

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: 01/20/2025

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 he reported a theft from his vehicle and provided suspect information to the [REDACTED] Police Service. The Complainant alleged Respondent Officer #1 neglected his duties by not completing a thorough and complete investigation.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Performance of Duties - O/Reg. 407/23 - Sec. 19

Decision and Reasons

Allegation - Performance of Duties - O.Reg. 407/23 - Sec.19: The Complainant alleged that the Respondent Officer failed to conduct a thorough and complete investigation. The Complainant wished for the officer to take an investigative step that did not occur and as such, alleged that the Respondent Officer neglected to perform their duty.

Conclusion: Respondent Officer began to investigate the Complainant's call for service the same morning he was assigned it as a follow up. Although the Respondent Officer did not complete one of the suggested investigative steps in his investigation, the Respondent Officer took very reasonable steps in his investigation. The Complainant was unhappy with the outcome of his criminal complaint, but the Respondent Officer investigated all avenues and evidence available to him.

Conclusion: It was determined that Respondent Officer #1 did conduct a complete investigation, therefore, the allegation was unsubstantiated.