

**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: 12/01/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

### De-identified Summary of Complaint

This summary concerns a complaint about the conduct of a police officer during a traffic stop, arrest, vehicle search, and detention arising from a Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (CDSA) investigation in [REDACTED] in July 2025.

The complainant alleged unlawful arrest, unreasonable length of detention, excessive search activity causing damage to personal property.

At the time of the incident, based on intelligence and prior police interactions, the officer formed grounds to believe the complainant was involved in transporting illicit drugs. The complainant was lawfully stopped while driving and was the sole occupant of the vehicle. Drug paraphernalia was observed, and the complainant was arrested for possession of a controlled substance. He was advised of his rights and placed in police custody.

A search incident to arrest and a roadside inventory search were conducted, during which Canadian currency was located. The vehicle was towed to police headquarters. A police canine unit was subsequently deployed, and the dog indicated the presence of narcotics odour in multiple areas of the vehicle.

The complainant remained in custody during investigative steps and was later released unconditionally the same evening. The seized currency was returned. Due to licensing restrictions, the complainant was required to arrange for a licensed driver to retrieve the vehicle. The complainant later alleged that the vehicle was damaged during the search, attributing the damage to the search. Officers involved reported that no damage was caused, and contemporaneous notes, photographs, and video evidence did not support the allegation. No concerns about damage were raised at the time of release or vehicle retrieval, and no property damage report was made.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

- Neglects to do duty, Sec 19
- Conduct undermines public trust, Sec 10

## Decision and Reasons

- The investigative review identified no objective evidence supporting the allegation that police caused damage to the complainant's vehicle. Specifically:
  - No officer reported or observed damage caused by police.
  - Body-worn camera footage, police report, video surveillance reviewed.
  - Towing and unloading were observed and documented without incident.
  - No contemporaneous complaint of damage was made at time of vehicle release/retrieval.
  - The individual who picked up the vehicle has been called three times; messages left and has not returned calls.
  - No photographs, repair invoices, or independent evidence of police caused damage were provided.

The evidence establishes that police actions were reasonable, measured, and consistent with lawful search authorities.

- The evidence does not substantiate the allegation. The arrest and vehicle searches were supported by reasonable grounds, authorized in law, and conducted in accordance with established police procedures. There is no evidence of neglect or improper vehicle handling. Accordingly, the allegation is unsubstantiated.
- The evidence does not substantiate the allegation. The conduct of the respondent officer and assisting officers was lawful, proportionate, and consistent with accepted policing standards. The absence of charges following release does not, in itself, establish misconduct. Accordingly, the allegation is unsubstantiated.