

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: 06/11/2025

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 her son was charged in error, after her other son provided his brother's name during a traffic stop. The complainant alleged that both she and her wrongly charged son went to their local police station to resolve the matter but did not receive assistance.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 19 - Neglect or Omit Duty

Decision and Reasons

The complaint arose from a traffic stop conducted by a uniform police officer for a speeding offence on a rural roadway during nighttime hours. During the stop, the driver verbally identified himself using another individual's name. The officer verified the provided identity through the Ministry of Transportation database and, based on the information available at the time, believed the identity to be accurate. A [Redacted] Offence Notice was issued accordingly.

Subsequently, the named individual advised police that he had not been the driver and alleged mistaken identity. He attended the detachment and later had further interaction with the officer, including a follow-up visit to his residence. The complainant alleged that the officer failed to properly investigate the matter and acted unprofessionally during the follow-up interaction.

The investigation included a review of civilian statements, police documentation, in-car camera footage, text message evidence, and Ministry of Transportation photographs. The evidence confirmed that the actual driver deliberately provided false identifying information to avoid enforcement consequences and made no effort to correct the matter. The investigation also confirmed that the officer relied on verbal identification and database photographs under low-visibility conditions, and that the individuals involved shared similar facial features.

The evidence did not establish that the officer knew or reasonably ought to have known that the identification was incorrect at the time of the traffic stop. There were no concerns identified regarding the manner in which the stop itself was conducted. When the identity issue was later raised, the officer took steps to follow up, advised the affected individual of available legal remedies, and the matter was ultimately reviewed by supervisory personnel. Upon receipt of corroborating evidence, the offence notice was withdrawn.

Based on the totality of the evidence, there was insufficient evidence to establish that the officer failed to perform their duties appropriately, or acted by neglect or omission contrary to Section 19 of Ontario Regulation 407/23. Accordingly, the allegation was determined to be unsubstantiated.