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: 02/02/2025

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 the Respondent Officer failed to respond to his multiple attempts of communication where the Complainant made queries about the status of his criminal investigation via email.

The Complainant alleged the Respondent Officer failed to file a report detailing his allegations of threatening.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, S.O. 2019, c. 1, Schedule 1 Code of Conduct for Police Officer: Ontario Regulation 407/23.

This regulation sets out the code of conduct with which every police officer must comply.

Allegation #1

Performance of Duties - Neglect of Duty

Decision and Reasons

Findings: The Complainant made attempts to contact RO1 by email. After his third attempt, and receiving no response from RO1, he filed his complaint with LECA.

Upon being notified of the LECA complaint, RO1 immediately admitted to his oversight and that he had no intention of disregarding the Complainant's emails. Rather, he became occupied with priority calls in the execution of his duties and admitted to forgetting to respond to the Complainant's emails.

The Investigator believes this incident to be a genuine oversight by RO1 and does not believe that RO1 refused to respond to the Complainant's emails. The Investigator confirmed that RO1 was engaged in various priority radio calls when he received the Complainant's emails.

RO1 has learned from the incident and will ensure to inform members of the public to follow up with the CIB when requiring additional information or assistance regarding their case. This will ensure immediate and effective communication between the involved person and members of the Toronto Police Service.

As a result of the investigation, the Complainant accepted RO1's apology that was sent directly to the Complainant by email.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.