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: 03/04/2025

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 4, 2025, the Complainant filed a LECA complaint alleging Respondent Officers unlawfully detained her, did not allow her to call lawyer, used excessive force on her and were unprofessional.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1.) Interaction with the Public - Section 8(1) Unauthorized physical or psychological detention
2.) Interaction with the Public - Section 11(1) Unnecessary or excessive use of force
3.) Interaction with the Public - Section 12(1) Incivility

Decision and Reasons

****Allegation #1**** Unsubstantiated

Respondent Officers had reasonable grounds to believe the Complainant committed a criminal offence in that she abandoned her child putting the child in danger, contrary to Section 218 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

The detention of the Complainant was not arbitrary and did not violate the Complainant's Section 9 Charter Rights.

The Respondent Officers were legally justified when they denied the Complainant's request to call a lawyer. Respondent Officers could not afford privacy as required by Ontario Court of Justice – R. v. Ahmad.

****Allegation #2**** Unsubstantiated

The Respondent Officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and were legally justified to detain/arrest the Complainant

The Complainant's pregnancy has no relevance pertaining to Respondent Officers use of force. Being pregnant does not prevent force from being applied. It is a consideration on the amount of force being used by officers.

Evidence shows de-escalation and communication tactics were deployed by Respondent Officers throughout the interaction. However, because of the Complainant's emotional state, Respondent Officers repeatedly tried to explain to the Complainant what was happening and provided instructions multiple times which were not followed. As such the Respondent Officer's used minimal force to gain compliance.