

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: 2025-05-28	
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 the RO neglected his duty. The complainant states that she contacted police regarding a fraudulent use of a writ of possession used to evict her sister. Despite reporting this matter, no investigation has been conducted, and the complainant has received no file number, and no follow-up from the assigned officer. Additionally, her follow-up emails and messages have gone unanswered.		

LECA 2024 Page 1 of 2



Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Neglects to do duty Sec. 19 CSPA

Decision and Reasons

All allegations were unsubstantiated

The complainant reported that she spoke with Officer 1 and Officer 2 and they did not take the complainant seriously and they did not do a thorough investigation. The complainant also stated that the officers failed to communicate with the complainant.

Officer 1 and Officer 2, collected evidence from the complainant and the sister of the complainant. They reviewed the evidence conducted interviews and determined that the complaint was civil in nature and would need to be handled in civil court. This information was explained to the complainant and the sister on separate dates. The complainant made a second complaint when the sister was evicted from the residence. Officer 1 and Officer 2 again reviewed all the reports and the judicial documentation that supported the eviction. Once again this was thoroughly explained to the complainant and the sister. Officer 1 and Officer 2 did a thorough investigation and clearly communicated their findings on numerous occasions.

LECA Page 2 of 2