

**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: 12/13/2025

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 alleged the Respondent Officer (RO) allowed their landlord to enter their residence without the authority to do so and while in the residence a theft occurred. The Complainant further alleged the RO showed familiarity with their landlord which they believed demonstrated a bias.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Duty - Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg 407/23  
Public - Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg 407/23  
Integrity - Access Information - Sec 18 CSPA Reg 407/23

## Decision and Reasons

### Duty - Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg 407/23

The Complainant alleged the RO did not have the authority to allow their landlord entry to their residence for an inspection because they denied entry and the landlord was required to take further steps with the Landlord and Tenant Board (LTB). The Complainant further alleged the RO failed to protect their property during the inspection and as a result items were stolen from their residence.

The Investigator reviewed officer reports, officer notes, The Residential Tenancies Act (RTA), The Landlord Tenant Board, the Notice of Entry, email communication between the Complainant and their landlord, Video evidence provided by the landlord, photograph evidence provided by the Complainant and witness statements.

The Investigator concluded the RO had the authority to allow entry to the residence for the purposes of an inspection as more than 24 hour notice was given by the landlord as per the RTA. There was no further action required by the landlord and the Complainant had no right to refuse entry. Furthermore, the Investigator concluded there was no evidence to support a theft occurred during the inspection.

### Public - Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg 407/23

The Complainant alleged the RO and landlord were familiar with one another and as a result the RO was bias towards their landlord.

The Investigator reviewed officer reports, officer notes, officer responses to follow-up questions and witness statements.

The Investigator concluded there was no evidence to support the RO and the Complainant's landlord had a preexisting relationship and a conflict of interest existed.

### Integrity - Access Information - Sec 18 CSPA Reg 407/23

The Complainant alleged the RO accessed [REDACTED] databases and shared information with their landlord regarding vehicles on their property.

The Investigator reviewed officer reports, officer notes, witness statements and conducted an audit of [REDACTED] data bases.

The Investigator concluded no searches were made by the RO pertaining to vehicles belonging to the Complainant and her family.

### Integrity - Access Information - Sec 18 CSPA Reg 407/23

The Complainant alleged the RO provided information to their landlord pertaining to vehicles on their property to assist the landlord with LTB proceedings.

The Investigator reviewed officer reports, officer notes, officer responses to follow-up questions, a witness statement and an Audit of [REDACTED] databases.

The Investigator concluded there was no unauthorized queries of the Complainants vehicles or license plates.