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: 05/05/2025

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 attempted to file a report with the [redacted] Police alleging that a person committed public mischief when they gave false evidence during a 911 call and subsequent police interview, which resulted in the Complainant being wrongfully charged.

The Complainant alleges that Respondent Officer 1 (RO1) declined to investigate and would not look at his evidence or conduct a proper interview. Further, Respondent Officer 2 (RO2) also did not take any steps to investigate his complaint.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Neglect of Duty – Section 19
Undermine Public Trust – Section 10(1)

Decision and Reasons

Neglect of Duty – Section 19

This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. RO1 was provided documents by the Complainant, which he believed were evidence that the other party had committed Public Mischief. RO1 reviewed the documents, compared them to the original case's evidence and determined they outlined inconsistencies and found no grounds for a charge of Public Mischief. RO1 did his due diligence upon being made aware of the allegation.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Undermine Public Trust – Section 10(1)

This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The Complainant raised his concerns with the investigation done by RO1. RO1 and RO2 attempted to resolve the complaint prior to it being filed. Once determined that they could not resolve the matter, the Complainant was provided with information on how he could file a complaint with LECA. Both RO1 and RO2 followed proper procedure with respect to complaints being made.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.