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: 11/16/2025

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 shoplifting investigation at a retail store, the respondent officer improperly accused them of stealing plastic bags and engaged in conduct that amounted to public shaming. Specifically, the complainant stated that while being searched in a loss prevention office, the respondent officer questioned the presence of plastic bags found in their personal belongings and suggested they had been taken from the store. The complainant maintained that the bags were complimentary items and not subject to theft. The complainant further alleged that the officer's tone and persistence were harassing, and that after their release, the officer made a comment instructing them not to steal in a manner intended to embarrass them in a public setting.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 10 -Undermining Public Trust
Ontario Regulation 407/23: Code of Conduct for Police Officers under the Community Safety and Policing Act (CSPA), 2019, states, a police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

Decision and Reasons

The investigation included a review of the complaint, police records, officer notes, witness statements, and body worn camera (BWC) footage. The evidence established that the complainant had been lawfully detained and arrested in relation to a shoplifting incident. The respondent officer's interaction with the complainant, including the search of personal property and related questioning, occurred within the context of this lawful investigation.

BWC confirmed that the officer questioned the origin of plastic bags found in the complainant's possession; however, the officer repeatedly clarified that no charges would result from the bags. The interaction was investigative in nature and remained controlled and professional. The evidence did not support that the officer's conduct was intended to harass, intimidate, or publicly shame the complainant. Additionally, there was no indication that members of the public were present during the interaction such that the complainant was exposed to public embarrassment. While the complainant perceived the interaction as distressing, this alone does not meet the threshold for misconduct under the Code of Conduct. Accordingly, there is insufficient evidence to establish that the officer engaged in discreditable conduct or undermined public trust. The allegation is unsubstantiated.