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: 06/09/2025

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 June 7th, 2025, the Respondent Officers conducted a negligent investigation and refused to examine video evidence. The Complainant further alleges being assaulted by the Respondent Officers and was discriminated against due to being a transgender woman.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, S.O. 2019, c. 1, Schedule 1 Code of Conduct for Police Officer: Ontario Regulation 407/23.

This regulation sets out the code of conduct with which every police officer must comply.

Allegation #1

Performance of Duties – Section 19

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Performance of Duties – Section 19

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 Officers were neglectful in their investigation and refused to examine evidence provided by the Complainant.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)
Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)
Respondent Officer 3 (RO3)
Respondent Officer 4 (RO4)

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities.

The Respondent Officers examined all evidence presented to them and further spoke with all available witnesses. They made the decision that it was not in the best public interest to proceed with charges and determined that at the time a caution would suffice.
The investigation is corroborated by their individual statements and matched to their individual Body Worn Camera's recordings.

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.