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: 12/04/2025

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 Respondent Officers used unnecessary or excessive force when she was apprehended under the Mental Health Act – Form 2. She further alleged that she was discriminated against due to a disability and the colour of her skin and that her rights were violated when the Respondent Officers allowed an occupant of the home to access the residence to collect her property.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Human Rights and the Charter
s. 5(1)) Treat person in contravention of HRC

Interactions with the Public
s. 10(1) Undermine public trust

Interactions with the Public
S. 11(1) Unnecessary or excessive use of force

Decision and Reasons

The available information supports that the Respondent Officers acted lawfully, reasonably, and with appropriate care throughout the apprehension. They attended the Complainant ' s residence under the authority of a Form 2 issued by a Justice of the Peace, based on the Caller ' s concerns regarding her mother ' s mental health. Body worn camera footage corroborates the officers ' accounts that they used only minimal force, demonstrated patience, and maintained a respectful demeanor during the interaction. The use of handcuffs occurred solely as a safety measure inherent to a Mental Health Act apprehension, and they were not applied until the Complainant indicated that her medical episode had subsided and voluntarily presented her arms; no complaints of pain were made at the time. The officers also reasonably believed the Caller resided at the address after she produced a lease listing her as an occupant and a working key, leading them to conclude she had authority to enter and collect belongings. Importantly, there is no evidence to support the Complainant ' s allegation that the apprehension, handcuffing, the decision to allow the Caller entry, or any other action taken by the officers was discriminatory. Collectively, these factors indicate that the officers ' actions were justified, measured, and consistent with their legal obligations, and all of the above allegations have been vehemently denied by the Respondent Officers.

Based on all of the evidence available to the Investigator, the Respondent Officers acted within all legislative authorities and [Police Service] procedures.