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: 08/11/2025

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 contacted police to conduct a well-being check on a young child with the belief that the caregiver was under the influence of a controlled substance. The complainant did not believe the officer carried out their due diligence during this investigation and neglected the safety of the child.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Conduct that Undermines Public Trust Sec. 10 (1) CSPA O'Reg 407/23 Code of Conduct - Interactions with Public

Neglect of Duty Sec. 19 CSPA O'Reg 407/23 Code of Conduct - Performance of Duties

Decision and Reasons

There was no clear and convincing evidence presented by the complainant that substantiated the allegations of Conduct that Undermines Public Trust or Neglect of Duty.

The officer responded to a well-being check and conducted a full investigation. The officer attended an address where it was found that the child was in the care of a capable and appropriate caregiver. The child was found to be in good health and spirits while in the care of this adult.

The Professional Standards Investigator reviewed evidence that was provided and relevant to this allegation.

This investigation did not support the allegation by the complainant.

Given these reasons stated above it has been determined that the allegations are unsubstantiated.

In addition the complainant spoke about additional allegations toward the police service in general not enforcing court orders between a particular time frame. This information was reviewed and no misconduct was identified.

The complainant also reported an incident that had previously been investigated by members of the Professional Standards Branch and found to be unsubstantiated.

No additional findings of misconduct were discovered as a result of this investigation.