

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: [REDACTED]

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 alleges that on July 1, 2025, she was subjected to excessive force, and discriminatory treatment while attempting to report the theft of her dogs. She alleged that the Respondent Officers forcefully restrained her without lawful grounds, used unnecessary force causing injuries, mocked her, failed to identify themselves and did not provide a reason for her detention.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1. Undermine Public Trust: Section 10(1)
2. Unnecessary Use of Force: Section 11(1)
3. Neglect of Duty: Section 19
4. Unlawful Detention: Section 8(1)

Decision and Reasons

1. Undermine Public Trust

On July 1, 2025, all officers who interacted with the Complainant were in full [REDACTED] uniform, clearly identifiable by their name tags and epaulettes displaying their badge numbers.

The Investigator found no evidence to suggest that the officers were uncivil or unprofessional in their interactions with the Complainant. On the contrary, all officers remained calm throughout the incident and explained the basis for the apprehension to the Complainant on several occasions. Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

2. Unnecessary Use of Force

On July 1, 2025, the Complainant was apprehended under the Mental Health Act (MHA), not arrested. As this was not a criminal arrest, officers were not required to read rights to counsel to the Complainant.

During the apprehension, the Complainant resisted the officers' efforts to apprehend her for safety reasons. Under the Mental Health Act (MHA), officers are permitted to use handcuffs when they believe an individual poses a risk to themselves or others. In this situation RO1 determined the Complainant was a danger to herself, as she had ran into traffic, was visibly distressed, and was holding a mobile construction sign while refusing repeated instructions to release it.

Because the Complainant positioned yourself between the construction sign and continued resisting, the officers were required to use physical force to separate her from the sign and gain control of her arms. While applying the handcuffs, the Complainant continued resisting by refusing to provide her arms as directed. At this point, the Complainant was on the ground, and the minimal force used was solely to gain control and ensure her safety. The Complainant was never dragged along the ground. She remained in the same general location throughout the apprehension.

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

3. Neglect of Duty