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: 02/26/2025

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 states the respondent officer did not seek information concerning the whereabouts of her brother, the day prior to her mother's fall at [redacted], the day of the incident, and not the days following it, especially that the investigation was ordered by the coroner, for the possibility of her brother's involvement leading to, during, or following her mother's death.
The complainant states the respondent officer did not question the [redacted] authorities on the personal support worker's record of care vs negligence towards residents.
The complainant alleges the police report is sloppy and poorly redacted.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 - Neglects to do duty section 19 CSPA

Allegation 2 - Conduct undermines public trust section 10 CSPA

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 - unsubstantiated
To meet the threshold of misconduct, the actions or inactions of the officer must "cross the line from mere performance consideration to matter of misconduct" - PG v. Police Complaint Commissioner.
The respondent officer did conduct a thorough and fulsome investigation in relation to the sudden death.
The respondent officer was directed by the coroner to obtain certain items listed in the coroner's warrant.
The respondent officer spoke with the nursing home staff and inspected the room of the deceased.
The respondent officer spoke with the PSW who was present during the initial incident being the fall of the deceased.
The respondent officer followed the GSPS procedure concerning investigating a sudden death.
The respondent officer did not have any authority to question the complainant's brother.

Allegation 2 - unsubstantiated

The conduct and investigative steps taken by the respondent officer were thorough and in compliance with procedures, his actions if made public would not bring the Service into disrepute.