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: 03/03/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

It was alleged that between March 24, 2021 and January 20, 2025, the Respondent Officers (RO 1 and RO 2) were neglectful in their duties by not conducting a thorough and complete fraud investigation and by ignoring repeated request for action involving the Complainant (CO).

The CO asserted that he was the victim of a renovation fraud involving CW1 in March 2021. RO1 responded to the call for service, and upon reviewing the evidence, deemed the matter to be a civil matter. Between March 2021 and January 2025, the CO continued to maintain the matter was criminal and had filed a civil suit against CW1. The civil matter remains before the courts while the CO continued to email RO1 advocating for criminal charges against CW1.

Between March 2021 and August 2022, the CO continued to email RO1 providing information or demanding an update or fraud charges be filed. RO1 reviewed and responded to some of the emails, which included consultation with his superior officers, resulting in the decision the matter remained a civil one, and not criminal.

In January 2025, the CO contacted Police and spoke to RO2 requesting an update to the fraud investigation. RO2 spoke with the CO and forwarded information provided by the CO to RO2 to RO1.

Between February 2025 and May 2025 WO1 completed a review and subsequent follow up of the CO fraud allegation and concerns directed at RO1's investigation into the matter. WO1 completed an 11-page report outlining his findings, confirming the fraud allegation was and remains a civil matter.

As a result of criminal charges not being filed by Police, the CO filed a complaint with LECA citing neglect of duty.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23
Neglect of Duty – Sec. 2(1)(c)(i) – PSA Reg. 268/10

Decision and Reasons

The complaint of Neglect of Duty x2 was deemed unsubstantiated.

The PSU Investigator obtained and reviewed WO1's report, and agreed with its findings that the fraud matter as alleged by the CO was and remains a civil matter. Further that civil litigation is still ongoing in Woodstock court.

The evidence of the RO1, RO2 and WO1 was consistent with their notes and duty and review reports.

There was no evidence the RO1 and RO2 were neglectful in their duties.