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: 05/09/2025

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 that the Respondent Officer used their position for personal benefit.

The Complainant states that the Respondent Officer, who appears to be her ex-partner and the father of her children, has abused his power as an officer.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent Officer has used his work resources to stalk her and gather personal information about her. The Complainant would like the Respondent Officer's search history investigated because it is a misuse of power for an officer to look someone up for no reason and he is using the information that he collected illegally to harass her.

The Complainant also provided a text message sent to her by the Respondent Officer that the Complainant believed to be inappropriate and unprofessional.

During the course of the investigation, the Complainant did not want the portion of her complaint that related to the Respondent Officer conducting data base queries of her further investigated.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Interactions with the Public - Undermine Public Trust

Section 10 (1) A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, trust in policing

• It was alleged that the Respondent Officer sent an inappropriate and unprofessional text message to the Complainant

Decision and Reasons

The sole issue that needs to be addressed is the text message that the Respondent Officer sent to the Complainant.

When reading the text message on its own without any context as to the events that were unfolding when it was sent, it would not be difficult to come to the conclusion that this statement would undermine the public trust in policing.

However, one must take into account the totality of the circumstances that led to the text message being sent.

In his investigative interview, the Respondent Officer indicated that he has been going through a very tumultuous and argumentative divorce and child custody process with the Complainant.

These messages usually will involve the visitation and general welfare of the two children that the Respondent Officer and the Complainant share custody of.

It was during one of these heated and emotional back-and-forth exchanges that the Respondent Officer sent the text message. In his investigative interview the Respondent Officer acknowledged that he let his emotions get the better of him and that he needs to be more disciplined and controlled when dealing with the Complainant.

The Respondent Officer indicated that when he sent this text message his intent was to advise the Complainant that he had multiple resources available to him through the Toronto Police Service and through their Employee and Family Assistance Program as well as other peer groups that can provide advice and guidance.

After reviewing all of the available information, the investigating officer has determined that there is an insufficient body of evidence to establish reasonable grounds to believe misconduct has