

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: [REDACTED]

Date of Complaint: July 24, 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 (C) alleged officers failed to protect his son by not performing a proper abuse investigation after his son was dragged by a teacher and kicked into a room.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Neglects to do Duty - Section 19 CSPA

Decision and Reasons

The Police Service and the Children's Aid Society jointly conduct investigations involving children. This partnership extends beyond customary practice and is formally mandated, with specific roles and functions clearly articulated in the Child Abuse Protocol.

As part of its initial assessment, the Children's Aid Society attended at CHILD1's school and interviewed relevant parties, including the child's mother. At the time of these events, CHILD1's mother held full custody and sole decision making authority pursuant to court order. CAS found CHILD1 was laying in the hallway beside a door and refusing to move. CHILD1 was at risk of getting injured by other children or staff who may use the door, and thus the teacher pulled CHILD1 out of the way and used her foot to nudge the child. Witnesses reported CHILD1 was intentional in their refusal to move, and was laughing at the teacher during the incident. The school reported the matter to CAS as mandated because the teacher made physical contact with CHILD1. The child's mother found this to be reasonable and did not wish for any further action beyond changes to the education plan.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1) while answering the Special Victims Unit general phone line, appropriately received C's concerns. Despite having no carriage of the file, RO1 took proactive steps to ensure the matter was addressed. She conducted follow up inquiries with both CAS and the child's mother and accurately documented all information obtained in her memorandum book and corresponding police occurrence report, in compliance with the Investigations Directive.

The characterization that no investigation occurred is factually incorrect. The absence of formal charges does not equate to investigative inaction.

At the time of the incident, the mother had sole custody and sole decision making authority over CHILD1. She explicitly advised that she did not believe the matter was criminal in nature and did not wish for the police to pursue the matter further. This position was lawfully and reasonably considered and is entirely consistent with established investigative practices, child-focused principles, and officer discretion recognized in case law.