

**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 that while he was riding his bicycle in [REDACTED] Park, the RO was harassing cyclists, blaring his horn and brake checked the Complainant.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

### Undermine Public Trust - Section 10(1) CSPA

### Decision and Reasons

#### Undermine Public Trust

Section 10(1): You are alleged to have committed misconduct in that, you conducted yourself in a manner that undermined, or was likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

It is alleged that the RO was harassing the Complainant and inappropriately driving a marked scout car while in [REDACTED] Park

This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The RO responded appropriately to a radio call regarding issues with cyclists and drove at an appropriate speed while in the park conducting traffic enforcement. There is no evidence the RO brake checked the Complainant, drove erratically or harassed cyclists.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.