

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: 07/28/2025

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 was a patient at [REDACTED] during May 2022. The Patient made a suicidal comment, was apprehended by [REDACTED] security, restrained and brought back to the emergency room to be assessed by a mental health professional. The Complainant alleged that her hip was broken by hospital security and made an assault complaint to the [REDACTED] Police April 2024. The Complainant alleged that Respondent Officer #1 never conducted an investigation or reviewed video of the alleged assault.

The Complainant made an additional complaint that Respondent Officer #2 and Respondent Officer #3 entered her residence in May 2025, without permission and that Respondent Officer #3 threatened her, recorded their interaction and was twirling his gun. The Complainant went on to state that she called the police station and spoke with Respondent Officer #4 and told the officer she wanted the Mental Health team to come to her residence and he never called the team to attend or followup.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

10 conduct undermines public trust

19 neglects to do duty

Decision and Reasons

A review of the assault complaint was conducted and it was determined that Respondent Officer #1 did conduct an investigation. He met on several occasions with the Complainant and had the Complainant sign medical release forms. The Respondent Officer would not be able to obtain video of the incident because the incident was reported 2 years after it occurred and video is only kept for 30 days with [REDACTED]. The Complaint against Respondent Officer #1 is unsubstantiated.

The complaint of Respondent Officer #2 and #3 entering the Complaint's residence without permission and Respondent Officer #3 threatening, recording and twirling or flicking his firearm at the Complainant was also reviewed. Both the Respondent Officers #2 and #3 indicated that these events did not occur. There was also a member of [REDACTED] Victim Services present, the officers were assisting, who advised in her statement that these events never occurred. The Victim Services Representative also advised officers were assisting with returning belongings to the Complainant and when asked to leave waited outside the residence. The complainant against Respondent Officers #2 and #3 is also unsubstantiated.

The Complainant also reported that she called the [REDACTED] Police station to complain about Respondent officers #2 and #3. She spoke to Respondent Officer #4 and told him she wanted the Mental Health Team(MHEART) to come to her residence and they never did attend. Respondent Officer #4 did indicate that the MHEART team was not available, but would let them know she called. Respondent Officer #4 did not pass on the information for MHEART to attend. The MHEART team is deployed when someone is suffering from a mental health crisis. Respondent Officer #4 was aware that there were officers on scene to assess if the Complainant was suffering from a mental health crisis and would request MHEART if required and they were not required. Then Complainant was angry with officers attending her residence. The Complainant did not meet the criteria for MHEART to be deployed under the [REDACTED] Police Service Policy, Police Response to Persons in Crisis. The complaint against Respondent Officer #4 is unsubstantiated.