

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: 03/16/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ☒

Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On March 15, 2025, the Complainant contacted police after her daughter informed her that her 16-year-old son had broken a window and made repeated threats to jump. The incident was classified as a Priority 2 – Threatening Suicide call, prompting the deployment of multiple [REDACTED] units to the family residence.

In a formal complaint submitted to the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) on March 16, the Complainant alleged that responding officers failed to apprehend her son under the Mental Health Act, despite his documented mental health history and the presence of apparent risk factors. She also challenged the accuracy of the officers' report, specifically disputing the claim that her daughter had denied hearing suicidal statements, a detail she believes significantly influenced the officers' decision not to proceed with an apprehension.

Additionally, the Complainant asserted that officers made inappropriate and intimidating remarks during their engagement with her, including cautions regarding potential legal consequences for misuse of 911 services or providing false information. The complaint alleges that these actions collectively constituted officer misconduct and may represent breaches of the Community Safety and Policing Act, specifically under Section 10 (Undermining Public Trust) and Section 27 (Failure to Comply with Service Governance).

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1

Interactions with the Public,

Section 10(1) A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

Allegation 2

Performance of Duties,

Section 27 - A police officer shall comply with the procedures established by their Chief of Police.

Allegation 3

Interactions with the Public,

Section 12(1) A police officer shall not, in the course of their duties, use abusive language with any person or otherwise treat any person in a manner that is abusive.

Decision and Reasons

The investigation determined that the Respondent Officers acted within the lawful scope of their duties and complied fully with the Mental Health Act, as well as [REDACTED] policies and procedures. In response to a complex mental health-related call involving a 16-year-old youth, officers demonstrated professionalism, sound judgment, and adherence to trauma-informed policing principles. Their engagement was respectful and measured, and their decision-making was based on direct observations supported by consistent third-party corroboration. After assessing the totality of the circumstances, the officers appropriately concluded that the legal criteria for involuntary apprehension had not been met.

Given the totality of the circumstances, Respondent Officer 2's caution to the Complainant regarding the improper use of 911 and [REDACTED] Communications Services was appropriate and delivered in a respectful, professional manner. The officer clearly articulated the potential consequences of misusing emergency services out of dissatisfaction with police decisions rather than due to a legitimate emergency.

The allegation that the Respondent Officers falsified information was found to be unsubstantiated. A clerical inaccuracy in the initial General Occurrence Report, concerning the daughter's statement, was identified and promptly corrected. This reporting error had no bearing on the real-time operational decisions made during the incident. Furthermore, the caution issued to the Complainant regarding repeated use of emergency services was conveyed professionally, with the intent to inform rather than penalize.

Throughout their response, the Respondent Officers acted in alignment with [REDACTED] Governance and the trauma-informed policing model endorsed by the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (OACP). Their conduct reflected an understanding of the complexities of youth mental health and the importance of de-escalation, autonomy, and family-based support.

Accordingly, the investigation determined that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct occurred. The available information does not support the allegation that the Respondent Officers engaged in behaviour that undermined, or was likely to undermine, public trust in policing under Section 10 of the Community Safety and Policing Act. As such, the allegation is considered unsubstantiated.

The investigation determined that the Respondent Officers acted lawfully, professionally, and in full alignment with relevant legislative authorities and [REDACTED] Service Governance. There is no evidence to support the allegation that officers failed to meet their obligations under [REDACTED] Procedure 06-04 (Persons in Crisis), Procedure 15-01 (Incident Response), or the trauma-informed policing framework endorsed by the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (OACP).

In response to the reported mental health crisis involving a 16-year-old youth, the Respondent Officers demonstrated sound judgment and employed a trauma-informed approach throughout their engagement. Upon locating the youth, they conducted a thorough in-person assessment. He presented as calm and coherent, denied any suicidal intent, and offered a rational explanation for the broken window and minor injury, an account supported by both his girlfriend and sister. Although the sister acknowledged hearing a self-harm statement, she clarified that she believed it was attention-seeking rather than indicative of genuine risk.

Given the totality of the circumstances and the corroborated information, officers determined that the legal threshold for involuntary apprehension under the Mental Health Act was not met. Instead, they facilitated a safe, family-based resolution by arranging for the youth to be placed in the care of his father. Despite the Complainant's continued insistence on apprehension, the youth was resolute in stating he was not suicidal and declined voluntary hospital assessment, further validating the officers' decision to avoid coercive intervention.

Based on these findings, the investigation determined that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct occurred. The allegation concerning failure to comply with Service Governance under Section 27 of the Community Safety and Policing Act is therefore considered unsubstantiated.