**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: 10/29/2024

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 had rented a small space to CW#1 in the basement part of her business. There was no formal rental agreement and over a period of time CW#1 reportedly fell behind in paying rent for the space (non commercial). It appears that both parties agreed to end the rental 'agreement' and CW#1 would remove her belongings from the property.

The complainant reported that on September 11, 2024, CW#1 arrived at her business in the company of three police officers to collect her belongings.

CW#1 found that her property had been moved and stored in a different room behind a locked door that she didn't have a key for.

Responding officers requested that the complainant provide keys to access to the room but it appears the appropriate key was not in the complainants possession. After an extend period of time, an unknown person dropped of the correct key allowing CW#1 to access her property.

Officers described the complainants behaviour as disruptive and confrontational as they attempted to educate her on her responsibilities under the Residential Tenancies Act. As CW#1 removed her property, the complainant alleges that one or more of the officers told her to 'shut the fuck up'.

The officers denied using profanity towards the complainant and advised that they stood by to ensure the safety of CW#1 and those assisting her.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

s.12 - use abusive language in the course of duties.

## Decision and Reasons

After review of the complaint and the officers statements and duty book notes, it was determined that there insufficient grounds to believe that the officers committed misconduct.

All three officers provided an independent, yet consistent description of the complainants behaviour that included her unwillingness to let officers explain themselves and berating CW#1 as she and associates moved the property from the complainants business.