

**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: 08/12/2024

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 outlines 3 officers (2 females and 1 male) attended her residence for a wellness check. The complainant indicates that she was questioned by one of the female officers and before she knew it, the officers jumped on her bringing her to the ground on her concrete porch where a struggle ensued. The complainant states she was handcuffed and put in the back of the police vehicle like a criminal where she was screaming and swearing. The complainant further states that she sustained several cuts and scrapes. The complainant indicates that she was then brought to the hospital where she called the male officer an inappropriate name. The complainant states that the male officer kept smirking at her which she found to be unprofessional. The complainant indicates he then spun her around and pushed her face into the bed after the officers were attempting to take the handcuffs off. The complainant states that she later found out the male officer went through her home making a comment about there being a lot of pills and if the complainant had a drinking problem due to the number of empty wine bottles.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

### Section 10- Conduct undermines public trust

### Section 11- Unnecessary force

## Decision and Reasons

On Saturday June 21st, 2025, the [Police Service] were dispatched to a suicide/attempts suicide call to check on the wellbeing of the Complainant. The Complainant's friend had called police as there were concerns for her wellbeing. The officers who were dispatched were provided with information both from the friend of the Complainant, who placed the call, and from [police service] local files related to the Complainant. The information provided was as follows:

- The call was dispatched to the officers as soon as it was generated as a "high priority" call.
- The Complainant's friend advised that she told her "goodbye" and "I need to end it all".
- The Complainant had made attempts of suicide previously by locking herself in her vehicle with it running.
- The Complainant was reported to be intoxicated by alcohol.
- Illicit drugs were not believed to a factor.
- The Complainant suffers from depression and takes medication for it.
- The Complainant mentioned taking all of her pills and going to sleep.
- Friend had last spoke to The Complainant 20 minutes prior but disconnected as she was getting too upset, The Complainant was incoherent and sobbing.
- The Complainant was having ongoing issues with her father and another friend who betrayed her.
- The Complainant's friend had attempted to call her a cab to take her to the hospital, however, she refused advising they treat her poorly.
- The Complainant had sent another text saying "goodbye" and was currently (still) typing.
- Local files showed several other calls regarding attempt suicides, mental health calls and wellbeing checks.
- Local files also show a note that states The Complainant prefers the Mobile Crisis Rapid Response Team (MCRRT) attend and female officers as she does not respond well to male officers.
- The Complainant's friend further advised that they received another text from The Complainant stating "goodbye" and wanted her friend to have her funds from a TD account.

Three officers were dispatched to respond to the call, one male constable, one female constable and one female sergeant (supervisor). [police service] has a note on the complainant's address that she does not respond well to male officer's, this was considered and the most appropriate and available resources were dispatched to her residence. The information of this incident was provided from the complainant's original complaint, an interview with the complainant, officers' notes and statements from the Respondent Officers.

The evidence supports that responding officers decision to apprehend the Complainant including statements "I just want to die, leave me the [\*\*\*\*] alone". The officers attempted to speak with the complainant for approximately 16-minutes and asked the Complainant if they could speak to her inside the residence however The Complainant would not allow this and again wanted the officers to leave. With the utterance made and the information provided to police in the dispatch events, it was determined that there were grounds to apprehend under Section 17 of the Mental Health Act. A respondent officer seized the Complainant by the arm to remove her from the doorway. The Complainant attempted to resist the apprehension and tripped on the doorframe. Once The Complainant was laying prone on the front step she was placed in handcuffs. From the information provided by the Complainant and the Respondent Officers this was the extent of the physical altercation. The Complainant continued to yell and scream but didn't offer any major physical resistance.

The In-Car Camera System (ICCS) begins when the Complainant is placed in the rear seat of RO #1's police vehicle in order to be transported to the hospital for psychiatric assessment. The ICCS footage shows the Complainant in a very elevated state berating RO #1 for the duration of the transport to hospital. RO #1 remains calm and professional throughout.

Pursuant to Section 25(1) of the Criminal Code, police officers are immune from criminal liability for force used in the course of their duties provided such force was reasonably necessary in the execution of an act that they were required or authorized to do by law. Based on the circumstances the officers were facing and the immediate need to apprehend the Complainant's the amount of force used to affect the apprehension was reasonable. While the injuries sustained to the Complainant during the apprehension are regrettable, the apprehension itself was both justified and necessary, and the force used was not excessive.