**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: 07/13/2025

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 on July 13th, 2025, police officers RO1 and RO2 attended to their residence and banged loudly on their front door. When they did not answer, RO1 entered their backyard and peered through their bedroom window. Later, at a different location, RO1 and RO2, without the necessary reasonable grounds, arrested them aggressively, handcuffed them unnecessarily and detained them in the rear seat of a police cruiser. During the arrest RO1 turned off their body-worn-camera.

When the complainant attended to police headquarters on August 19th, 2025, to have their fingerprints taken in relation to the criminal charge, they were told by RO3 that the charges weren't going through and they should be happy. This officer refused to provide their badge number, the names of the investigating officers, or documentation regarding the withdrawn charge.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation # 1 - Section 11(1) Unnecessary Force
A police officer shall not use force unless,
(a) the force is used for the purpose of carrying out a duty;
(b) the officer is entitled, by statute or common law, to use force for the purpose of carrying out that duty;
(c) the officer is acting on reasonable grounds; and
(d) the force used is no more than is necessary given the circumstances.

## Decision and Reasons

Sources of Information:
a) Occurrence reports collected from the Records Management System
b) Body-Worn-Camera (BWC) records in relation to the occurrence
c) Video Recording of Police Service Headquarters - General Office
d) Audio Recordings of phone calls made to/from Police Service Headquarters
e) CCTV - a 10 second clip of security video
f) Duty Reports and Notebook Entries

Allegation 1:

The available evidence, including the Body-Worn-Camera recordings, demonstrates that the Respondent Officers (RO1 and RO2) acted proportionately in their interactions with the complainant during the arrest. The complainant's behaviour, ranged from passive to active resistance, and the officers were justified in employing the physical control options they did as outlined in the Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid (2023). They did not escalate to physical strikes or employ intermediate weapons, and therefore did not use more force than was necessary given the circumstances. The complainant did not report any injuries as a result of the arrest.

Allegation 2(a):

The available evidence including a 10-second CCTV video clip of the theft, documentation of the acrimonious relationship between the reporter of the theft and the complainant, information provided by the reporter, and the body-worn-camera recordings all demonstrate that the Respondent Officers (RO1 and RO2) had sufficient reasonable grounds to believe that the complainant committed the offence of Theft Under $5000. It was determined that the officers were acting within the lawful performance of their duties and conducted themselves in a manner that did not undermine public trust.