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: 02/26/2025

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 Police failed to identify themselves, didn't allow him to get dressed before going to the police station and failed to do a proper investigation before arresting him.

Furthermore, while at the Police Station, the officers laughed at him while he was in his underwear and asked the Complainant if he was a man because they saw him in his underwear.

Lastly, officers harshly arrested him at his house and did not identify themselves.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Conduct Undermines Public Trust - Section 10 (1) CSPA
Incivility - Section 12(1) CSPA
Neglects to do Duty - Section 19 CSPA

Decision and Reasons

Conduct Undermines Public Trust

This investigation has revealed the officer(s) were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. RO5 and RO6 were in full uniform with their appropriate identification while interacting with the Complainant and followed [redacted] procedures while handcuffing the Complainant.

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

Incivility

This investigation has revealed the officer(s) were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. RO3 and RO4 followed the proper guidelines within [redacted] procedures and were professional during their interaction with the Complainant.

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

Neglects to do Duty

This investigation has revealed the officer(s) were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. RO1 and RO2 conducted a thorough investigation and advised the Complainant of his rights while interviewing him about the allegations.

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