

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: 06/05/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On June 5, 2025 the complainant filed a complaint with LECA for an occurrence that took place on June 11, 2023. The complaint was the officer that responded to a domestic disturbance failed to conduct a complete and thorough investigation. The complainant alleged that she had been forcibly confined and was sexually assaulted. If the officer would have conducted a better investigation and took photos, reviewed cell phone texts and videos, and interviewed the complainant he would have developed grounds for the arrest of the subject.

On July 15, 2025 the complaint was assigned to the police for investigation. The complainant was brought in for an interview and she provided her complaint in detail. The complainant stated that police had a cellphone in property that had evidence to support her allegation that she was sexually assaulted and forcibly confined. She stated that she was provided a drink by the subject and believes she had been drugged.

A warrant was written for this phone. A Detective was assigned to pull the text messages and photos from the week prior to this incident. An extensive review was conducted and no evidence supporting the allegations were found.

On June 9, 2025 the investigating officer was brought in for questioning. A copy of his notes and a copy of the occurrence report was reviewed. The complainant did report to the investigating officer that the subject did prevent her from leaving his house but at the time of the report, the complainant was outside in a truck honking the horn. The investigating officer was provided conflicting stories at the time. The subject did not want the complainant at his house and she was reporting he wouldn't let her go. The situation resolved itself when the complainants mother attended and took her home.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

S. 10 Conduct undermines public trust
S. 19 Neglect of Duty

Decision and Reasons

A thorough review of all the evidence including interviews with the complainant and the investigating officer, the cell phone in police custody and the subsequent reports filed from the complainant. The investigation was complete and no misconduct can be substantiated against the investigating officer.