

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: 06/16/2025

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 the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) and specifically Respondent Officer 1 (RO1), failed to properly handle her sexual assault case, demonstrating patterns of negligence, re-traumatization, a lack of trauma-informed care, and inappropriate conduct. She reported being sexually assaulted in 2015, and the case was assigned to RO1 for investigation.

In 2016, she was advised that she would be contacted to submit critical evidence; however, no follow-up occurred, and the evidence was never reviewed. When she attempted to follow up in 2017, she received no response for several months, and when contact was eventually made, she felt her concerns were dismissed by RO1.

The complainant further stated that on June 16th, 2025, after contacting Respondent Officer 2 (RO2) to request that her case be reopened, she was mocked, dismissed, and retraumatized due to what she described as RO2's unprofessional conduct.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Conduct undermines public trust Section 10
Allegation 2 – Fail to Perform Duties Section 19

Decision and Reasons

There was insufficient evidence to support the complainant's allegations. The initial investigation was fulsome and policy was followed. The follow up call did not provide any further grounds for misconduct.