

**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: 07/12/2025

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, who was a licensed realtor, was investigated and charged by the respondent officer (RO). She alleged the RO had a conflict of interest due to her secondary employment as a licensed realtor as well.

The complainant asserts the police failed to interview her or consider key evidence—such as documentation, text messages, and phone logs—prior to laying the charges. The complainant believed she was being unfairly targeted by the RO, noting that this was the second instance where charges were laid against her and later withdrawn by the Crown.

**Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations**

Conduct Undermines Public Trust Section 10  
Fail to Perform Duties Section 19

**Decision and Reasons**

Although [REDACTED] policy was not in place at the time of the investigation, the CSPA outlined specific criteria for a conflict of interest. There was insufficient evidence to conclude the RO had a conflict of interest while investigating the complainant for criminal harassment.

[REDACTED] officers are also expected to follow a Code of Ethics which provides guidance on how officers will conduct themselves, on and off duty. It appeared the RO's actions were inline with the [REDACTED] Code of Ethics.

The investigation revealed the RO collected a variety of evidence to support her decision to charge the complainant. The investigation was conducted in accordance with [REDACTED] policy, and general practices. As a result, there were no reasonable grounds to support a finding of misconduct.