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: 05/20/2025

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

Incident # 1
The complainant alleges that while officers were arresting another individual, they used blunt force to detain her without cause. She describes being physically dragged into the situation despite being an uninvolved bystander. The officers reportedly displayed aggressive and dismissive behavior during the encounter, including laughing and making light of the arrest. The complainant felt the force used was excessive and unjustified given her lack of involvement.

Incident # 2
The complainant states she was wrongfully arrested without probable cause. After officers discovered she was not connected to the original suspect, they allegedly turned off their body cameras and continued with what she describes as a “fake arrest.” During this time, officers discussed how best to justify her detainment. The complainant was eventually released after officers found pepper spray in her possession, which they misclassified as a prohibited weapon

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1
Interactions with the Public
Section 11(1) - A police officer shall not use force unless
(a) The force is used for the purpose of carrying out a duty;
(b) The officer is entitled, by statute or common law, to use force for the purpose of carrying out that duty;
(c) The officer is acting on reasonable grounds; and
(d) The force used is no more than is necessary given the circumstances

Decision and Reasons

Allegation # 1

Finding: The investigation determined that the Respondent Officers use of force against the Complainant was lawful, reasonable, necessary and justified.
Based on the available information, there was insufficient evidence to believe on reasonable grounds that the Respondent Officers committed misconduct.

The allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation # 2

Finding: The arrest was lawful, as it was based on reasonable grounds arising from the observed hand-to-hand exchange consistent with a drug transaction in a high-crime area under active investigation. Based on the available information, there was insufficient evidence to believe on reasonable grounds that the Respondent Officers committed misconduct.

The allegation is unsubstantiated.

Conclusion:

Based on the findings of the investigation, both allegations against the Respondent Officers are unsubstantiated. In the first allegation, the use of force was found to be lawful, reasonable, necessary, and justified. In the second, the arrest was determined to be lawful, supported by reasonable grounds stemming from an observed hand-to-hand exchange consistent with a drug transaction in a high crime area under active investigation. Given the available information, there is insufficient evidence to support a belief, on reasonable grounds, that the Respondent Officers engaged in any misconduct. Accordingly, there are reasonable grounds to believe that no misconduct occurred in relation to the actions of the Respondent Officers.