

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: 05/21/2025

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 alleges that on May 1, 2025, he visited a restaurant located in the area of [REDACTED]. Upon entering, he was confronted by RO1 and told to leave. The Complainant briefly returned to the restaurant, where he alleges that he was threatened by the owner and trespassed from the property. He believes that the Respondent Officer was retaliating against him for a prior, unrelated complaint he filed with the LECA. Additionally, the Complainant claims that the Respondent Officer intimidated him, publicly stated that he had a previous arrest, and shared sensitive police video evidence from his personal cellphone.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1

Undermine Public Trust,

Section 10(1) – conducted yourself in a manner that undermined, or was likely to undermine, public trust in policing

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer was verbally aggressive, threatening and disrespectful to the Complainant.

Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019

Allegation #2

Community Safety and Policing Act – Other Matters – Prohibited Conduct

Section 179 (1) No person shall harass, coerce or intimidate, or attempt to harass, coerce or intimidate, any other person in relation to a complaint made or investigation conducted.

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer was intimidating the Complainant with respect to a previous Complaint.

As a result, with respect to this allegation, the conclusion is unsubstantiated.

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Community Safety and Policing Act – Ontario Regulation 407/23 Code of Conduct for Police Officers

Undermine Public Trust

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

It is alleged that the Respondent Officer was verbally aggressive, threatening and disrespectful to the Complainant. It is also alleged that the Respondent Officer showed a sensitive video containing police evidence to the Complainant.

Finding: This investigation revealed that the Respondent Officer was off duty at the time of his interaction with the Complainant and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. Interviews with civilian witnesses confirmed that the Complainant initiated the interaction and that restaurant staff ordered him to leave. Although the Respondent Officer briefly interacted with the Complainant, he made no attempt to remove him from the restaurant.

The Respondent Officer confirmed previously showing the Complainant an open-source video of a police interaction from the United States. This was not sensitive video evidence from a [REDACTED] Police Service investigation. The Investigator concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish any misconduct. Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation #2

Community Safety and Policing Act – Other Matters – Prohibited Conduct

Section 179 (1) No person shall harass, coerce or intimidate, or attempt to harass, coerce or intimidate, any other person in relation to a complaint made or investigation conducted.

It is alleged that the Respondent Officer was intimidating the Complainant with respect to a previous Complaint.

Finding: This investigation revealed that the Respondent Officer was off duty at the time of his interaction with the Complainant and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. A civilian witness confirmed that the Complainant initiated the interaction, that no threats were made by the Respondent Officer, and that there was no evidence to support the Complainant's claim of an aggressive or threatening tone directed at him. Additionally, there was no mention of the Complainant's outstanding LECA complaint by the Respondent Officer, nor was there any evidence to suggest that he was aware of this ongoing investigation. The Investigator concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish any misconduct. Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Respondent Officer #1