

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: [REDACTED]

Date of Complaint: 05/07/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ☒

Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On April 22, 2025, at approximately 7:22 p.m., the Complainant's niece, contacted the police requesting a wellness check for her aunt. The Caller reported that she had no contact with her aunt since Sunday, April 20, 2025.

The Caller was concerned for her aunt's wellbeing as she reported it was out of character for the Complainant not to respond to her. The Caller also reported the Complainant; lived alone, her health was deteriorating and was distraught over recently having to put down her two dogs.

Subsequently, the Respondent Officers were dispatched to the Complainant's residence to check on her wellbeing. During the course of the investigation, the officers elected to forcibly enter the Complainant's residence by kicking in her front door. The residence was searched, and the Complainant was not located within the residence. The entry by the involved officers caused damage to the door, door frame, door handle and deadbolt.

Investigation revealed that the Complainant was away on vacation at the time of the incident.

On May 7, 2025, the Complainant filed a complaint with the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency grieving the conduct of the involved officers and is also seeking restitution for the damages to her front door.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 19 - Neglects to do duty.

Decision and Reasons

Based upon the information presented at the time, the Respondent Officers had reasonable grounds to believe the Complainant was in the residence and that she was in a state of distress.

Acting in good faith, they utilized their common law authority and breached the front door of the residence, with as little force as possible, for the purpose of ensuring the Complainant's health and safety.

The Complainant understood why the Respondent Officers entered her home but felt they should have considered the side door entry, or a basement window which would have caused less damage to her residence.

The steps undertaken by the officers during their investigation was reasonable and thought out. They had a duty to ensure that the Complainant was not in need of any assistance. Delaying their entry into the residence to verify or gather further information for clarification was unreasonable as the circumstances dictated an exigent response.

Upon careful review and analysis of all available information, and without any further information from the witness, there is insufficient evidence available to form reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Officers were in neglect of their duties.