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: 06/26/2025

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 officer failed to identify himself by name and badge number, used unnecessary force against the complainant and acted in a manner that undermined public trust.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1) Conduct Undermines Public Trust - sec 10(1) CSPA Reg. 407/23
2) Used unnecessary Force Against the Complainant - sec 11(1) CSPA Reg. 407/23
3) Failed to Provide Name and Badge Number to the Complainant when Requested - sec 13(2) CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

The respondent officer attended the complainant's residence. The respondent officer remained in the cruiser and called the complainant to come out to the driveway, as there was a dog barking and signs on the property regarding a dog.

The respondent officer questioned the complainant regarding an incident that had occurred weeks prior. The complainant accused the officer of not working in official capacity and was there on behalf of another organization. The complainant asked for the officer's name and badge number. The respondent officer said they verbally stated their name and badge to the complainant. The complainant reached into the cruiser in an effort to take a photograph with their cell phone of the respondent officer's name crest on their vest. The respondent officer pushed the complainant's hands out of the cruiser and started to drive way, as the the complainant reached their hands back into the cruiser, causing contact with the window of the cruiser. The complainant accused the respondent officer of hitting them with the cruiser.

The respondent officer continued to reverse out of the driveway as the complainant followed the cruiser. The complainant stated the officer struck the complainant with the cruiser again. The respondent officer stated that they heard the complainant punch the cruiser and saw the complainant kneel in front of the wheel well in an attempt to be struck by the cruiser. The respondent officer stated they drove around the cruiser so they would not hit the complainant.

The respondent officer exited their cruiser to confront the complainant on why they punched the cruiser and knelt beside the cruiser. The complainant had this portion of the incident on video from their phone, but no other portion of the incident was recorded.

With the information available throughout the course of the investigation, and no witnesses or video evidence of the interactions between the complainant and the respondent officer, it was determined there were no grounds to substantiate the allegations made by the complainant. There was no basis for substantiating any misconduct by the respondent officer.