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: 11/06/2025

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 alleges the RO1 and RO2 neglected their duty, used their position improperly and their actions and language undermined the public trust.

The Complainant alleged RO1 and RO2, who are from a neighbouring jurisdiction, attended her home, threatened to arrest her and were rude. RO1 and RO2 failed to identify themselves and did not explain to the complainant why she could be arrested - aside from a reference to her sending emails. This caused the Complainant to fear for her safety for three reasons:

1) she did not believe it was possible to be arrested for sending emails
2) if sending emails was something you could be arrested for then her local police service would have attended her home, not officers from a neighbouring jurisdiction
3) her ex-husband also lives within the same jurisdiction as the Complainant and he knows police officers from the respondent officer police service. Given reasons 1 and 2, he must know RO1 and RO2 and they are harassing her on his behalf.

For the above reasons, the complaint alleges the respondent abused their position and she has been traumatized as a result.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

10 conduct undermines public trust
19 neglects to do duty
15(1) improper use of position

Decision and Reasons

The investigation into the Complainant's allegations revealed no evidence to corroborate misconduct on behalf of RO1 and RO2. RO1 and RO2 were in the lawful execution of their duties when they attended the Complainant's residence.

A significant amount of the Complainant's concern emanated from the fact that RO1 and RO2 do not work for the Complainant's local police service. This was then compounded by the fact the Complainant did not believe a person could be arrested for sending emails. From the Complainant's perspective, this equates to there being no lawful reason as to why RO1 and RO2 would attend her residence.

The Complainant's understanding of the circumstances involved that resulted in RO1 and RO2 attending her home was incorrect. A member of the public called police and made an allegation of criminal harassment against the Complainant. The alleged criminal offence took place within the jurisdiction of which RO1 and RO2 are employed, thus their involvement versus that of the local police service of where the Complainant resides. RO1 and RO2 had a duty to investigate the allegation.

Regarding the issue of emails, the Complainant is mistaken in her opinion that a person cannot be arrested for sending emails. While case specific, there are circumstances in which a person can be arrested for sending emails. In this matter, emails were part of RO1 and RO2's investigation.

There is no evidence to support that RO1 and RO2 failed to identify themselves or explain why the Complainant was arrestable. There is no evidence to support RO1 and RO2 were rude or where acting on behalf of the Complainant's ex-husband. There is evidence to support that RO1 and RO2 attended the Complainant's residence to caution her for a criminal offence and warn her that continued behaviour could lead to her being arrested. Furthermore, there is evidence to support RO1 and RO2 used a stern tone of voice when speaking with the Complainant regarding the issue of immediately ceasing contact with the member of the public who had made the criminal allegation.