

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: 07/30/2025

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 reported that the Respondent Officers attended her residence on July 30, 2025, in relation to a civil matter. The Respondent Officers refused to provide the reason for their attendance, failed to identify themselves and acted in a rude and aggressive manner by threatening her with criminal charges.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1. Undermine Public Trust: Section 10(1)
2. Fail to Identify: Section 13(1)

Decision and Reasons

1. Undermine Public Trust

This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities.

On July 30, 2025, the Respondent Officers attended the Complainant's residence in response to a radio call for a property dispute involving tree cutting. The Respondent Officers engaged the Complainant in a professional manner, explained the reason for their attendance, and attempted to clarify the potential for legal implications of cutting down trees without consent.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish misconduct.

2. Fail to Identify

On July 30, 2025, when the Respondent Officers attended the Complainant's residence, they were in full uniform, which clearly displayed their name tags on their vest and badge numbers on their epaulettes. At no time during the interaction did the Complainant request any identification from the Respondent Officers or the officers refused to provide it.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish misconduct.