

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

The complainant alleged that the RO made a baseless report to the [police service], claiming that she had harassed him and his wife by email. She alleged that this was done with the intent of undermining her prospects for a career in law enforcement.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Public-Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CPSA Reg. 407/26

Decision and Reasons

Allegation – Undermine Public Trust

The complainant has alleged that the RO reported a baseless claim to [police service] that she had harassed, him and his wife by email, to hamper her chances of a career in Law Enforcement.

Section 10(1), O/Reg 407/23 of the Community Safety and Police Act, under the Code of Conduct states: “A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.”

In this matter, the RO and the complainant shared a child and the responsibilities of parenting that child. Over time, their communication regarding parenting broke down. To improve this, a designated email account was established as the sole method of non-emergency communication between them regarding their child.

Despite this arrangement, the evidence shows that the complainant continued to send messages not only through the designated email but also to the RO and his wife’s personal email accounts. This continued even after the RO, on three separate occasions, directed her to use only the designated email and warned that all other communication would be considered harassment.

As a result of the ongoing unwanted communication, the RO attended [police service] and filed a formal complaint. He provided a sworn video statement along with supporting emails. A [police service] Detective was assigned to investigate. The investigation included reviewing emails and consulting with a [city] Assistant Crown Attorney. At its conclusion, the [police service] Detective determined that the evidence did not meet the threshold for criminal harassment. However, the complainant was cautioned that further communication outside of the designated email could result in criminal charges. The [police service] Detective closed the investigation “Founded – Not Cleared”.

There is no evidence to suggest that the RO complaint was baseless or intended to hinder the complainants employment opportunities in law enforcement.

According to Section 6.10.1 of [police service] Police Orders, Professionalism in the [police service] the conduct of employees, both on and off duty, reflects on the organization as a whole. On September 6, 2024, while off duty and acting as a private citizen in [city] Region, the RO reported his concerns to [police service]. Throughout the investigation, there is no evidence that the RO sought or implied a request for preferential treatment because of his [police service] position. He remained professional at all times during the process.

In reviewing the Community Safety and Policing Act, Code of Conduct, and comparing it to the evidence of the Complainant, Respondent Officer, Witness Officer and the referenced materials, there is no evidence to support a breach of the code of conduct by the RO when compared to the allegations. Therefore, the allegation that the RO acted in a manner that would Undermine Public Trust is unsubstantiated.