

**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: 03/17/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ☒

Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

### De-identified Summary of Complaint

On June 16, 2024, at approximately 3:59 pm the [REDACTED] Police Service received a call for service from C.W.1 who reported ongoing issues with the complainant.

C.W.1 advised that the complainant entered onto C.W.1's property and refused to leave as directed.

The Respondent Officer's efforts to resolve the dispute were unsuccessful and the Respondent issued the complainant a Provincial Offence Notice under the Trespass to Property Act for Fail to Leave Premises for when directed.

The complainant cited that the Respondent Officer's conduct was unprofessional, biased and an infringement of Human Rights.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Failure to Perform Duties

Treat a person in a manner that contravenes Human Rights Code

Undermine Public Trust

## Decision and Reasons

The complainant did not provide any video evidence of officer misconduct, nor did he provide any witnesses to officer misconduct.

The available evidence suggests that the Respondent officer, was acting in good faith and attempted to achieve a resolution suitable to both parties.

The Respondent Officer had reasonable grounds to charge the complainant with Fail to Leave Premises when Directed and acted under the lawful authority of the Trespass to Property Act.

A witness officer, stated that she observed the Respondent speak to all parties in a reasonable and professional manner.

There are no grounds to suggest that the Respondent officer failed to examine evidence during a Trespass investigation, nor did the Respondent exhibit gender bias in making decisions.

The allegations were unsubstantiated.