

**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: 10/02/2024

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 they were the victim of identity theft by their former spouse and the officers that responded to their complaints failed to conduct a thorough investigation or dismissed their concerns of intimate partner violence. In addition, the complainant alleges one officer that attended to investigate their complaint was rude and condescending towards the complainant during their interactions.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

19 neglects to do duty  
10 conduct undermines public trust

## Decision and Reasons

### 19 Neglects to do duty:

The Professional Standards Bureau investigator reviewed ten (10) incidents that involved the complainant in relation to their calls for service for intimate partner violence. The review involved six officers and the respondent officer.

Each call for service did outline several different incidents and each incident was thoroughly investigated and the complainant was provided information to address their concerns through either civil court or family law. Further, on two occasions with two separate officers all the calls for service were reviewed with the complainant outlining the officers actions taken and what was needed to further an investigation. No officer found reasonable or probable grounds a criminal offense had occurred and further each attempted to have the complainant understand the threshold officers must meet to arrest an individual criminally.

The Professional Standards Bureau investigator found no corroborating evidence to suggest any officer willfully refused to assist the complainant, nor was the investigator able to reach a conclusion that the degree of neglect would constitute misconduct.

### 10 Conduct undermines public trust:

The Professional Standards Bureau investigator spoke with the respondent officer's Supervisor who attended the residence of the complainant with the respondent officer. The Supervisor indicated the respondent officer was patient and professional with the complainant during their interaction. Further, the respondent officer had indicated they believed they were professional and provided the complainant with the courtesy they would provide every one.

In totality of the circumstances, the Professional Standards Bureau investigator found the evidence of the officer and the complainant to be conflicting; therefore, the investigator is unable to corroborate the complainants allegation.

In both allegations, the Professional Standards Bureau investigator's evidence threshold must meet 'clear and convincing'; wherein it is highly and substantially more likely to be true than untrue. Upon review of the evidence there is insufficient evidence to establish misconduct occurred and the Professional Standards Bureau is unable to substantiate any allegation.