

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: 09/08/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ☒

Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

During September of 2024, the complainant reported to Police being assaulted and sexually assaulted. The complainant requested that a new officer be assigned to their case. The complainant did not feel that the officer thoroughly investigated other allegations brought forward by the complainant.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 19- Neglects to do duty

A police officer shall not, by an act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

Decision and Reasons

Throughout this investigation police reports, officer notes, witness statements, email correspondence and a video interview of the complainant were reviewed. The complainant alleged that preceding their initial complaint of sexual assault and assault, the officer in charge of the incident was neglecting to do their duty, contrary to section 19 of the Code of Conduct for Police Officers. Based on a review and analysis of the information, the PSB investigation has concluded that there are no reasonable grounds to support this allegation. It was found that the complainant made criminal allegations regarding their spouse. The officer was able to corroborate 2 of the allegations and ultimately lay criminal charges. It was determined that the additional allegations provided to the officer were either not credible or had already been investigated by another agency. The regional crown attorney was consulted regarding this matter and advised there was no reasonable prospect of conviction, however they did not have any concerns regarding the investigation being neglectful.