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: 06/26/2025

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 4th, 2025, at approximately 12:20 p.m., the Complainant's mother, contacted the police reporting her son was having a mental breakdown and was concerned for herself and the safety of others. At 12:54 pm police received another call from a local business owner who stated the Complainant was threatening to damage property and kill staff members.

Several uniform officers and civilian members of the MCCRT (Mobile Crisis Rapid Response Team) attended the area and located the complainant in a motor vehicle. The Complainant was contained and officers negotiated his peaceful surrender for several hours in attempts to apprehend the Complainant under the Mental Health Act.

At 3:35 the Complainant exited the vehicle and became assaultive towards officers. A Conducted Energy Weapon was deployed to incapacitate the Complainant and apprehend him for his own safety and the safety of the public. The Complainant was then transported to a hospital for a psychiatric assessment.

On June 26th, 2025, the Complainant filed a complaint with the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency grieving the conduct of the involved officer.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Unnecessary Exercise of Authority 2(1)(g)(ii) of the Ontario Police Service Act

Decision and Reasons

The Respondent Officer's intention from the start of the incident was to negotiate a peaceful surrender which lasted just short of three hours in length. The Complainant exited the vehicle but did not surrender himself to police. The Respondent officer believed the use of force necessary for the safety of all parties involved and the risk to the public should he escape. The Respondent officer deployed his CEW to incapacitate the Complainant and carry out a Mental Health Act apprehension.

Upon careful review and analysis of all available information, there is insufficient evidence available to form reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Officer used excessive force to apprehend the Complainant.