

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: 10/10/2025

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 was panhandling in the drive-thru area of a McDonald's. The Respondent Officer instructed the Complainant to leave the premise. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent Officer tackled him to the ground when he began to walk away.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations**Unnecessary Force - Section 11****Decision and Reasons****1) Unnecessary Force**

The Respondent Officer confirmed with the business management that they wanted the Complainant removed and trespassed from the property. The Respondent Officer initiated a lawful investigation under the Trespass to Property Act (TPA) and began investigating the Complainant. When approached by the Respondent Officer, the Complainant chose to walk away and refused to identify himself as required by the TPA. The Respondent Officer used minimal force to gain physical control of the Complainant's arm momentarily to prevent him from leaving. The Complainant then verbally provided his identification, which the Respondent Officer confirmed before serving him with a warning infraction notice for violating the TPA. The physical interaction between the Respondent Officer and the Complainant was recorded on the officer's body-worn camera. A review of the video evidence confirms that it does not support the Complainant's allegations.

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

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.