

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: 08/01/2025

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 alleges that on June 28, 2025, when the Respondent Officers attended his building, they claimed to recognize him and proceeded to arrest him without providing any explanation. During transport to the division, he reports being assaulted by RO2, and upon arrival at the division, he was denied medical attention.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1

Undermine Public Trust - Section 10(1) – A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

Allegation #2

Unnecessary or excessive use of force - Section 11(1) – A police officer shall not use force unless, a) the force is used for the purpose of carrying out a duty;
b) the officer is entitled, by statute or common law, to use force for the purpose of carrying out that duty;
c) the officer is acting on reasonable grounds; and the force used is no more than is necessary given the circumstances

Allegation #3

Neglect health or safety of person in custody - Section 9 – A police officer shall not neglect the health and safety of any individual who is in their custody as a result of the officer's duties

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

The Complainant was arrested for pulling a fire alarm and later found breaching a release order. After being advised of his rights, he became aggressive during transport, striking the partition and window. At [Redacted] Division, further aggression led to leg restraints being applied, during which he sustained a minor facial scratch. In booking, he refused to cooperate and showed no visible injuries, so medical care was not provided. Later footage showed inconsistent walking, though records indicate prior knee pain. The investigation concluded there was insufficient evidence of misconduct, and the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation #2

The investigation found RO1 and RO2 acted lawfully and followed all procedures. During transport, the Complainant became agitated over ventilation, despite officers maximizing airflow. He struck the partition and kicked the rear window, then became aggressive upon arrival, kicking the door and shouting obscenities. Officers removed him and applied leg restraints without twisting or forcing his knee. Based on the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds for misconduct; the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation #3

The Complainant received a minor facial scratch and scratch to his shoulder while being placed in leg restraints after kicking a door and being removed from the scout car. At booking, he ignored questions about injuries but later requested medical attention without explaining why, eventually mentioning his leg and knee. In the interview room, he showed discomfort but refused to clarify his needs, despite knocking for attention twice. Observations showed inconsistent limping and normal leg movement. Since he provided no details and showed no clear signs of injury, medical care was not given. The investigation found no evidence of misconduct; the allegation is unsubstantiated.