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: 06/27/2024

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 was having on-going issues with their neighbours who lived on the main floor of the two-story residence. The complainant lived upstairs and reported several noise complaints as the neighbours were noisy late at night that kept his family awake and the neighbour's dog frightened the complainant's children.

The complainant arrived home and entered into a verbal argument with the neighbours who called police. The neighbours reported to police that the complaint exposed their genitals and threatened one of the neighbours with a stick. There were insufficient grounds to proceed with criminal charges, and police went to speak with the complainant.

The complainant was upset that police attended when the neighbours called, but not when the complainant called police.

The complainant expressed their issues with their neighbours and showed police a video of the dog frightening the complainant's children, which the complainant stated would enact police to do something with the neighbours.

The complainant was upset that police didn't do anything to help the complainant with the neighbours. The complainant felt that the officers (RO #1 and RO #2) neglected their duty.

The CSPA investigation concluded and found the complaint unsubstantiated.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Undermine public trust contrary to section 10(1) of the Code of Conduct, Ontario Regulation 407/23.

Neglect to do duty section 19 of the Code of Conduct, Ontario Regulation 407/23.

Decision and Reasons

RO #1 and RO #2 attended the complainant's residence to investigate the allegations made by the lower neighbours. After the complainant denied the allegations, RO #1 and RO #2 heard the complainant's issues with the neighbours and how no one was helping the complainant.

RO #1 provided the complainant with different options to assist the complaint regarding issues with the lower neighbours. RO #1 explained to the complainant that police had no evidence of noise or barking dog while police were on scene, as well as the police response protocol for calls for service.

RO #1 and RO #2 both advised they were not shown any videos from the complainant.

The investigator requested that the complainant send the video the complainant claimed was shown to police. Upon reviewing the video, there was no evidence of any wrong doing. The complainant walked outside and a dark from inside the house barked twice. In addition, the video was from 2 months prior to the day police were at the complainant's house.

RO #2 authored an initial report summarizing the information that police received. Both RO #1 and RO #1 wrote proper duty book notes regarding their interactions with the complainant.

In addition, the investigator queried 6 incidents where the complainant called police to report noise complaints against the lower neighbours. Police attended in an appropriate manner and on two occasions, police spoke with the complainant.

At no point in the information provided by the complainant, RO #1 or RO #2, was there any evidence that RO #1 or RO #2 neglected their duties as police officers.