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: 11/27/2024

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 alleges respondent officer 1 and respondent officer 2 were neglectful in not conducting a thorough and fulsome investigation concerning her Break and Enter report.
The complainant alleges respondent officer 1 and 2 attended and completed the investigation and the complainant felt heard. The complainant then attend the police station a time period later to provide more information and was told the investigation was closed. At this time the complainant felt disheartened and was given false hope from the two respondent officers.

The complainant alleges respondent officer 3 was neglectful in not conducting a thorough and fulsome investigation concerning her Sexual Assault report.
The complainant was told the investigation was being closed because of the lack of evidence to support her allegations. The complainant alleges respondent officer 3 told her their was no reasonable grounds to arrest the suspect because the suspect was under the influence at the time of the alleged offense and can not be held responsible.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 - Neglects to do duty section 19 CSPA

Allegation 2 - Neglects to do duty section 19 CSPA

Decision and Reasons

(1) Unsubstantiated - The respondent officers who attend the complainant's residence in relation to her break and enter, completed a thorough investigation. The officers took pictures of text messages provided by the complainant. The officer checked for any signs of forced entry which was never discovered. The residence was check for any kind of physical evidence of a break and enter which was never discovered. The officers conducted witness and video canvasses that never revealed an evidence of a break and enter. The officers exhausted all investigative avenues in an attempt to identified a person of interest or suspect. The officers followed the GSPS procedure in relation to investigating a break and enter and property related offenses. The officers completed their notes and reports in a timely manner as per the GSPS procedure.

(2) Unsubstantiated - The respondent officer is a qualified sexual assault investigator. The respondent officer has completed various interviewing course and investigated this sexual assault being mindful to using a victim centered approach. The respondent officer completed a video/ audio statement with complainant. The complainant after the interviewed wished not to proceed with the investigation and for the respondent officer not to reach out the person of interest.
The complainant was unavailable for a time period for any follow up after her statement. The complainant once available alleges she made attempts to reach out the the respondent officer to provide further evidence. The complainant was unable to provided any dates for these attempts.
The respondent officer advised he never told the complainant the sexual assault investigation was being closed because the person of interest was intoxicated at the time of the offense. The respondent officer told the complainant the investigation was being closed because of insufficient evidence to proceed with reasonable grounds for an arrest.
The respondent officer followed the GSPS Sexual Assault Investigations Procedure.

Paul CEYSSENS "Legal Aspects of Policing" was referred too for both allegations.