

**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: 04/11/2024

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

### De-identified Summary of Complaint

The CO explained in the complaint that they have been having ongoing issues a neighbour. The neighbour has made threats and attempted to kill them. These incidents have been reported to the police and nothing has been done. The CO believes police dispatch; and an unnamed police Sergeant have tried to make him look crazy and would bring up mental health. The CO has made 23 harassment calls to the police

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Duty-Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CPSA Reg. 407/29 - Unsubstantiated

## Decision and Reasons

According to the RO, the CO was loud and would not listen to his questions or suggestions. In the CO's LECA complaint, he stated he was upset that the officer hung up on him, the RO stated he "ended the call" because the CO was becoming more agitated and would not let the officer speak. When the CO called police, the police dispatcher gave him the option of a phone call, or an officer attend his residence. The CO stated he wanted a phone call and that his lawyer could speak with the police. The CO then stated he did not want the police to call him, he wanted the police to call his neighbour and tell him to stop harassing him. The police call taker explained that she does not provide direction to the officer on how to do their jobs. The CO then called a second time advising he no longer wished to speak with the police, that he would file with the Ontario Court of Justice.

There is no recording to reference of the RO's conversation with the CO. While listening to the 12min call taker audio, the CO continuously spoke over the call taker, interrupting her and was expressing his conspiracy theories as to why his neighbour had not been arrested and charged in the past (even though his neighbour was charged with assault during a previous investigation.)

The RO explained in his Duty Report that he ended the call and explained that the CO ignored him, spoke over him in an aggressive manner. He made several attempts to calm him down and have a civil conversation without success. He ended the conversation as the CO refused to allow him to speak or listen to any suggestions that he was proposing, and it was obvious that he was only getting more worked up and unintelligible. The RO then updated his supervisor. Although police officers are required to be patient and calm while dealing with the public, there becomes a point that officers need to end conversations at time when it becomes counterproductive.

The CO has called the police 34 times. 23 of those calls were reporting issues with his neighbour. The contentious issues would appear very challenging and difficult to resolve for the local police as the large majority of the calls had no merit. Between (dates), the CO called the police 6 times suggesting that his neighbour was playing loud music, and a speaker was pointed in the direction of his residence in retaliation of the assault charges. Police attended each time and did not hear any music. The PS investigator conducted an audit of all the calls for service involving the CO and established that the Crisis Rapid Response Team was only referred / tasked once.