

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: 03/17/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

Both complainants (CO1 and CO2) stated they were conducting personal business at an Ontario courthouse and were video recording their interaction with a clerk at the reception desk. They alleged that respondent officer 1 (RO1) used excessive force in seizing the recording device from CO2 and in physically removing CO1 from the courthouse. Both complainants further claimed this conduct amounted to assault and infringed upon their rights as sovereign citizens. Additionally, CO1 alleged RO2 used insulting language during the incident. The complainants asserted the incident undermined public confidence in the police service.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

The respondent officers are alleged to have engaged in the following misconduct under the Community Safety and Policing Act (CSPA):

- Section 10 – Undermine public trust
- Section 11 – Unnecessary force
- Section 12 – Insulting language

Decision and Reasons

Section 10 – Undermine public trust

Section 11 – Unnecessary force

The Professional Standards investigator reviewed courthouse video footage of the incident. The footage does not support the sequence of events described by the complainants, and the physical interactions alleged in both complaints are exaggerated or fabricated. The complainants were recording video inside the courthouse, which is prohibited. They refused to stop recording, surrender the device, or identify themselves. RO1 was authorized to use reasonable force to seize the recording device and remove the complainants from the premises. The recording device was seized from CO2 after brief scuffle in which no strikes or injury occurred. CO1 was escorted out of the courthouse using minimal force. Officers placed their hands on CO1's arm, back, and shoulder and guided him to the exit without any indication of aggression or excessive force.

Supporting statutes:

Trespass to Property Act, Section 2(1)

Courts of Justice Act, Section 136(1)

Community Safety and Policing Act, Part XV

Section 12 – Insulting language

Body-worn camera footage confirmed the respondent officers remained calm, respectful, and patient throughout the interaction. At no point did the officers raise their voices or use profane or condescending language. The footage shows that CO1 was visibly upset and repeatedly used expletives and derogatory remarks during the recorded conversation with RO2. These comments reflected ideological beliefs commonly associated with "Freeman on the Land" principles, and included accusations that the officers were corrupt and "protecting their own."