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: 03/03/2025

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 alleged that the Respondent Officer failed to complete a thorough investigation regarding a vehicle collision.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 19 - Fail to Perform Duties

Decision and Reasons

The Complainant was involved in a two-vehicle collision, and was listed as "Driver 1" (at fault or most at fault driver) on the collision report. He alleged that the Respondent Officer assigned full fault to him, failed to consider evidence, and relied on an unverified witness statement. The complainant requested that a review of the investigation be conducted, and that the collision report be amended to list him as "Driver 2".

The evidence demonstrated that the Respondent Officer completed a fulsome and thorough investigation, considered all available evidence, had the investigation reviewed by a Traffic Collision Investigator, and obtained statements from the other involved driver, and an independent witness. The Complainant was given the opportunity to provide a statement at the scene, but declined.

The Complainant further believed he should not have be assigned full fault for the collision. The Ontario Fault Determination Rules R.R.O. 1990 Reg. 668 are the guidelines for insurance companies to determine fault in collisions in Ontario, and fall outside of the authority of the police.

The Complainant had the ability to file a complaint with his insurance company, the General Insurance OmbudService, and the Financial Services Regulatory Authority of Ontario to address their "at fault" determination.

There was no evidence to suggest that misconduct occurred.