

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 states that they and their partner sought assistance from the Police Service regarding a custody dispute. During their interaction with a police officer, over the phone, the officer neglected to do their duty, in that they provided incorrect advice, and they also used insulting language.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 12 (1): A police officer shall not, in the course of their duties, use abusive language with any person or otherwise treat any person in a manner that is abusive.

Section 19: A police officer shall not, by 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

In their complaint to LECA, the complainant was vague with their description of both the officer's conduct and with the context regarding the information provided to, and by, the officer. Multiple attempts were made to elicit further information from the complainant, but the complainant elected to cease communication with the investigator. Based on the evidence available, the allegations of misconduct could not be substantiated.