

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: [REDACTED]

Date of Complaint: 04/28/2025

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 alleged three [REDACTED] Police officers, here on in referred to as, RO1, RO2 and RO3, failed to conduct a fulsome investigation following his involvement in a fail to remain accident. He further alleged, he had to follow-up with RO1 multiple times to get a response, which was ignored or delayed.

The complainant was also of the view that a provincial offence notice should have been laid in the matter.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 10. Conducts undermines public trust
Section 19. Neglects to do duty

Decision and Reasons

The investigation determined that the accident was not a fail-to-remain incident as defined under Section 200(1)(a) of the Ontario Highway Traffic Act.

RO1 exercised discretion in choosing not to issue a provincial offence notice under Section 138(1) of the Ontario Highway Traffic Act. This decision is supported by the Supreme Court of Canada's ruling in Hill v. Hamilton-Wentworth. Instead, RO1 opted to educate the other driver.

The documentation reviewed throughout the investigation did not substantiate the allegation that the responding officers ignored or delayed their response to the complainant.

There was insufficient evidence to substantiate any misconduct on the part of the respondent officers.