

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: 08/27/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

The first Complainant alleges he was wrongfully arrested and detained. He was then left in a police car under extreme heat and humidity for a long time.

The second Complainant alleges police used excessive force to unlawfully detain her. She was denied multiple times to use the bathroom while in the police car causing her to urinate on herself. She alleges the difference in her treatment can be attributed to her being a visible minority.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Human Rights Code	Section 5(1)
Unlawful Detention	Section 8(1)
Neglects health/safety of person in custody	Section 9
Conduct Undermines Public Trust	Section 10(1)
Unnecessary or excessive use of force	Section 11(1)
Neglect of duty	Section 19

Decision and Reasons

Complainant 1 alleges the Respondent Officer unlawfully arrested him. The Respondent Officer responded to a 911 call and formed reasonable grounds to believe Complainant 1 had assaulted Complainant 2. The Respondent Officer based her decision on information she received from the civilian witnesses, her own observations, and utterances by Complainant 2. Reasonable grounds existed at the time to arrest the Complainant.

Complainant 2 alleges the Respondent Officer discriminated against her because of her race. Based on the 911 call, the Complainant's utterances, physical appearance and disorientated demeanor, the Respondent Officer determined that the Complainant was a danger to herself and made the decision to apprehend her under the Mental Health Act. There is no evidence showing the Respondent Officer discriminated against the Complainant.

Complainant 2 alleges the Respondent Officer used unnecessary force on her. Based on the 911 call and the Complainant's physical appearance and disorientated demeanor, the Respondent Officer determined that the Complainant was unable to properly care for herself and made the decision to apprehend her under the Mental Health Act. Video evidence shows a minimal amount of force was used to apprehend the complainant. The Complainant was compliant and no more force was used than necessary when placing handcuffs on the Complainant.

The Complainants allege the Respondent Officer was unprofessional. Video evidence shows the Respondent Officer was polite and professional to the Complainants and acted in a professional manner at all times. There is no evidence to suggest the Respondent Officer treated the Complainants unfairly or that would place the reputation of the Service into disrepute.