

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: 03/14/2025

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 she was unlawfully evicted from her residence by the Respondent Officers.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Interactions with the Public

Section 10(1) A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing

Decision and Reasons

Based on all of the evidence available to the Investigator, the Respondent Officers acted within all legislative authorities and [REDACTED] Police Service Procedures. They were called to the address and invited in by the homeowner.

As per the ROs' statements they were not evicting the Complainant, but rather acting under the TPA due to the fact that she was not covered under the RTA and the homeowner no longer wanted her in the home due to specific safety concerns. The fact that the living arrangements dictated that she shared a kitchen with the homeowner, resulted in an exemption to all of the protections under the RTA that are normally afforded to a tenant.

The lease agreement document that had been signed by both parties clearly stated that it was not to be used in any circumstances that were exempt from the RTA (Section 5), as outlined above due to the layout of the residence.

The audio/video evidence corroborates that the ROs conduct was lawful and accurate in their attempts to explain the situation, how the Complainant was not protected under the RTA and the potential ramifications under the TPA should she not leave the premise voluntarily. The ROs were professional, patient, respectful, clearly informative and they did not conduct themselves in a threatening manner. There is no objective evidence to support that the ROs enforcement actions amounted to racially biased policing or that the Complainant's skin color or gender were factors in the ROs reasoning and decision making, nor that the Complainant was being threatened or coerced into taking a refund for the last months' rent. In fact, the ROs were rather accommodating from the outset and in assisting the Complainant as they waited while she gathered her belongings. There is no evidence the ROs contravened [REDACTED] Police Service Procedure 13-14 Human Rights nor [REDACTED] Police Service Governance Section Fairness Discrimination and Harassment.