

**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: 08/09/2025

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 alleged that Respondent Officer #1 neglected their duty by not documenting all the information report to them, which caused a faulty investigation by the investigative unit. In addition, the complainant alleged that Respondent Officer #1 was aggressive in their attendance at the complainant's residence, by way of knocking at the door and accusatory statements.

The complainant further alleged that Respondent Officer #2, from the investigative unit, neglected their duties by not speaking with the complainant's spouse, prior to their arrest. If police would have spoken to the complainant's spouse charges would not have been laid.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

### Respondent Officer #1

- By act or omission, failed to perform duties appropriately without lawful excuse - sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

### Respondent Officer #2

- By act or omission, failed to perform duties appropriately without lawful excuse - sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

## Decision and Reasons

Respondent Officer #1 attended the complainant's residence to gather information. There was no evidence provided to suggest that Respondent Officer #1 was aggressive in their knocking and questioning toward the complainant. Respondent Officer #1 documented their findings in a report that was up to standard with the police service policy.

Respondent Officer #2 was tasked with investigating the incident. Respondent Officer #2 conducted interviews and gathered evidence. As a result, Respondent Officer #2 arrested the complainant's spouse. During an accused interview Respondent Officer #2 offered the complainant's spouse an opportunity to speak; however, the complainant's spouse didn't say anything, as was the advice given to them by their lawyer. There is no case law or police service policy that requires a police officer to speak with a suspect prior to their arrest.

With the information available throughout the course of the investigation, it was determined there were no grounds to substantiate the allegations made by the complainant. There was no basis for substantiating any misconduct by Respondent Officer #1 or Respondent Officer #2.