

**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: 02/24/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:  Referred to Other Service:  Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

### De-identified Summary of Complaint

On November 28, 2024, the complainant called police after he was threatened by a neighbour with two long sticks. The complainant also alleged that the neighbour threatened to sexually assault them.

Police attended and located the neighbour in the back yard of their house under the influence of drugs and alcohol in a psychotic episode.

The neighbour was apprehended under the mental health act and transport to hospital for assessment.

The complainant provided a statement to police with the allegations. The statement provided by the complainant along with the video footage supplied showed that there were no threats and no threat of sexual assault.

The complainant believed that officers were neglectful in their investigation and did not take him seriously.

The investigation revealed that officers were correct in their conclusion that no ground for charges existed. The allegation of neglect was unfounded.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

### Allegation 1 – Neglect

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 of omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

### Decision and Reasons

The statement and video provided by the complainant showed that there were no threats of physical harm or sexual assault. Therefore the officers decision not to charge the neighbour and to instead apprehend for a mental health assessment was correct.