

**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: 12/05/2025


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 alleges that respondent officers #1 and #2 used excessive force, caused injury, failed to deescalate the interaction and used insulting language.



## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1: Interactions with the Public - Unnecessary Force - S.11(1) CSPA  
Allegation #2: Interactions with the Public - Insulting Language - S.12(1) CSPA  
Allegation #3: Performance of Duties - Neglect to do Duty - S.19 CSPA  
Allegation #4: Interactions with the Public - Conduct Undermines Public Trust - S.10(1) CSPA

## Decision and Reasons

Respondent officer #1 and respondent officer #2 were dispatched to the complainant's residence after learning that the complainant had sent an email with suicidal comments. Based on the information learned during their investigation, the respondent officers formed reasonable grounds to apprehend the complainant under the Mental Health Act.

The respondent officers entered the complainant's residence with authority established in case law as well as the homeowners consent for the purpose of preserving the complainant's life.

The respondent officers followed their provincially mandated training in an attempt to deescalate the subject which was unsuccessful. The respondent officers also complied with their provincially mandate training when using soft control to apprehend the actively resistant complainant.

The respondent officers did not use insulting language that amounts to misconduct under the Community Safety and Policing Act when interacting with the complainant.

**CONCLUSION:** The Chief did not have reasonable grounds to believe that the actions of the respondent officers constituted misconduct.