

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: 09/25/2025

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 called into the police station to make a sexual assault complaint and alleged that a sexual assault investigation did not occur.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Performance of Duties. Section 19

Fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse, if at the time, they know or reasonable ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

It is alleged that the Respondent officer did not conduct an investigation after the Complainant called the police to report a sexual assault.

Decision and Reasons

Upon review of the complaint and the information gathered, this investigation finds that the Respondent Officer did not fail in the performance of his duty. The Complainant, wished to remain anonymous and indicated that he was seeking advice about a sexual assault. The Respondent Officer, at the end of the call, also advised that if the Complainant changed his mind could call to report the incident. This information was contained within the Duty report of the officer and of the S/Sgt. that the officer spoke to. The dispatch recording, before the Complainant was transferred also indicated that the Complainant indicated that he also had questions. When the complainant was interviewed, the Complainant was really just upset with the tone of the officer and wanted him spoken, which was done. As a result of the available information, it has been determined that there are no reasonable grounds to believe the Respondent Officer failed in his duty. The allegation of fail to perform duties is unsubstantiated.