finally, a Peace Bond Application filed by the complainant was denied by the Assistant Crown Attorney in charge of the case due to insufficient evidence. The presiding Judge agreed.

Allegation #2 is unsubstantiated as body worn camera footage shows the respondent officer's demeanor and actions was to the contrary.

Allegations #3 and #4 are unsubstantiated as the respondent officer correctly determined through investigation that the complainant's allegation that their ex-partner was criminally harassing them by being present at an open swimming session at a local public pool was not an offence. It was determined that the complainant's ex-partner was at the pool before the complainant arrived and did not commit an offence. The respondent officer's demeanor was captured on body worn camera which showed they were professional and empathic. This is contrary to the allegations made by the complainant.

Allegations #5 and #6 are unsubstantiated as the respondent officer correctly determined through investigation that the complainant's ex-partner's presence at a local Costco store close to their residence was not an offence and that the complainant was not at the store at the time nor contacted by their ex-partner prior to or after being at the Costco store. Furthermore, the respondent officer's body worn camera footage showed that they were professional and polite which is contrary to the complainant's allegations.

Allegations #7 and #8 are unsubstantiated as the respondent officer correctly determined that the allegation that the complainant's ex-partner was continuing to contact their parent was historic and had previously been reported. Body worn camera footage showed that the respondent officer was