

**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: 02/06/2026

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 having her phone was stolen. The Complainant advised that the RO told the Complainant to gather the footage herself, or the police could assist. The Complainant attempted to gather the video and was told that the camera would have gathered the incident but did not work. The Complainant requested the RO assist in gathering the other video and alleges the RO emailed back stating that there was insufficient evidence based on 1 out of the 4 cameras.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Conduct Undermines Public Trust - Section 10(1) CSPA  
Neglects to do duty - Section 19 CSPA

## Decision and Reasons

### Conduct Undermines Public Trust

Section 10 (1) A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing

It is alleged that the RO deferred the investigation, making the Complainant seize video evidence

This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of his duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. RO1 requested the Complainant to download a video through a link provided by email, RO1 also followed up in person regarding any other available video.

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.

### Neglects to do duty

Section 19 A police officer shall not, by act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

It is alleged that the RO's failed to properly investigate his stolen phone.

This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of his duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. RO1 conducted a thorough investigation and appropriately utilized the resources available to him.

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.