

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: 08/26/2025

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 the Respondent Officer was biased during an investigation and failed to lay a criminal charge.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Duty - Neglect or Omit - S.19 CSPA - Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

Duty - Neglect or Omit - S.19 CSPA - Reg. 407/23

The Complainant believed the Respondent Officer incorrectly concluded a criminal investigation by choosing to follow evidence which was in direct conflict with the Complainants evidence.

The Investigator reviewed officer's reports, notes, In-Car Camera footage, Body Worn Camera footage, related occurrence reports and relevant legislation.

The Investigator concluded there was insufficient evidence to support the Respondent Officer had conducted a neglectful investigation.