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: 12/14/2024

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 alleged that he was assaulted while in police custody by Respondent Officer (RO 1) and that the RO 2 had deleted content from his phone without consent or authorization. Further while in custody his glasses were removed where he reported he needed them.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Public-Unnecessary Force - Sec 11 CSPA Reg. 407/23 - RO 1
Public-Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23 - RO 2

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 (Assault): Unnecessary Force
No evidence of assault. Complainant was uncooperative with Professional Standards Investigator. The arrest and use of force were lawful supported by the witness and respondent officer evidence.

Allegation 2 (Undermining Public Trust):
Video showed RO 2 did not manipulate the phone and further no witnesses observed this misconduct. The complainant was uncooperative in providing the phone for forensic analysis.
Additional Concern (Eyewear Use): Booking and Cell video confirmed officers allowed use of glasses when appropriate.

unsubstantiated