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: 09/09/2025

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 he was harassed and investigated arbitrarily after confronting the Respondent Officer for driving erratically and below the speed limit.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1: Interactions with the Public,

Section 8(1) A police officer shall not authorize or make a physical or psychological detention if, at the time of the detention, the officer knows or reasonably ought to know that the detention is unlawful.

• It is alleged that on September 9, 2025, the Respondent Officer arbitrarily detained the Complainant.

Allegation #2: 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 on September 9, 2025, the Respondent Officer conducted a traffic stop in retaliation for a comment made by the Complainant.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1:

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. RO1 possessed the reasonable grounds to investigate the Complainant for Careless Driving contrary to Section 130(1) of the HTA.

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.

Allegation #2:

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. RO1 possessed the reasonable grounds to initiate a vehicle stop and investigate the Complainant. RO1 was professional in his interaction with the Complainant.

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.