

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: 05/15/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On August 31, 2024, members of the [Redacted] Police received a request for assistance from Emergency Medical Services (EMS) and subsequently apprehended a male under the Mental Health Act (MHA). In May 2025, a complaint was received by the Law Enforcement Complaint Agency (LECA) alleging that officers used excessive force during the apprehension and demonstrated insufficient consideration of the needs of a vulnerable individual with mental and physical health difficulties.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23
Unnecessary Force - Sec 11 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

The investigation established that RO1 and RO2 acted lawfully and reasonably under section 17 of the Mental Health Act, having grounds to believe CO2 was suffering from a mental disorder and was at risk of serious harm, and required apprehension for medical assessment. Evidence showed CO2 was agitated, refused medical assistance, and displayed assaultive behaviour by clenching his fists, raising a fist toward RO1, and attempting to bite the officers. This prompted RO1 and RO2 to apply minimal soft physical control, consistent with [Redacted] principles of lawful, necessary, reasonable, and proportional force. Medical evidence confirmed CO2 did not sustain a fracture or hip dislocation during police apprehension but suffered from a preexisting medical condition. Allegations that the officers failed to consider CO2's vulnerabilities were unsupported, as the officers recognized his impaired mental state, used minimal force, and transported him to hospital only after he refused ambulance care. CO2 was cooperative during transport, showed no signs of acute distress in-car, and the officers relayed his condition to hospital staff. Once examined by a physician, police authority under the MHA ended, and they had no ability to prevent his discharge. There is no evidence the officers acted without empathy or professionalism, and both allegations—excessive use of force and undermining public trust—are unsubstantiated.