

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

The Complainant alleges the respondent officers were neglectful in not conducting a thorough and complete investigation and failed to take the appropriate enforcement action.

Further, the complainant alleges the respondent officers undermined public trust by failing to communicate promptly, and when such communications occurred, the respondent officers were uncivil.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Neglects to do Duty PSA 2(1)(c)(i)

Discreditable Conduct PSA 2(1)(a)(xi)

Decision and Reasons

The Respondent Officers investigated the Complainant's report and reviewed all available evidence. The Respondent Officers determined there was no reasonable prospect of a conviction and chose not to take further action.

The Complainant was dissatisfied with the Respondent Officer's decision and further dissatisfied when he attempted to discuss the matter but was rebuffed by the Respondent Officers. The Investigator agreed with the Respondent Officer's decision that criminal charges were not warranted in this matter.

There is no evidence to show the Respondent Officers were uncivil.