

**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: 08/20/2024

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

### De-identified Summary of Complaint

The Complainant alleged that during their arrest, they were not informed of their Rights to Counsel, a breach under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Performance of Duties – CSPA O. Reg 407/23 Code of Conduct  
Section 19: A police officer shall not, by act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately. It is alleged that on August 20th 2025, Respondent Officer 1 (RO1) did not provide adequate reason for her arrest, nor provided with her rights to counsel, as required in her duty.

Allegation 2 – Deny Charter Rights – CSPA O. Reg 407/23 Code of Conduct  
Section 6(1): A police officer shall not, by act or omission, do anything that the officer, at the time, knows or reasonably ought to know would infringe or deny a person's rights or freedoms under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

It is alleged that on August 20th, 2025, Respondent Officer 1 (RO1) did not provide information to the complainant as required under section 10 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, therefore, denying the Complainant their Charter Rights.

## Decision and Reasons

In the absence of cooperation from the Complainant and with all available documentary and video evidence aligning with the officers' accounts, there is no objective evidence supporting the allegations. Therefore, this allegation is unsubstantiated