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: 06/20/2025

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 that the RO failed to follow procedures when he failed to properly investigate her complaint. She alleged he failed to take a formal report, disseminate a media release, take a statement, call paramedics, and further he allowed her to drive while in distress.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Duty-Follow Procedures - Sec 27 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

The complainant alleged that the RO failed to comply with procedures by failing to complete a formal report. Procedures are set, reviewed the RMS report completed by the RO and found it complied with the requirements set out in Police Orders as they contained pertinent details of the investigation.

The complainant alleged the RO did not comply with procedures by failing to take a statement. Investigators were satisfied that the RO would not have gained any further detail from an audio video interview and the complaint's information was sufficiently documented considering the totality of the circumstances.

The complainant alleged the RO did not comply with procedures by failing to call paramedics .

After reviewing CSPA O/Reg 407/23, Code of Conduct s. 27, as well as relevant sections of Police Orders, and comparing them to the evidence of the complainant, Respondent Officer, RMS incident, there is no evidence to support that The RO failed to comply with procedures. Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated