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: 05/16/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint
It is alleged that on May 13th, 2025, when the Complainant attended [redacted] Police Service [redacted] to report a crime committed against him, it is further alleged that the Respondent officer conducted a neglectful investigation by failing to take a report from the Complainant, and further that he acted in an unprofessional manner by failing to provide his identifying information.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1

Performance of Duties,
Section 19 A police officer shall not, by act or omission, fail to perform their
duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know
or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount
to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officers conducted a neglectful investigation.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)

Allegation #2

Section 13(2) While acting in the course of their duties, a police officer shall, upon
Request, provide their name, badge number and the name of their
Police service to any member of the public in a manner reasonable
In the circumstances that allows the member of the public to identify the officer, unless the officer has reason to believe that doing so would undermine the safety of an individual.

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer failed to provide his identifying information upon request.

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Performance of Duties,
Section 19 A police officer shall not, by act or omission, fail to perform their
duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know
or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount
to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officers conducted a neglectful investigation.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. As per the Complainant's own statement and emails to the Investigator he was attempting to report an occurrence not deemed to be of a criminal nature or a major case as defined in the Ontario Major Case Management Manual; making an arrest; investigating a matter likely to be prosecuted; or deemed necessary. RO1 had the discretion to refuse to submit a report after listening to the information provided by 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.

Allegation #2

Section 13(2) While acting in the course of their duties, a police officer shall, upon
Request, provide their name, badge number and the name of their
Police service to any member of the public in a manner reasonable
In the circumstances that allows the member of the public to identify the officer, unless the officer has reason to believe that doing so would undermine the safety of an individual.

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer failed to provide his identifying information upon request.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities.

RO1 was wearing his badge number on his epaulets on his shoulders, as well as his name tag worn on his chest. Furthermore after reviewing RO1's Body Worn Camera recoding there is no evidence of the Complainant ever requesting his name or badge number.

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.