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: 05/21/2025

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 a supervisory officer failed to respond appropriately to calls for police assistance in relation to an ongoing landlord–tenant dispute. The complainant stated that after reporting concerns to the police service, they were promised a call back which was not received.

The following day, the complainant contacted the service again and was advised that no record of the earlier call existed. The complainant requested to speak with a supervisor and was later contacted by another officer.

The complainant advised that they explained the landlord–tenant dispute to the supervisor but were denied police assistance, being told that the matter was not a police issue.

The complainant believed that police should have investigated further and alleged that the officer's actions amounted to neglect of duty and undermined public trust.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – NEGLECTS TO DO DUTY – Section 19

Allegation 2 – CONDUCT UNDERMINES PUBLIC TRUST – Section 10 of Ontario Regulation 407/23

Decision and Reasons

A review of the incident reports and duty statements determined that responding officers attended the scene of the landlord–tenant dispute on multiple occasions. Officers confirmed that proper notice of entry had been served in accordance with applicable legislation and conducted a police stand-by to prevent a breach of the peace. No evidence of a criminal offence was observed.

When follow-up concerns were raised, a supervisor contacted the complainant, reviewed the matter, and reiterated that the dispute was a civil issue under the jurisdiction of the Landlord and Tenant Board. The supervisor concluded that the matter did not warrant further police investigation.

The investigation determined that the officer did take reasonable measures to review and respond to the complainant's concerns. There was insufficient evidence to establish misconduct.