

**DISCLAIMER:** In accord  
and Protection of Privacy  
of individuals, including p

the *Community Safety and Policing Act* and the *Freedom of Information*  
summary below has been de-identified to remove the personal information  
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: 09/15/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same



Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

### De-identified Summary of Complaint

- The complainant alleges the respondent officer was neglectful in investigating a civil matter and making unlawful demands.
- Further, the complainant alleges the respondent officer may have had a personal relationship with the party who was in dispute with the store owner.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation#1-CSPA Code of Conduct Section – 16(1)

Allegation#2. CSPA Code of Conduct Section-10(1)

Allegation #3 CSPA Code of Conduct – Section 19

## Decision and Reasons

Allegation#1-CSPA Code of Conduct Section – 16(1)

The Respondent Officer has had no previous calls for service or any relationship of any kind with Customer or their family and was the first interaction with the Customer. Therefore the Respondent Officer's attendance at the incident location did not benefit them or the Customer and therefore not improperly using the Respondent Officer's position. There is no evidence to support a breach of section 16(1) of the CPSA by the Respondent Officer.

Allegation#2. CSPA Code of Conduct Section-10(1)

The Respondent Officer was dispatched to the incident location and gathered details of the situation and attempted keep the peace and assist facilitate a refund for the customer as the both sides were at an impasse and not communicating effectively as the situation got heated. No demands were made by the Respondent Officer during the interaction. The Respondent Officer preformed their duty and acted in good faith with no malice or preferential treatment to either side therefore was not undermining the public trust. There is no evidence to support a breach of section 10(1) of the CSPA.

Allegation #3 CSPA Code of Conduct – Section 19

The allegation is that the Respondent Officer unnecessarily conducted an investigation into a civil matter that was outside of the scope of their police duties is what is deemed to be a failure to perform their duties appropriately. The Respondent Officer was assigned to attend the incident location and attempted mediate a heated situation and keep the peace. The Respondent Officer was at the incident location for four minutes while they gathered details and diffused the situation. The body worn camera belonging to Respondent Officer shows they were not aggressive, did not antagonize either involved party of the dispute, or unnecessarily loiter at the incident location. The Respondent Officer isn't disciplined or guilty of an offence if their conduct was reasonable and in good faith. The Respondent Officer believed that they were performing their duties appropriately by acting as mediator and problem solver for a heated civil matter. There is no evidence to support a breach of section 19 of the CSPA.