

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:

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

uniform members of the Police Service responded to an unknown 911 call for service. Information provided to the officers indicated that a male was overheard on the call yelling about someone being hit and a child screaming in the background.

When officers arrived at the residence, they were immediately confronted by three males who were standing in the garage consuming alcohol. As the officers attempted to speak with the males, their agitation and aggression towards the officers increased as they refused to grant officers entry to the residence to confirm the welfare of any occupants.

The complainant alleged that the officers were antagonistic and made unwelcome remarks while they were present at the residence. The complainant also believes that the officers violated their rights under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The complainant stated that the officers actions were captured on private CCTV and they would be willing to share the footage to investigators.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

S.12 - Insulting language

Decision and Reasons

At the conclusion of the investigation, it was determined that the allegations were unsubstantiated.

Uniformed officers responded to a 911 call in which a child could be heard crying in the background. Upon arrival at the address, officers encountered three adult males in an attached garage who were consuming alcohol and acting aggressively. The individuals refused to hear why police were present and demanded that officers leave the property.

Due to the escalating behaviour, additional officers were requested for safety reasons. Police explained that, given the nature of the 911 call, they were required to enter the residence to confirm the welfare of any occupants. Entry was initially refused until officers advised that refusal could result in obstruction charges. The officers were then permitted entry.

Inside, the residence was found to be unclean and in disarray, but no occupants were present. The investigation confirmed that officers were lawfully on the premises and had legislative and case law authority to conduct a welfare check under these circumstances.

The complainant advised investigators that private video footage of the interaction existed, but despite repeated attempts, investigators were unable to obtain the recording.