

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: 2025-08-16

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 stated he was homeless and the R.O's were not empathetic to his situation. The R.O's instructed the complainant to move his car from a public side road and move to an unsafe area. The complainant stated that 'angry white people' were making the complaints about his location. The complainant believed that the incident was motivated by race. The complainant stated that the R.O became visibly angry and reacted with excessive force and aggression. The complainant believed that the R.O's racism was exposed when he threatened to tow the complainant's vehicle. The complainant believed that the R.O intended to cause harm or death to the complainant. The complainant stated that the R.O dismissed all complaints and uttered death threats prior to leaving.

The complainant attempted to report the hate crime to the R.O's supervisor who dismissed the complaint.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Neglects to do duty Sec. 19 CSPA
Allegation 2 - Discrimination - Human Rights Code Sec. 5 CSPA
Allegation 3 - Neglects to do duty Sec. 19 CSPA
Allegation 4 - Discrimination

Decision and Reasons

All allegations were unsubstantiated

The complainant reported that he spoke with Officer 1 and Officer 2 and they did not empathize with his homelessness. The officers ordered him to leave property that he felt they did not have the authority to do.

Officer 1 and Officer 2, observed forced entry into a gated hydro line owned by Hydro One Utility. The complainant was located on the property and it was established that he did not seek permission from Hydro One to be on the property. The complainant had been parked on the property and residing in that location for four days. Officer 1 and Officer 2 informed him that he was trespassing on the property and he had to leave. The Trespass to Property Act was explained to the complainant. The complainant was argumentative. The complainant was offered victim services and ideas for other places to park his vehicle until he found housing but the complainant did not want to move. Officer 1 informed him that they would tow his vehicle if he did not leave but they indicated that was a last resort because they did not want to take away the one place he felt comfortable. The officers were called away on an emergency call and advised the complainant to leave after they left. No officer made any threats to the complainant.

The complainant spoke with the R.O's supervisor who reiterated the trespass to property act and explained the rationale of the officers. The supervisor explained that the officers actions were not motivated by race, they were following the law.

All allegations were unsubstantiated.