

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: 06/15/2025

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 provided the following details in her complaint to LECA on June 15, 2025:

Two officers attended the complainant's residence to conduct a bail compliance check on her son, who was out on a charge of robbery with a firearm.

During this interaction, the Complainant advised the officers failed to properly identify themselves and displayed an aggressive and confrontational tone. This investigation specifically surrounded the allegation of failing to identify, as other areas of this complaint were screened out by LECA.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Interactions with the Public – CSPA O. Reg 407/23 Code of Conduct

Section 13(2): While acting in the course of their duties, a police officer shall, upon request, provide their name, badge number and the name of their police service to any member of the public in a manner reasonable in the circumstances that allows the member of the public to identify the officer, unless the officer has reason to believe that doing so would undermine the safety of an individual.

Decision and Reasons

This investigation finds the Respondent Officers conducted themselves lawfully and presented themselves as police officers having two marked police vehicles parked out front, both wearing full uniform with police crests on their shirts and both donning name tags on their vests.

When the Complainant asked the reason for their visit, she was informed it was a compliance check on her son's bail conditions.

At no point during this interaction did the Complainant request officer names and badge numbers.

When RO1 conducted a second compliance check, the Complainant made the request and officer names and badges numbers were immediately provided.

As a result, the investigation finds there are no reasonable grounds to conclude any misconduct took place.

The allegation is unsubstantiated.