

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: 06/05/2025

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 has alleged that the Respondent Officers were negligent in confirming the correct apartment in response to a radio call before entering his premises unlawfully, using unnecessary force, conducting an illegal search, and treating him in a discriminatory manner due to his race.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1

Performance of Duties,

Section 19 - A police officer shall not, by act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

- It is alleged that the Respondent Officers neglected to confirm the correct unit number prior to entering the Complainant's residence.

- Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)
- Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)
- Respondent Officer 3 (RO3)
- Respondent Officer 4 (RO4)
- Respondent Officer 5 (RO5)
- Respondent Officer 6 (RO6)

Allegation #2

Interactions with the Public,

Section 10, (1) A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

- It is alleged the Respondent Officers unlawfully entered the Complainant's residence and conducted an illegal search.

- Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)

Decision and Reasons

The RO's acted lawfully and appropriately based on urgent and credible information received from the dispatcher regarding a potential life-threatening situation involving a woman screaming for help. The Caller identified an apartment #. Upon arrival, the officers entered the unit under exigent circumstances to protect life. The Complainant who resided in the unit was uncooperative and aggressive, prompting RO3 to seat him for safety and control. The minimal amount of force used in this case was lawful, reasonable, necessary, and justified, and was in accordance with the use of force procedure on incident response.

No victim was located inside the Complainant's apartment, and within four minutes, it was determined that the correct unit was in fact another an apartment across the hall The ROs then entered that unit under the same legal and exigent conditions. At all times, officers acted within the scope of their lawful duties, confirmed the original unit number provided by dispatch and efficiently determined the correct unit number once they realized that the incident had not occurred inside the Complainant's unit, they took necessary measures to ensure the safety of all individuals present, and as they exited, all badge numbers were provided as requested.

RO1 ensured that the lawful entry into the Complainant's residence was accurately documented in the GO report pertaining to the original call which was eventually investigated and dealt with as required. The RO offered an apology and attempted to provide an explanation, however the Complainant was not willing to participate in a conversation, which was his right.

Based on all of the evidence available to the Investigator, the Respondent Officers acted within all legislative authorities and [REDACTED] Police Service procedures.