

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: 09/25/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

The CO filed a complaint with LECA on September 25, 2025. The CO came across an unmarked (Redacted) vehicle parked on the side of the roadway without emergency lights activated. The CO addressed one of the RO #1 (no longer works for the (Redacted)) at roadside and later spoke with the second RO #2 on the phone. The CO was unhappy with both officer interactions.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Public-Uncivil - Sec 12 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

Although the PS Investigator has no information from RO #1 as to the placement of his (Redacted) vehicle, according to RO #2, RO #1 was debriefing with another officer after responding to a domestic violence call. Officers have discretion not to activate their emergency lights if they feel it would be a distraction to motorists. It is also unclear the exact time the interaction occurred between the CO and RO #1, however, according to RMS the domestic call came at 1:13pm. So, it is fair to assume the interaction was during daylight hours in a 50km/h residential zone. If officers are speaking on the roadside after a call, there should be no need to have their emergency lights activated. Although RO #1's self-admitted comments to RO #2 were less than expected of a police officer, they do not meet the threshold of misconduct. Regardless, RO #1, has left the (Redacted) and is no longer subject to misconduct under the CSPA. When speaking with RO #2 on the phone, the CO insisted that there was an inherent risk to the public with the position of the (Redacted) vehicle. It was RO #2 position that the CO was exaggerating the situation and could not be reasoned with. The CO eventually hung up the phone