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: 04/23/2025

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 he was incorrectly issued a ticket for disobeying a stop sign. He states that after receiving the ticket, he informed the officer that he would contest it in court. In response, the officer escalated the situation by claiming the Complainant was instigating. The Complainant further alleges that the officer then used an offensive racial slur before driving away.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Incivility - Section 12 (1) CSPA
Conduct undermines public trust – Section 10(1) CSPA
Human Rights and the Charter 5(1) CSPA

Decision and Reasons

Incivility

This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of his duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. A thorough review of the available video evidence confirms that the Respondent Officer did not swear or make any derogatory comments directed at the Complainant.

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

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Conduct undermines public trust

This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of his duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. A thorough review of the available video evidence confirms that the Respondent Officer was calm and professional throughout the interaction with the Complainant. The Respondent Officer questioned the Complainant concerning the remarks he made after being issued the Provincial Offence Notice. This was a short interaction and there was no attempt to instigate the Complainant or escalate their interaction.

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

Human Rights and the Charter

This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of his duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. A thorough review of the available video evidence confirms that the Respondent Officer was calm and professional throughout the interaction with