

**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: 07/29/2025

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 alleges that on June 21st, 2025, he experienced a targeted and disturbing incident involving multiple officers from [REDACTED] near his residence. He alleges this is not an isolated event but part of a sustained and deliberate pattern of police presence, harassment, and intimidation directed towards him. The Complainant noticed an unknown person waving him out of his house and believes this person to have been a plainclothes officer. The Complainant further alleges that a tall officer that was on the sidewalk muted his camera, pulled out his personal phone and showed it to another officer, the second officer started a confrontation with the Complainant in an aggressive tone saying "can I help you"? followed by "whatever happened is being dealt with". The Complainant further alleges having a similar incident on June 19th, 2025, when he was harassed by a [REDACTED] unit by being visible but not engaging, the officer followed him in his car but never made contact.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, S.O. 2019, c. 1, Schedule 1 Code of Conduct for Police Officer: Ontario Regulation 407/23.  
This regulation sets out the code of conduct with which every police officer must comply.

**Allegation #1**

Interactions with the public – Section 10

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

• It is alleged that on June 21st, 2025, 41 Division Officers were, without cause, harassing the Complainant by driving by his house with lights and sirens on for no reason.

**Allegation #2**

Interactions with the public – Section 10

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

• It is alleged that also on June 21st, 2025, when the Complainant attended the scene of the emergency call and Respondent Officer 1 turned off his Body Worn Camera and proceeded to voice out to the Dispatcher in a way to be heard by the Complainant, and showed RO2 something using his personal cell phone. It is further alleged that Respondent Officer 2 asked the Complainant if he needed help in an aggressive tone, and when the Complainant declined the officer escalated by calling the Complainant noisy and stating that "whatever happened is being dealt with".  
Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)  
Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)

**Allegation #3**

Interactions with the public – Section 10

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

• It is alleged that on June 19th, 2025, an officer was stopped in the middle of an intersection in a police vehicle without any reason to be there, and that the officer followed the Complainant in his police car without stopping to talk to him.

## Decision and Reasons

**Allegation #1: Interactions with the Public, Section 10** - A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

• It is alleged that on June 21st, 2025, [REDACTED] Officers were, without cause, harassing the Complainant by driving by his house with lights and sirens on for no reason.

**Finding:** This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities.

The Officers were proven beyond reasonable doubt to be attending a high priority call for service near the Complainant's home. The Officers were in the lawful execution of their duties and had a purpose for driving with their emergency equipment activated. Furthermore, the Officers had no previous interactions with the Complainant to be able to know who the Complainant was or where he lived.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

**Allegation #2: Interactions with the Public, Section 10** - A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

• It is alleged that also on June 21st, 2025, when the Complainant attended the scene of the emergency call Respondent Officer 1 turned off his Body Worn Camera and proceeded to voice out to the Dispatcher in a way to be heard by the Complainant, and showed RO2 something using his personal cell phone. It is further alleged that Respondent Officer 2 asked the Complainant if he needed help in an aggressive tone, and when the Complainant declined the officer escalated by calling the Complainant noisy and stating that "whatever happened is being dealt with".  
Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)  
Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)

**Finding:** This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities.

A recording captured by service vehicle fleet number 4141 shows the Respondent Officers standing in front of the vehicle, by the sidewalk. At no point is RO1 seen showing RO2 a cell phone. Furthermore BWC recordings show proof that RO1 did not tamper with his BWC and using it according to procedure.

The recording also captures a very brief interaction between RO2 and the Complainant lasting 36 seconds that corroborates RO2's statement regarding the brief conversation RO2 had with the Complainant.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

**Allegation #3: Interactions with the Public, Section 10** - A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

• It is alleged that on June 19th, 2025, an officer was stopped in the middle of an intersection in a police vehicle without any reason to be there, and that the officer followed the Complainant in his police car without stopping to talk to him.

**Respondent Officers 3 (RO3)**

**Finding:** This investigation has revealed that there were officers in the area due to a Violent Behaviour call for service where a school was put in Lock Down. No officer was actually identified by the Complainant, and there was no allegation of any communication between the unknown officer and the Complainant.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

**Allegation #4: Performance of Duties, Section 27** - A police officer shall comply with the procedures established by their Chief of police.

• It is alleged that RO1 inappropriately turned off his Body Worn Camera during the course of his interaction with the Complainant.

**Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)**

**Finding:** This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities.

Body-Worn Camera recordings show RO1 using his BWC according to procedure, and further ICC recording shows RO1 had no contact/interactions with the Complainant, thus negating the need to turn on his BWC.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.