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: 10/02/2025

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 attended in front of the police service seeking assistance to have her son removed from her vehicle. He son was an addict who was begging for money which escatlated into a physical confrontation with another passanger in the vehicle. The passanger entered the police service and requested assistance.

Officer attended the vehicle to remove the male, now known to be wanted on a warrant. Multiple officers were on scene and direct the male to exit the vehicle. The male resisted, was flailing around and requried multiple officer to restrain him in handcuffs. Once in handcuffs he was still kicking his legs.

Four officers surrounded the male, keeping him under control when the respondant officer walked around in front of the male and punched him in the chest. The hit was hard enough to be heard by the complainant seated in her vehicle.

The complainant yelled to stop that it wasn't allowed. The complainant is unsure if he continued to hit the male after that.

The complainant expressed dissipointment about the conduct of the officer, feels the use of force was unreasonable.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Alligation 1 - Use of Force 11

Alligation 2 - Conduct Undermined Public Trust 10(1)

Decision and Reasons

The investigation included an interview with the complainant, a review of all reports and involved officer's notes, as well as a review of body-worn camera footage. The respondent officer reported that the individual was actively resisting arrest, including pulling away and kicking at officers. The officer stated that a discretionary strike to the abdomen was delivered in response to being kicked in the groin, in order to regain control and prevent further harm.
The body-worn camera footage confirmed that the individual was physically resisting arrest. While the footage did not clearly capture the moment of the kick, the audio and visible reactions supported the officer's account. No evidence was found to contradict the officer's explanation or to suggest that the force used was excessive or outside the scope of professional conduct.

Based on the totality of the evidence, including the officer's account and the corroborating elements of the video footage, the allegation of excessive force was determined to be unsubstantiated. The officer's actions were found to be consistent with the legal authority under Section 25 of the Criminal Code of Canada and aligned with accepted use-of-force protocols.
The additional allegation that the officer's conduct which underminder public trust was also reviewed. While the complainant's perception of the incident is acknowledged, public trust must be assessed based on objective standards and the reasonableness of the officer's conduct under the circumstances. In this case, the officer responded to a combative individual using force that was proportionate and legally justified. As such, the allegation of breach of public trust is also considered unsubstantiated.