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: May 6, 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 that he was involved in a traffic stop in the downtown area. The complainant alleged that the officers involved acted in an uncivil manner by speaking in a loud and aggressive manner and failed to explain the reason for the traffic stop. He alleged that an excessive number of officers attended the traffic stop. He further alleged that officers failed to record the interaction with their body cameras and several officers failed to identify themselves.

During the investigation process, the complainant also alleged that an officer he spoke to on the phone refused to provide him with his name and badge number.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 10 - Undermines public trust in policing
Section 13(2) - Fail to Provide Identifying Information Upon Request

Decision and Reasons

The traffic stop was conducted in the downtown core during a high visibility initiative. The initial officers on the traffic stop were on foot, so two additional officers attended in a vehicle. A sixth officer attended the scene to speak to the sergeant on scene about an unrelated matter.

It was determined that the officers provided the complainant with the reason for the stop several times, but the complainant continued to speak over the officers.

There were only two officers on scene equipped with body-worn microphones that are paired with in-car cameras. One of the officers with a body-worn microphone was on foot patrol and not within range of his police vehicle so his recording could not be activated. The second officer was the officer who arrived to speak to the sergeant about an unrelated matter. His car was recording but his microphone was not, as it was charging within his police vehicle.

It was determined that five of the six officers on scene provided the complainant with both their name and badge number.

The last officer to arrive on scene did not provide his name. He only provided the complainant with his number as per his previous training.

It was determined that the officer that the complainant spoke to on the phone did not provide his name or badge number.