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: 02/24/2025

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 alleges the respondent officer conducted a negligent investigation and undermined public trust.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 - Section 10(1) Undermine Public Trust - Performance of Duties - RO1

Allegation 2 - Section 19 Neglect of Duty - Performance of Duties - RO1

Decision and Reasons

Performance of Duties

Section 19 – A police officer shall not, by act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer failed to properly communicate with the Complainant and secure evidence in relation to the Complainant's fraud occurrence.

Finding: This investigation revealed that the Respondent Officer made an unintentional error, resulting in the loss of potential evidence that could have aided in identifying a suspect in the Complainant's reported fraud occurrence. The Respondent Officer misinterpreted a response email from the Complainant's financial institution, which directed her to forward the request to another department. The Officer believed the financial institution was indicating that the inquiry had been received and would be forwarded appropriately. However, a closer examination of the email revealed that the Respondent Officer should have forwarded the request herself. While this was an unintentional administrative error, the Investigator has determined that it does not rise to the level of misconduct.