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
On March 25, 2025, the Complainant was working as a crossing guard for the [redacted]. The Complainant witnessed a motorist drive through a red light. The police officer did not follow behind the motorist.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Conduct Undermines Public Trust

Neglect of Duty

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Interactions with the Public

Section 12(1) A police officer shall not, in the course of their duties, use abusive language with any person or otherwise treat any person in a manner that is abusive.

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer yelled and screamed at the Complainant to get off the road.

Respondent Officer

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of his duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The Respondent Officer raised his voice when he was trying to pass through the intersection with his emergency equipment activated and the Complainant refused to let him pass. The RO was professional and assertive; the Complainant was shouting and insulting the RO during the entire interaction.

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

Performance of Duties

Section 19 - Neglect of Duty

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 Officer allowed a vehicle to run a red light without stopping the vehicle.

Respondent Officer

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The Respondent Officer activated his emergency equipment to proceed through the red light in order to stop the vehicle. The Complainant was preventing the officer from his lawful duties; therefore, the Respondent Officer could not have neglected to do his job.

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.