

**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: [REDACTED]

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

The Complainant alleged that the Respondent Officers used unnecessary or excessive force when the Complainant was apprehended under Section 17 of the Mental Health Act (MHA). It was alleged that there were no grounds to apprehend the Complainant under Section 17 of the MHA and that the Respondent Officers failed to properly de-escalate and negotiate with the Complainant. It was further alleged that the Respondent Officers failed to provide their names and badge numbers when the information was requested.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Interactions with the Public - 11(1)

Interactions with the Public - 13(2)

Interactions with the Public - 10(1)

## Decision and Reasons

The Complainant had contacted family after they engaged in self-harm, indicating that they wanted to kill themselves. The Complainant was uncooperative with paramedics and made further suicidal remarks. The Complainant refused to engage with the Respondent Officers to discuss the current concerns or safety plan. The Respondent Officers formed grounds to apprehend the Complainant under Section 17 of the MHA. The Respondent Officers attempted to de-escalate and reason with the Complainant, during which time the Complainant's behaviour escalated from passive resistant to actively resistant. The Respondent Officers used force that was reasonable, necessary, and justified in the circumstances to affect the apprehension, including controlling the Complainant's limbs, handcuffing, and restraining the Complainant to a transportation chair. During the interaction Respondent Officer 1 was asked for his name and badge number, which he promptly provided.

This was corroborated by body worn camera footage and surveillance from the residence.

Conclusion: There were not reasonable grounds to believe that the conduct of the Respondent Officers constituted misconduct.