

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: 06/16/2025

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On May 2nd, 2025, the Complainant alleged that they were aggressively handled by the Respondent Officer while being apprehended under the Mental Health Act and that her wrist and body was bruised and sore.

Note: There was an error found regarding the date and the RO, and the Complainant interacted. The interaction occurred on May 4, 2025.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Conduct Undermines Public trust Unnecessary Use of Force

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Interactions with the Public

Section 10(1) A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

- It is alleged that the Respondent Officer approached the Complainant with aggression.

Finding: This investigation has revealed the Respondent Officer was in the lawful performance of his duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The Respondent Officer cautioned the Complainant numerous times that she was trespassing and gave her many opportunities to leave on her own. The Complainant ignored the officers demands and she had to be physically escorted out of the building. The Complainant was eventually apprehended under the Mental health Act as she was experiencing delusions.

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.

Respondent Officer (RO)

Allegation #2

Interactions with the Public

Section 11(1) A police officer shall not use force unless,

- (a) the force is used for the purpose of carrying out a duty;
- (b) the officer is entitled, by statute or common law, to use force for the purpose of carrying out that duty;
- (c) the officer is acting on reasonable grounds; and
- (d) the force used is no more than is necessary given the circumstances.

- It is alleged the Respondent Officer used unnecessary force during the interaction.

Respondent Officer (RO)

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The Respondent Officer used the necessary amount of force to effect the apprehension. The Complainant was injured, nor did she appear to have injuries on the BWC. The use of force used was minimal, making it reasonable and proportionate.

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.