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: [redacted] Date of Complaint: 07/21/2025

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 the Respondent Officers neglected to thoroughly investigate an allegation that he was assaulted. It was alleged that the Respondent Officers failed to speak with witnesses or review video of the incident.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Performance of Duties - S. 19

Decision and Reasons

The Complainant alleged that he was assaulted in an unprovoked attack by an unknown suspect at a local restaurant. The complainant had cuts and swelling on his face that he reportedly suffered after being punched twice. No evidence was provided to speak to the extent of the injuries.

The Respondent Officers spoke with the Complainant to gather information about the allegation and offered to get him medical attention. One of the Respondent Officers followed up with an employee from the restaurant. The employee was an independent witness and advised that the Complainant was the primary aggressor in a consensual fight. The employee also advised that there was no video available.

The other involved party was not identified and there were no further investigative leads. The Respondent Officers did not form reasonable grounds that an assault had occurred. The Respondent Officers conducted a reasonable investigation that led this conclusion.

Conclusion: There were not reasonable grounds to believe that the conduct of the Respondent Officers constituted misconduct.