

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: 07/02/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On July 2, 2025, the CO filed a complaint with the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA). The CO was involved in an ongoing dispute with the owners of a campground where her trailer was located. The [Redacted] was called by the campground owner, who wanted the CO and her spouse removed from their property. The CO stated that RO #1 and RO #2 threatened to put them in handcuffs and drag them out of their trailer. The CO explained the [Redacted] did not have an eviction order and this was a civil issue.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

RO #1 - Duty-Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

RO #2 - Duty-Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

RO #1 made efforts to seek direction from both the [Redacted] Risk Management Unit and the [Redacted] Legal Services Branch. The situation at the Campground was challenging to navigate as the campground owner clearly wanted the CO to leave permanently, while the CO wanted to stay. The CO spend their fall/winter in Florida and used their trailer as their seasonal summer residence. Although the CO wanted to continue to spend their summers at the campground, it was made clear through legal avenues that the campground is private property and not subject to the RTA through the LTB. The owners of the campground no longer wished to provide rental of their property and told the CO to vacate.

Although the [Redacted] main function is to standby and keep the peace in civil matters without enforceable orders, RO #1 and RO #2 appropriately sought advice through the [Redacted] Risk Management and [Redacted] counsel prior to taking any enforcement action and were acting in good faith based on the advice and information received from all parties. Even though the CO was successful in remaining on the property due to filing an appeal and asserting that her interpretation of the RTA and TPA were correct, that appeal and motion were dismissed by a Divisional Court