

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: [REDACTED]

Date of Complaint: 08/26/2025

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 posted a negative review of an item that was being sold online and the seller threatened the Complainant through a private message. The Respondent Officer conducted an investigation and never contacted the Complainant back to advised of the findings.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Performance of Duties – CSPA O. Reg 407/23 Code of Conduct

Section 19: A police officer shall not, by act for omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately

Decision and Reasons

The Respondent Officer conducted the investigation and indicated in the report that 2 calls were made to the Complainant with no response. An email was subsequently sent to the Complainant to the same email provided in the LECA complaint, advising of the outcome of the investigation. Therefore the allegation that the Respondent Officer never contacted the Complainant is unsubstantiated.