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: May 16th, 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 officers illegally entered and broke into her home without consent nor a warrant .
The complainant tried to file a complaint about another officer who lied in court and withheld her body cam footage to do so.

The complainant alleged that her father has been the target of police harassment for months.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1. Conduct undermines public trust S.10 CSPA

Decision and Reasons

In conclusion, there is insufficient evidence to reasonably conclude RO#1 or RO#2 broke into the complainant's residence or acted in a manner which would undermine the public's trust in policing. RO#1 and RO #2 were both polite with the complainant during the interaction and did not enter the residence. Their actions were objectively reasonable and they both acted within their authorities as provided by the Criminal Code of Canada, common law, and the Trespass to Property Act.

This investigation has found insufficient evidence to support what the complainant had claimed in the complaint. Therefore, based on a review and analysis of the available information, the investigation has determined that there is insufficient evidence to establish that misconduct occurred.