

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: [REDACTED]

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 reports the RO acted inappropriately as the RO called the CO approximately 24 times in a single day and also sent several emails.

The complainant advised has screen shots of the calls.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1. Conduct undermines public trust S.10 CSPA

Decision and Reasons

In conclusion, RO#1 had the authority and responsibility to further investigate who the driver of the motor vehicle was. RO#1 had concerns for public safety due to the driving behaviour displayed and decided not to pursue the vehicle, rather he used follow-up investigative techniques in an attempt to investigate the offences of stunt driving and fail to remain.

It is unknown why the complainant decided not to respond to RO#1. The stolen vehicle report indicated his vehicle was in the possession of (Company1) when it was stolen, and therefore, the complainant would have no obvious jeopardy or concern to speak with the investigating officer. The complainant would have been able to simply state the vehicle was not in his possession and he did not know who was driving it. It is further unknown as to why the complainant would send an email to several generic [REDACTED] email addresses, rather than respond to RO#1's email or voicemails directly.