

**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: 03/17/2025

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 during a traffic stop, the Respondent Officer was negligent and unprofessional when she arbitrarily detained him during a traffic stop.

**Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations**

Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, S.O. 2019, c. 1, Schedule 1 Code of Conduct for Police Officer: Ontario Regulation 407/23.

- 1- Human Rights Code – Discrimination
- 2- Undermine public trust

**Decision and Reasons****Allegation 1: Human Rights Code - Discrimination**

RO1 initiated a HTA investigation due to the Complainant's traffic violation. RO1 never had any prior interaction with the Complainant, and no prior knowledge of the Complainant's medical condition. RO1 acted within the scope of her duties under the Highway Traffic Act and did not display any conduct that could reasonably be interpreted as discriminatory based on the Complainant's medical condition. She responded appropriately based on the information available.

Officers are required to balance individual needs with their legal responsibilities, and there is no evidence to suggest that RO1's actions were influenced by bias or prejudice.

**Allegation 2: Undermine Public Trust**

RO1 was engaged in lawful traffic enforcement and responded to a traffic infraction in accordance with her duties. While the Complainant expressed a medical need to use the washroom during the interaction, RO1 acknowledged the concern and provided accurate information regarding the lack of public washroom facilities in [REDACTED] Division. Although, the Complainant questioned RO1's behaviour, and the situation became tense, the officer maintained professionalism throughout and completed the infraction process appropriately.

Both of the allegations were unsubstantiated.