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:

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

It was alleged that between March 1, 2025, and May 25, 2025, the Respondent Officer (RO) was neglectful in his duties by not continuing with a criminal fraud investigation and ignoring the request for action involving the Complainant (CO).

The CO asserted that he was the victim of a renovation fraud involving CW1 in March 2021. The matter was investigated by responding officers between March 24, 2021 and January 20, 2025, who deemed the matter as civil in nature.

The CO disagreed with the findings which resulted in a further examination of the the fraud allegations by the RO.

The RO was tasked with reviewing the fraud investigation and authored a comprehensive report outlining reasons why the matter was and remains civil in nature.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

The complaint of Neglect of Duty was deemed unsubstantiated.

Between February 2025 - May 2025, the RO completed and extensive review of the CO's original fraud investigation from March 2021 - January 2025, in addition to complaints brought forward by the CO and concluded that the primary investigating officer had not erred in his findings and that the matter was civil in nature.

The evidence of the RO was consistent with their duty report and notes and the comprehensive review report he authored in May 2025.

It was confirmed that the CO's civil litigation remains before the courts involving CW1's business.

There was no evidence the RO was neglectful in their duties.