

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:

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

The Respondent Officer investigated a person injured collision involving a pedestrian and motor vehicle at the intersection of [Redacted] Avenue and [Redacted] Avenue in the City of [Redacted].

The Complainant alleged the Respondent Officer failed to undertake a thorough and proper investigation into the collision, believing the incident was fabricated by the pedestrian as part of an insurance scam against him.

The Complainant further alleged the Respondent Officer was rude and unprofessional during their interaction.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations**Allegation 1 - Interactions with the Public; Undermine Public Trust, s. 10(1)****Decision and Reasons****Allegation 1:**

The Complainant alleged the Respondent Officer failed to undertake a thorough and proper investigation into the collision, believing the incident was fabricated by the pedestrian as part of an insurance scam against him.

The Complainant further alleged the Respondent Officer was rude and unprofessional during their interaction.

The conduct investigation included a review of the Motor Vehicle Collision report submitted by the Respondent Officer. It was determined the Respondent Officer received a radio call to attend the scene following reports of a pedestrian that had been struck by vehicle that failed to remain at the scene.

An independent witness observed the incident and corroborated information provided by the pedestrian. Photos of the Complainant's vehicle were also tendered as evidence weighed by the Respondent Officer.

Pursuant to requirements under the Highway Traffic Act, the Respondent Officer continued the investigation and obtained identifying information, including insurance information of the Complainant who was the involved driver.

The Complainant admitted to the Respondent Officer that he had been driving the vehicle involved in the collision.

The interaction between the Respondent Officer and the Complainant was recorded on the officer's Body Worn Camera (BWC). Through an analysis of this recording, the Respondent Officer was observed to be professional throughout the interaction and no misconduct was identified.

The officer acted on reasonable grounds and fulfilled his duties as required by Provincial Legislation and police service Procedure.

There is no evidence to conclude the Respondent Officer committed misconduct in relation to the allegation the officer Undermined Public Trust.

The allegation is therefore Unsubstantiated.