

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: 09/08/2025

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 she was the victim of a car repair scam, that tools were stolen from her property, and that the Respondent Officers failed to conduct proper investigations into both matters.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

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

Decision and Reasons

The evidence demonstrated that the Complainant entered a private contract with CW #1 surrounding repairs to her vehicle. When she failed to pay for the work completed due to a disagreement with CW #1, she reported the matter to police.

RO #1 investigated the Complainant's allegations and determined the matter to be civil in nature.

There was no evidence identified to indicate that RO #1 failed to properly review or assess the situation. Her actions were consistent with her duties, OPP policy, and were professionally carried out.

The Complainant disagreed with RO #1's assessment and began to harass and threaten CW #1 who reported the harassment to police between July 11 and August 9, 2025. RO #2 investigated the harassment complaints and formed reasonable grounds to believe the Complainant committed criminal offences, for which she was arrested.

There was no available evidence to indicate that RO #2's actions were neglectful. His investigation was thorough, completed according to OPP policy and professionally carried out.

The criminal charges against the Complainant were later resolved through a Peace Bond.

It was confirmed that the Complainant had, at the time of the investigation, an active civil litigation against CW#1 with an impending court date.