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: 07/22/2025

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 June 23, 2025, the respondent officers failed to take appropriate action and did not conduct a thorough investigation into ongoing issues with their neighbours. The complainant was not satisfied with police investigations on multiple occasions prior; however, cited this particular incident as being most egregious.

Their belief was that the officers neglected their duty as they did not do a thorough investigation and that criminal charges should have been laid.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

ONTARIO REGULATION 407/23
Allegation 1 – Performance of Duties Sec. 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 failure to perform their duties appropriately.

Decision and Reasons

It is alleged that the respondent officers neglected to perform their duties and failed to conduct a thorough investigation. This allegation is unsubstantiated. This is determined through the review of their detailed occurrence reports, duty reports, notes, and digital evidence collected.

As a result of this investigation, the officers were thorough in speaking with all involved parties regarding this incident. The officers collected all evidence that they were able, and attempted to review all evidence with the complainant. Some of this evidence included additional video footage that captured significant important details of the incident. During this review, the complainant became uncooperative, would not review their own actions and disclosed to the officers they no longer wished to proceed with the investigation. This was likely due to the fact that the full complete video provided by the neighbours, depicts the complainant as the aggressor in the situation.

The officers had determined that during the altercation, the one responsible for escalating the situation was the complainant them self. They escalated the level of anger, tension and was in fact the instigator and initiator of the physical confrontation by pushing the other involved subject. They continued to escalate the altercation by calling on a separate individual to a physical altercation; making comments to the subject saying “hit me and go to jail.”

As a result, it was determined that the complainant was the aggressor. The respondent officers perceived this incident to be a minor, consensual physical altercation that did not meet the threshold of an occurrence worthy of criminal charges of assault. The officer’s investigation is deemed to be thorough and complete. The officers spoke to all involved, reviewed multiple sources of video evidence, provided advise for all to remain inside and separate with avenues for future assistance.

Note: The complainant was not cooperative with Professional Standards Investigators.