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: 03/06/2025

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 alleges the involved [redacted] unethically acted as both a child advocate and a police officer during an investigation. The Complainant claims the officer turned off recording equipment while interviewing his son and continued the interview. The Complainant interrupted the interview and alleges the Officer used aggressive language and assaulted the Complainant throwing him out. The Complainant alleges the officer grabbed the Complainant by the arm after the interview and accused the Complainant of attacking him. The Complainant alleges discrimination in that the officer was trying to get him in trouble and he was subject to incivility and excessive force (twice). The Complainant believes the discrimination is a result of his juvenile history in [redacted]

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1. Undermine Public Trust - s. 10(1)
2. Incivility - s. 12(1)
3. Unnecessary or Excessive Use of Force s. 11(1)
4. Unnecessary or Excessive Use of Force s. 11(1)
5. Treat Person in Contravention of HRC s. 5(1)

Decision and Reasons

1. Undermine Public Trust - The Officer is a designated child abuse investigator. Case Notes, reports, emails and recorded interviews were reviewed. This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of his duties and acted in accordance with relevant governance while conducting a joint investigation with the assigned Child Protection Worker.

2. Incivility - The alleged interaction was recorded electronically. The Complainant's version of events is a significant departure from the reality of the recording. The Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

3. Unnecessary or Excessive Use of Force - The alleged interaction was recorded electronically. The Complainant's version of events is a significant departure from the reality of the recording. The Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

4. Unnecessary or Excessive Use of Force - The Officer statement(s) describe a benign touch to the Complainant's elbow and no evidence of grabbing the Complainant or accusing him of attack. The Complainant identified a civilian witness. An additional civilian witness was identified from the first. Both of the civilian witnesses made notes at the time. The information from the civilian witnesses do not support the complaint.

5. Treat Person in Contravention of HRC - The electronic recording and civilian witness evidence do not support the Complainant's allegations. The Complainant was never arrested or accused of any offence in relation to this occurrence. The Complainant is 36 years of age. Neither the RO or WO were employed with TPS when the Complainant was a juvenile. Finally , the basis on which the Complainant alleges the officers were discriminatory do not fall under the prohibited grounds defined by the Human Rights Code (HRC). Therefore, there is no evidence the officers contravened the HRC or Toronto Police Service Procedure 13-14 Human Rights.