

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: 08/08/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On June 21, 2025, [REDACTED] located the complainant sleeping in [REDACTED] multi-faith chapel, located in [REDACTED]. The complainant was asked multiple times to leave the chapel but refused and police were contacted. Two (2) [REDACTED] Police officers attended the multi-faith chapel and engaged the complainant under the Trespass to Property Act. The complainant was asked to leave, however the complainant directed the officers to remove their shoes. It was briefly explained to the complainant that their shoes would remain, and the complainant was again ordered to grab his belongings and discuss the incident outside of the multi-faith chapel to not disturb other practicing worshipers. After two (2) mentions of arrest and seven (7) demands to leave, the complainant finally left the multi-faith chapel and discussed the incident with officers. The complainant showed his boarding pass to police after a third request to verify his flight status.

The complainant explained he didn't agree with the how the security officer spoke to him and questioned his professional. The complainant again had an issue with how both police officers communicated with him.

The complainant advised police that he was being discriminated against due to the brown colour of his skin. Having determined that the situation was resolved, the Responding Officers disengaged themselves from the complainant and no provincial offence notice for trespassing was issued.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – O. REG. 407/23 – 10(1)

A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

Allegation 2 – O. REG. 407/23 – 5(1)

A police officer shall not, in the course of their duties, treat any person in a manner that the officer, at the time, knows or reasonably ought to know would contravene the Human Rights Code.

Decision and Reasons

Allegations 1 and 2

Based on a review and analysis of all the information, specifically utilizing the visual evidence of the body worn camera video, the complainant admitted to police that he was sleeping in the chapel and was asked by security twice to leave but he refused. Upon police being called, he again refused to leave and ordered the officers to remove their shoes. The Responding Officers made reasonable attempts to discuss the incident outside of the multi-faith chapel, having informed the complainant on two (2) occasions of arrest and giving seven (7) demands to leave. The complainant was also requested to show his boarding pass twice, before eventually showing it to police on a third request, outside of the multi-faith chapel.

Police explained their reason for attendance to the complainant, as they were contacted by the airport's security. At no time did police mention the complainant's skin colour or show any bias against the complainant's race. The Responding Officers utilized the Trespass to Property Act (Ontario) to engage the complainant and gain compliance.

Conclusion: Reasonable grounds to believe no misconduct existed from the actions of the [REDACTED] Police officers.